

BL13 Sugg Add Mss 45837-40 mss on Suggestions for Thought, 995 pp

Add Mss 45837, microfilm, has RN notes with page numbers at top right; Abbott is consistent, crossed out name not clear, checked again Oct 2010, 252 ff total; Adam Matthew microfilm reel 51

ff1-35 notes not in printed Suggestions
ff36-112 dialogue between MS, JA, begins Sugg 1:3-66,
ff113-46 are in the printed Sugg 1:66-92 as a conversation among Ignatius of Loyola, HM and Jacob Abbott;
ff147-61 JA, MS, printed 1:93-105
ff162-217 JA, HM, MS are in the printed text 1:106-35

f1 {archivist: R.N. 135} ink, pencil additions
96]

[11:689-

Political Economists are generally men of very logical minds, who set out upon a wrong premise, reason clearly & well, & are much pleased in their conclusions - But what is their premise? That virtue must be rewarded & Vice punished -

But is this ~~His~~/God's thought?

They think of Vice as a very pleasant thing, but subject to an (almost arbitrary) interdiction of God, & for which we must be ~~h~~anged & punished - a thing not in itself an evil, but for which God harms us or does something to us.

But is not God's thought that Virtue & Happiness are synonymous, one & the same thing. Virtue *is* Happiness. That Vice is misery - And that the honest (unprovided for) are in themselves happier than the dishonest (provided for)

P. Economy is a very narrow view of things, but arising as Puseyism did naturally out of & to counter it, Germanism, out of the new views of Prison Discipline & Punishment-

But carry it to its lengths - the letting evil alone - to work not its own experience - & see what it will come to - Will the bad man

f1v

become better, the bad man's offspring become reformed? The drunken man's child becomes a sot, a thief - & society ends by shutting him up for its own protection - There seems no chance for them in this way -

Yes, but you say, the honest man is encouraged. But he ought not to be - For the reformation of every bad man is an advantage, the deterioration a disadvantage to all society. He himself, the honest man, is injured by the other -

What you want is to educate all the rich to lay aside the doctrine of Reward & Punishment, the poor honest man to feel that the reformation of the dishonest is an advantage to society & therefore to him - & to all to feel that virtue is itself the good, vice in itself the evil.

What you want is not the reformation of that particular Ragged Sch - but the amelioration of Society - & how is that to be effected? Not by leaving the wicked to propagate himself.

For is there not more hope of the wicked child becoming instrumental in reforming the father - you send him back home on a vantage ground where the example of the father can be of use to him - than if you leave both to rot - what can you expect?

f2

Then as to the principle of not educating or reforming vice, for fear of en/discouraging the virtuous, carry it to its extreme - the thief has a child which becomes a thief & is shut up - ~~but~~ there it is not to be educated - because the honest man can't afford a similar education - & is it to have a clean healthy room & sufficient food? No because the honest man can't afford a healthy home - The parents are to pay for it - says the Economist - but if he drinks away all his money, is it to starve? Yes - Then you are to give it nothing but confinement.

But if the honest man cd see that the rogue's disease is worse than his? that, of the starving & the hungry, the starving are to be attended to first.

But shan't you make the honest man envious of the dishonest? No, because you don't exempt the dishonest from the consequences of his evil, you can't, if you would - He has an ulcer, which you must put under process of cure - but he must suffer from the disease -

f2v

But if the P.E.s are ~~wrong~~/right, Howard's whole system is wrong - the prisoners ought to have been left to suffer everything.

[pencil here]

In the Cholera too, the poor are much better off than the rich - because the poor get their houses whitewashed & plied upon - by law - Oh but you say, it is infectious & wd spread - Well is not vice infectious?

Then it seems to me that man wd become bad under the non interference system than under the other - Taking for granted that some of the honest will become dishonest for ye sake of ye maintenance, you will not more (the offspring of the dishonest) become so if let alone. The argument of the P.E. applies to all work house schools, of course.

[pen resumes]

Child has made itself sick & is like to die - do you neglect it for fear of making another child desirous to over eat itself, to get attention - Granted you do, but the child is like to die - the wicked are like to do still more than die -

This very question was asked of Christ, & he said They that are whole need not &c

f3 {archivist: R.N. 135} pen and pencil

God does not play such tricks with us -
If we are in a healthy state, we are not
created such that we can't tell but that
green is blue & blue is green - that we
can't tell what [pencil here] is good & what is bad - what is
a good God & what is a bad God - If we are told
God does not mean you to perceive & reason, He has given
you a book to read out of concerning Himself - I can
understand that - But I read the book & find it
differing with itself - I cannot use the faculties
wh God has given me & say This is good in a man,
this, infinite & perfect, wd be good in a God - I don't
know that we have anything else -

Hume an Ex of the logical mind going wrong,
no one ever reasoned more clearly & more perfectly,
but he set out from imperfect premises - leaving
Feeling entirely out of the argument. (I do not mean
that he was an unfeeling man) & I suppose no one
has ever gone more wrong.

St Ignatius made the mistake of thinking that each
particular circumstance was a particular volition
of God - that we have no right to alter it - the laws by

f3v

wh we come to that position were the will of God - that we shd be murdered, e.g. & we have no cause therefore to be angry with the murderer - [pen resumes] he murdered us, in the process to perfect happiness - he murdered us on his way to something else - God is not sorry - He sees him at this moment in his perfect state- This does not mean that the murderer is not to be sorry for what he has done - or that you are not to try to alter it - If it were by a particular volition of God that it came about, you ought not to try to alter it - that is the difference - but it came about in consequence of His laws. And you do not cease to suffer from toothache or to try to relieve it . So the murderer must suffer & you reform him - i.e. put yourself in connexion with the laws of God in regard to him - *It may not be consonant with the law of God* that you should alter him, (St. Ignatius again) you have to *find out* the laws of God & put yourself in connexion with them.

f4 [pen]

Are there not spiritual laws as well as physical? But the former are not ~~even~~/only not sought for but not acknowledged. You are told to Cast your bread &c to teach & preach & help, not looking for the effect, but to hope. The Minister complains of the hardness of the hearts, but hopes - some seed is sown, some shaft has struck. It wd be wrong to do more than trust. But if we were to examine & find out the law of what *has* struck, we shd no more say any thing which was at random, (as we do now, hoping that by *accident something* will come in connexion with a spiritual law & act) If by degrees we knew all the spiritual laws, we should be able always to speak & teach to effect - i.e. in conformity with the laws of God. That fatal word "Faith", which we have construed to mean, walking blindfold among the laws of God, shutting our eyes to them, so that we literally speak of "blind trust" - really means finding out a law of God & trusting to it. You do not build a steam engine in this manner - trusting that some

f4v

engine will come out by accident - Why do you build a human character in this manner?

It is true that many act according to the spiritual laws of God without knowing it & we call these Geniuses in education - but all might find them out & apply more or less skilfully.

It is true also that all characters are different & therefore you may say how can there be spiritual laws invariable concerning them, which you may lay hold of? But you make 6 pianofortes by the same law or laws, & they turn out all different so with the human character - you *don't* want to form it - you only want to teach it to form itself.

Till Education has become the first profession instead of the last, but now the physician is literally put before the school-master - he is of a higher caste -

{written sideways}

~~R.C. truth~~

~~You'd leave off~~

reading ye Bible

f5 {archivist: R.N. 136}

Tho' it is sometimes good to "commune with God & be still" to hold such intercourse as we can thro' our own being only, there is no employment, no enjoyment wh is not increased by companionship.

You must pay such attention to the cries of nature - All cries mean something -

You do not excite a person's interest in the every day circumstances of life - you dream of circumstances where you will excite their interest. It is a natural cry that of sharing an interest, of seeking companionship for each of the purposes & thoughts of life. If it cannot be satisfied, it becomes perverted. Do not be angry with yourself, it will be satisfied in Eternity.

The Gloria I like so much- The Father i.e. God, the Son i.e. Man & the Holy Ghost i.e. God in Man. & the as is was is now &c I like so much.

I think there is such truth in the Puseyites attention to little things - in the ejaculation &c Because a man when he is sinning is not in a state to maintain himself in a high state of mind - it is only by attention to little things, if at all, that he is to be recalled - A drunken man cannot be told

f5v

to keep up a high state of feeling - to put a flower in water, any little trifle to divert his attention at the moment, ~~to~~& which *he can do*, is the only thing. Aiming too high I take it to be our bane; because then we fall too low - If a person suffering from ennui aims at too sublime occupations which she cannot do, she will end with taking a puff out of the closet, or thinking of her dress, but if she finds out what she can do easily, she does it.

Rules are so valuable - because they prevent you from thinking about forbidden things. If you wish for a dainty dish & yield, you are the worse for it - if you wish for it & resist, you are still the worse for the thought, but a rule prevents you thinking about it.

I have such a value for little things. The greatest things of life are accomplished by them. A pencil in the pocket to write down a question or a thought at the time, because a thought is an inspiration of God & shd not be lost. The mere getting up an hour earlier may make "a sot a prince" all day, & without it he may stay a sot. The getting up at 9 instead of 8 may prevent a man from being a reasoner -

f6

The prayer Keep us from vain imaginings I like in one sense - It is true that we only can keep ourselves from vain imaginings & that only by putting ourselves in accordance with the laws of God - but the uttering the prayer is an obeying a law of God - a thinking of something else -

Ought we to reject anything? Surely if we have decided what is best to do, i.e. what is the only thing to do, to say we are sorry for the consequences, sorry we cannot do the other is absurd. It is as absurd to be sorry that you cannot see Mme Mohl, if you have missed her by one hour by deciding that it is right to go, as it is to say that you are sorry you cannot see the Bp of Norwich who is in the other world. You must have no regrets - Everything is done by the laws of God.

With regard to the spiritual laws, you admit that inspiration which has written "the book" in every age, is received by men not exempted from the common laws of mankind, not endowed with separate organizations. The question is to find out the laws by which they received it, (probably unknown to themselves) that we may receive it not uncertainly & accidentally but knowingly - may put our selves & others under the influence of those laws -

f6v

Does a law benefit each person individually as well as the whole? Yes because ~~illeg~~the happiness which each person may & will reach cd not exist at all if it were not for those laws. Each individual obtains a higher happiness i.e. God's happiness under those laws & in consequence of that plan than he could under any other.

The Roman Ca. had got hold of a higher truth than we when they made physicians of the soul, & confession to them of our soul maladies, & gave them an education for the employment, training them in the knowledge of character & of spiritual laws. But the physicians did their work so badly that men said We will have none of them. But we have put the spiritual teachers, the schoolmasters, beneath even the physical teachers, the physicians.

The Evangelicals say Don't look at the effect of what you are doing - & they say true - for if you did, you'd leave off.

They say, Have faith - go on - trust that something will sow a seed -
Yes but that something succeeds by some spiritual law, find out that law, find out the other laws, & all will succeed - or rather, you will do nothing that won't have an effect -

They say, don't look, you won't see - No, you say, because it is not there - & therefore you do right not to look or you'd

leave off.

f7 {archivist: R.N. 136}

I can't believe that God wd
leave our highest morals &
highest happiness to come by
accident - to come without
our call - & so that we cannot
recall them - He must have
made spiritual laws as well
as physical - Indeed, we
acknowledge them - we say,
if we put ourselves under such
& such circumstances - we cannot
trust our imaginations, if we
listen to such & such conversation
we spoil our affections - if we
read such & such books, we
cultivate them.

Isaiah was Isaiah, because
with such an organization &
under such circumstances such
effects took place - You say
Oh there cannot be spiritual
laws - because no two men are alike.

f7v

But that is just what proves
a law, because no two men
are under exactly the same
circumstances - there never
can be another Shakspere -

The Evangelical goes out &
reads the Bible & gives tracts
to the poor & the drunken,
& does not look what takes
effect & what does not.

f8 {archivist: R.N. 137}

Many acknowledge that "God orders all things for the best" many pray every day "Thy will be done". If a great calamity come, they will really struggle to feel as well as say this. But it is often forgotten that it was not said "God orders all *great* concerns for the best, but small matters are not his care. nor Thy will be done in all great things we wish ours to be done in smaller things - God directs the stars on their course. In a storm or a whirlwind we feel he is there, we recognise his presence with awe. But when we cannot take a walk we wished to take because it rains, when somebody does not come that we wanted or somebody comes we did not want, or our dress is stained, or a glass is broken, it wd be thought ridiculous & bordering on profane to connect thoughts of God & religion with such concerns.

Yet there is one Will in consequence of which every change in the Universe which makes the present moment different from the past takes place. The rain drops from the clouds, the glass from the table by consequence of the same law, without which the earth wd not travel round the sun. All these are effects arising from its being the will of God that this *Law* shd be at the moment they take place.

f8v

~~filleg~~/Let us look into what passes within us in regard to the smaller circumstances of life which are troublesome or disagreeable. Some such are attributable to no person but to what is called the course of events - some to ourselves, some to other people. If to ourselves it wd be felt an undesirable indifference not to be somewhat vexed & provoked with ourselves. If to others, if we are only a little vexed & angry at a little provocation, it is considered natural. In proportion to what is called our easiness of temper & good nature we shall sooner or later forgive & forget. If we were not at all vexed or angry, we shd be thought too easy, stupid perhaps. All is vague, it is not of consequence enough to think about - it wd be tiresome & pragmatical & ridiculous to think about such feelings - They pass off when others take their place as in children.

In God's thought in God's ways there is no vagueness- there is no difference in his attention to what we call great & to what we call small. There is no great or small in his view, because one law, one purpose, attaches to all in accordance with which the whole is ruled. Man should aim so to

f9

rule his spirit that there shall be no difference in the thought, the feeling with which he receives events because they are comparatively great or small. Whenever an individual wd bring about or prevent somewhat if he could, if such prevention or effect is certainly beyond his power, he cannot indulge a wish or a regret concerning it consistently with his acknowledgment God orders all things &/or his prayer Thy will be done.

It may be answered, This may be admitted, where it is clear to the mind that the small annoyance comes from God but it is very certain that any of our lesser vexations come from ourselves or other people.

Whatever comes from ourselves or other people comes from some law of God in regard to human nature.

Let us be very careful to distinguish between the idea of a separate distinct volition of God, & a law of God. Suppose a glass broken, I do not mean that there preceded it a volition of God, this glass shall be broken, I mean that the breaking of the glass arose from a variety of laws or volitions of God that certain consequences shd invariably attend certain preceding circumstances. What

f9v

all the laws connected with any event perhaps no man can tell. However comparatively of small import the event itself - on the laws which induce it depends the whole framework of the Universe - the whole Providence of God. With such an event as the breaking of a glass at a particular time by a particular person, will be connected a variety of physical laws in regard to the glass broken, of physical & other laws concerning human nature in regard to the person who breaks.

It may be that laws of Chemistry of Nat. Phil. of Geology, that laws wh regulate the intellectual & spiritual nature of man, may have united in the production of that event wh cd not have taken place without them.

What is Truth?

Truth is the thought, the feeling of God. The truth concerning any subject is the view God takes of it.

f10 {archivist: R.N. 138} pencil, small paper

You say that ~~illeg~~/Absolute Prevision fetters the Will - I know, every body says it - & it's very odd, for an old fellow of my time of life, I can't see it -

There are Quetelet's tables - he ~~foretells~~/computes that so many third marriages will take place in one year - that so many people will die at 4 o'clock, & supposing the computation correct, he foretells, we may say, these things. But does he therefore limit our Free Will?

Yes, if he foretold this unerringly he would. No, ~~because~~/but he does not foretell who shall die & who shall steal & who shall marry?

Why I can foretell as well as possible of the children of the school - this girl will turn out ill, that will - Do I therefore *make* them do so? In judging of each other, if I see my mother go by the window in her best gown, I ~~don't~~ know she's going to call on Mrs. Thingumbob & that she's not going to garden - She would even be annoyed if I were to suppose such a thing - She would say You extravagant child, do you suppose I'm going make a dog of my best gown? Do I make her go & pay that visit? The nearer we approach to perfect knowledge of one another's character the more accurately can we predict. But is there any coercive force in that prediction?

[end 11:696]

f11 {archivist: R.N. 139} pencil, small paper

hypostasis

substance eule

person

express image impress of the
character seal - identical

representation, leaving out the
essence - but being spiritual
to our comprehension

it becomes almost *identity* -

~~person~~/hypostasis - entirety - a thing which
submits of itself - which stands
on its own foundation - as the
chair is a ~~person~~/hypostasis, the carpet
is not - (being cut off) a
stereotype - a thing indivisible,
remaining - substance -
~~person~~ means an ~~whole~~/individuality as
the personality of the affly
of matter

f11v

substance of leg of mutton not
different from that of sheep

~~"person"/substance ought to be translated~~

~~substance~~/existence with entirety - including

of course

essence

substance

existence under a form defined

& fixed - both in essence &

accidents - comprehending

entirety - an existing entirety

a soldier & a citizen may be

~~the same~~ 2 persons - but ~~in~~/the same

substance two distinct ideas

you may choose the wrong

~~substance~~/person to act from -

a man may make the confusion

of his ~~substances~~/persons to act ~~from~~/with

hyp - sub - Athan Cd -

the Trin - is all one hyp - but

different persons - different

independent actions

f12

outer & inner view of which two
persons but one substance

Chairman receives money as C -
pays the interest as man - 2 persons
but one substance - impersonates 2 people

lake runs into individual creeks
but has one indivisible substance

a man is his different relations
brother father husband in three
persons, but one substance

hypostasis - essence with the form
whole including essence
entirety

water as ice, water as water & water as steam
is same substance - it has its
essence & its whole - but under
different accidents - it has
different personalities - 2 accidents

f12v

this is us & that's you
we're to be Bishops &
you're to be damned
{written on the other end of the paper, hence upside down}
of same thing
{character written in Greek letters}
Xt two hypostasis forming a
3rd hypostasis by their conjunction

brandy & water 2 essences make brandy=&=
water a 3rd essence but reproducible into
the two by the chemist - not
so commingled that they cannot
be reproduced -

f13 {archivist: R.N. 140} pen

The Euclid of Metaphysics

[11:697-98]

Postulates

I

Let it be granted that there is a God

II

That God is Eternal

III

That God is Perfect

Axioms

I

A part cannot conceive of the whole -

f14 {archivist: R.N. 140}

Definitions

Omnipotence

Perfection

f15

Prop I

The Human Mind is incapable of conceiving a beginning to
Creation

a part cannot conceive of the whole -

the Finite Mind cannot conceive ~~Infinity~~

~~Eternity~~ - beginning to creation - for, if

~~it could conceive the whole, it could come~~

~~to the limits of the whole - & could under-~~

~~stand the beginning - but, it cannot~~

~~conceive the whole - the less the greater~~

the part the whole, which is absurd.

The human mind is incapable of concei=
ving how Creation began.

Prop II

The Human Mind is incapable of conceiving

Eternity

f16 {arch: R.N. 141 ~~1862?~~

~~In answer to J.S. Mills criticism of Suggestions?~~
not 1860 handwriting I think

[FN begins here]

I think, in defining Law, I confused
the two meanings of the words which,
if we come to think *what* we do mean
when we use the word in common
parlance, we shall find that we
attach to it. When we use the
word Law, in reference to ~~filled~~ Physical/Nature
things, we simply mean to generalize.
There is nothing more, absolutely no
other meaning in the word - law
is not a sequence, nor a cause, nor
a reason, nor a power, but simply
a generalization. For instance, the
law of gravitation or ~~classification~~/categorization of
a number of phenomena - To say
that a stone must fall because of the law of attraction - i.e.
that one stone *must* fall to the
ground - because another does, or
because the Earth is attracted by
the Sun, is simply absurd - the Law
of gravitation is merely a general
formula, embracing all these facts -
But Law has another meaning in our

[11:47-48]

f16v

minds - & we confuse the two - This
other ~~meaning~~ *has* a compelling
meaning. Thou shalt do no murder
which means, If thou doest murder,
such & such consequence shall follow.
But this has obviously quite a
different meaning from the other.
Murders are done & the consequences
do follow - ~~In the other~~ But
stones do *not not* fall to the ground -
It is not, If thou dost not
attract the Earth, such & such
consequences will follow - ~~It~~/The Law is
simply an expression of a fact -
The Sun attracts the Earth, the
stone falls to the ground - & our
Law is ~~simply an~~/the expression of all
these facts in one - If we could
have two words to signify these two
very different things - it would be

f17

desirable - meanwhile it is important to keep in mind that the word has two meanings - we must not say, *This Law cannot be broken, that can* - there is no generalizing the two kinds of Law in one - excepting in this way. Both are expressions of the thought of God. It is obvious that the Physical law is nothing but the unvarying thought or will. There is no cause - none but His will. The second kind of Laws might almost be called a deduction from the first - secondary Laws - In this way, Thou shalt not cast thy child into the lake simply means - not a fact but - if thou castest thy child into the lake the law of gravitation will ~~act~~/be there, the child will fall - this fact will become ranged among the other facts -

f17v

Thus there are two definitions of the word "Law" - 1st an intention or will in a conscious intelligent Being - & 2nd a generalization of facts - To talk of a Law, in this latter sense, as coercive is the mistake which, it would seem, has led all the *Materialists* so far afield. The statement of a Law is no *explanation* of the facts - it is merely a general expression of them. Newton did not explain the Universe - he simply expressed it under a formula.

The "Law" of the Legislators of England, ~~for instance,~~/again is quite a different thing - & ought to be called by quite a different word - that is no statement of facts. I think that perhaps we confuse the word "Law" & the word "Power". Law is not the power of God. The Law cannot make the stone fall - is not the cause of the stone falling. It is the expression of the Power which makes the stone fall.

[end**11:48]**

f18 {archivist: R.N. 141} [blue paper]

We cannot have progress
to add]

[suggpt4

separated from the conditions
necessarily attached to it.
Light first breaks upon a
few, is then communicated to
others, & lastly diffuses itself
thro' society -

Suppose this choice to be
presented to us - Will you be
all of one mind & satisfied
with your present state of
barbarism? or will you have
progress with the condition
attached to it - variety of
opinion? No enlightened man
wd hesitate to prefer the latter,
nor be unwilling to find him=
self one of the minority in the
van of progress -

Two paths are open to every
minority - They may endeavour
to overcome the majority by

f18v

physical force, & impose their
own views upon a society
incapable of appreciating them;
or they may endeavour by
instruction & persuasion to
enlighten & conciliate the igno=
rant & the prejudiced - or,
which is the same thing, to
gain over the majority.

After many years of trial,
opinion is generally settled
in favour of representative
government. There is thought
to be a great balance of
advantage in its favour.
But there is no blindness to
its disadvantages; & among
them is the almost necessary
exclusion from office of those
who hold opinions in advance
of their age - True, as a compen=
sation for this exclusion, they
may be said to have a

f19

monopoly of the privilege of enlightening & improving mankind.

Two classes of eminent men are a necessary development of progressive civilization under representative government - the leaders of a majority & the leaders of a minority. Both are made up of capable men. The first are selected by the prevailing opinion, to govern in accordance with that opinion. The second are appointed - independently of opinion - in fulfilment of the highest destiny vouchsafed to man, to shed around the influence of their own superior intelligence & goodness -
add]

[end suggpt4

An allusion to Matt 9:12.

f20 {archivist: R.N. 141} regular small paper again [suggpt4]

The Mysticians & the Rationalists alike acknowledge an organization through which Man must think, feel, will - by means of which Man has mind - They are alike in recognizing God as the author of this Organization. Both sects are therefore believers alike in a Creator & Governor. The difference is that the Mysticians believe that God speaks through the Organization which he has created - that he is its Holy Ghost. The Rationalists believe that this Organization in accordance with the laws which He has given it, generates or secretes its own Holy Ghost.

f20v

I should be tempted to think that, if we came to close definitions, there is very little real distinction - What is the difference between God & his laws? His laws are, after all, only his thoughts - the expression of his thoughts. If we could be sure of 1st always thinking the same thing & 2nd accomplishing our thought, our thoughts would be ~~our~~ laws. Law is nothing but invariable thought in a Being, where Thought & Action is the same thing. But we have got into our heads that Law is some mysterious chain which God

f21

creates & then leaves - machinery (like the watch, which the maker manufactures & then sends to a distance out of his own hands.)
 If, however, it is correct to ~~say~~/define law as but the unvarying thought of God, ~~that~~/what is the real distinction between the Mysticism which says God communicates/speaks himself with/through the Organization which he has created - & the Rationalism which says ~~God is thought~~ (or ~~so~~ the Organization which

f21v

God has created speaks by means of/in accordance with his thoughts. (or laws) I can make no distinction between God & his thoughts. Or, putting it into an algebraical formula,
 Organizn x God = man's mind
 Organizn x Law = man's mind
 but Law = God's thought or God.

[end 11:698]

f22 {archivist: R.N. 141}

Law

In believing that Law ~~to~~ governs the Physical Universe - that is, that all the phenomena we see are but the expression of the unvarying thought of God - do we conceive the spiritual Universe not to be under the same Government?

I cannot read Sermons - what is all this about forgive=ness? Do we believe that God thinks one thing at one time & another at another? What is the meaning of that cowardly prayer, Hide thy face from my ~~iniquities~~ sins & blot out all mine iniquities. I always say, Don't listen, my God - don't hear us - On the contrary, put my sins into the full light of thy countenance - shew me how to alter them -

And as for the second clause, Blot out all mine iniquities -

f22v

why, God couldn't if He would - Can God make that which has been not to have been? alter the past? The prayer is an absurdity.

{f23 is blank}

f23v

The excellence, in as much as it imitates God, the utility & the happiness of this end to be one with God, will serve me nothing if I do not follow it according to thy laws - in accordance, that is, with thy thoughts - by those means which Thou hast appointed.

f24 {archivist: R.N. 142}

Can all men will what they please? Some can, some cannot - ~~Some cannot~~
Can any man will to please to be permanently wrong?
No, because the laws of God, i.e. of the Spirit of Right, are made to bring all men ultimately to will what is right.

Therefore the question being not to will what they please but to will what is right, i.e. what is a possibility to human Nature, can all men will what is right?
No, some men cannot will at all what is right, cannot will even to alter their nature, & others must help them -

And let it be remembered

f24v

that we must will what is a possibility to human nature, in order to attain what we will - It is not a possibility to human nature to will always what is wrong -

Therefore the question becomes, Can every man will all that is possible to human nature? No, some cannot even will it - others will it, but have not discovered the means - others will it, but have not calculated the time -

What people want to believe is that, whatever the state of the nature, & whatever the circumstances, a man may will either this or that - i.e. may will two things with the same nature

f25

If you could do this, what
would become of the laws of
God? If there were no
invariableness that, with
the same nature, under
the same circumstances,
the same result would
follow - But how are you
to alter that nature?
In some cases, the race
must alter it for you -
in others, the results
themselves alter it for you.

This leads to another
consideration - a man
willing what he pleases
generally means that a
man in the present
state of his nature can
will what shall be his
will in future state
of his nature - Nothing
can be commoner than a

f25v

man, under present
suffering of results, willing
an entire change of will
in the future, which, when that suffering
has passed away, he
cannot/does not will -

¶/You ask whether a man
can will in the present
what he shall will in the
future - Sometimes he knows & sometimes he
does not - for instance,
a man says I know that
I can will to be punctual
if I please, for if any
one's life depends upon
it I know I should be
punctual -

That is, he knows that
in that case it *will* be
his nature to will to be
punctual - but if he
does not know what

f26 {archivist: R.N. 142}

the circumstances may be
he may not know what
his will will be -

What is it that man
has to attain? Not, as we
often think, the power to
will as he pleases - but
the impossibility of willing
other than right. We
want a nature, like
God's, to which it is
impossible to will anything
but right - we don't
want to will any thing
we please - We want it
be impossible to us to get
up anything but early -
not to will to get up early
or not as we please -
supposing it to be right
to get up early.

This being the case, can

f26v

man will as he please
is not the question but
can man always will
what is right - Perhaps
there is hardly any man who
can -

f27

What is self command? It is the power of the whole self - not of any peculiar part - it is the power of the Reason not over the Feelings, because the state of the man without the Feelings would be as destitute of the presence of the man's whole self as the state of the man without the Reason, but it is the power of the Reason & the Feelings together - Then has a man power to will as he pleases? Certainly not - He can only will what his nature wills - He cannot always depend on his nature, either thro' ignorance, of means, or thro' want of time, to will what is right.

f27v

Can you say man has power over himself? What is man's power? It is the power of his nature - It is the state of his nature at that time which has power, not he who has power over his nature - What do we mean then by acquiring power over ourselves? We mean that his nature is in that state that he can will in the present what he shall will in the future - But does that mean anything than that his will for right has become invincible, however ~~greater~~/imperfect his ~~ignorance~~/knowledge of what is right? To obtain power over himself is therefore to obtain that no one part of his nature shall have undue preponderance so as to overpower the other parts-

f28 {archivist: R.N. 142}

There are two questions.
Can man will what he wishes?
Can man do what he will?
In some cases, if he can be secure
of his will, he can be secure of
doing what he will. In others,
he may be secure of his will, but
may be mistaken as to his
power of doing it - In others,
he may wish a thing, but be
aware that he has not the
means to accomplish it, in
which case, he cannot be said
to will it -

I intend to get up early every
morning - ~~Here is a will which~~

Can you?

Yes, if I choose -

This is correct - *If* I please
tomorrow morning to get up
early, I can - But tomorrow
perhaps I may not please -
Can I will what I wish?
Can I do what I will?

f28v

Faith & Virtue
Desire & Law
Foreknowledge not compatible with Free Will
Belief

~~Louis Napoleon
Clergyman
Specifying time
German Patients
Believing in Prayer~~

f29 {archivist: R.N. 142}

In defining Law, if we come to think what we do mean when we use the word in common conversation, we shall find two entirely different meanings.

1st when used, in reference to Nature, as when we say a Physical Law - we simply mean to generalize. Law is here neither a sequence, nor a cause, nor a reason, nor a power, it is simply the generalization of a number of phenomena. To say that a stone must fall *because* of the law of attraction is to ~~illeg~~/say that one stone must fall *because* another does, or *because* the Earth tends to fall towards the Sun -

2nd we use Law in a legislative sense - Thou shalt do no murder -

f29v

which means, If thou doest murder, such & such consequences shall follow This is a totally different meaning from the other. Murders are done, & the consequences do follow - But stones do *not not* fall to the ground - It is not, If thou doest not attract the Earth. such & such consequences will follow.

The first kind of Law is therefore simply an expression of a fact or rather the generalization of a number of facts - We must not say This Law cannot be broken, that can - The second means, If you do this, you come under that Law, of the first kind . If you throw your child down a precipice, it comes under the Law of Gravitation.

f30 {archivist: R.N. 142}

Can all men do what they will? You ask - some can, some cannot.

Can all men will what they please?

Certainly you are willing what you please -

But could any man will to be eternally what is wrong?

No. he could not please to will it : because the laws of God, i.e. of the Spirit of Right are made to bring every man ultimately to will what is right -

Then the question being not to will any thing which tongue can speak, but to will what is right, ~~all (it being within the possibility of human nature, understood)~~ can all men will what is right -

No, some men cannot even wish what is right, cannot wish even to alter their nature, & others must help them.

To do what we will, let it be remembered that we must will what is a possibility, to human nature - It is not a possibility to human nature to do always what is wrong -

Could not Buonaparte be a Buonaparte for ever?

Certainly not. Therefore the question ~~The~~ becomes, Can every man will all that is possible to human nature?

And can they?

No, some cannot even wish it - others will it but have not discovered the means to do what they will - others will it, but have not calculated the time necessary -

What you want to believe when you use the words Free Will is that, whatever the state

f30v

of the nature & whatever the circumstances,
a man may will either this or that - i.e.
may will two things with the same nature

But how are you to alter that nature?

In some cases, the race must alter it for
you - in others, the results themselves alter
it -

A man being able to do as he will generally
means that a man, in the present state
of his nature, can will what shall be his
will in a future state of his nature -

To be sure he can -

And ~~why~~, yet nothing can be commoner than a
man, under present suffering of results,
willing an entire change of will in the future,
which, when that Suffering has passed away,
he does not will.

You ask whether a man can wish in the
present what he shall will in the future -
Sometimes he knows & sometimes he does
not - whether he can will. For instance,
a man says, I know that I can ~~will to~~/be
punctual if I will, for if a life depended
upon it, I know I should be punctual.
That is, he knows that in such a case
it *will* be his nature to be punctual -
but if he does not know what the circum=
stances may be, he may not know what
his will will be -

What is it that man has to attain?

Not, as we often think, the power to ~~do~~/will
whatever he wish - but the impossibility
of willing other than right - We want a
nature, like God's to which it is impossible
to will anything but right - we don't want to will
{written in the right side margin}
anything we wish. We want it to be impossible to us to get up
~~other/any~~
~~thing but~~/than early - ~~not to will~~ supposing it to be right to
get up

early -

not to be able to get up early or not as we will. Such being the
case,
can man will what he wishes is not the question, but can man
always
will what is right? Perhaps there is hardly any man who can.

f31 {archivist: R.N. 143}

What has God created us
for? Close in the train
of this question
follow a multitude of
subordinate ones, Why did
He create us to be Evil,
to be suffering, to be damned?
When a man looks abroad
into the different natures,
back into history, forward
into future suffering, he
feels inclined to exclaim,
I would not have created
Man -

Of the beings with
which we are acquainted
God, man, beasts - it
appears unnecessary to
prove that God could not

f31v

have created another god.
That with God, a contradic=
tion is an impossibility, is
not detraction from His
omnipotence -

He might then have
created us animals, which
never do wrong, which
always act under his
immediate inspiration or
instinct, but which
never improve -

But what was God's
object in creating us?
Was it not to form beings
capable of perfection, of
happiness, which is the
same thing, of being one
with Him? That this
should be worked out by

f32

their own efforts, that man should not be an animal, blindly obeying instinct, a machine worked by the hand of its maker, appears the only manner of accomplishing His purpose, unless He had created Gods.

The end of man is therefore to be one with God - Everything that is His is to be man's, saving, of course, His omnipotence.

That man should make mistakes in following this end is as unavoidable as that the child should fall when learning to walk - that the pupil in

f32v

drawing should make faults while learning to draw. A ~~parent~~/mother may foresee the actual falls ~~his~~/her child will have, a teacher, if a good one, will know the very faults his pupil will make - yet if wise he will allow him to make those faults, rather than keep him acting blindly under his orders - To say that God foresaw sin, therefore He willed that particular sin is to say that the Mother willed that particular fall of her child.

f33 {archivist: R.N. 143}

-2-

God does not desire to be praised or glorified any more than a good human being desires it - He wishes us to be one with Him, not to serve Him, not to honour Him, but to be one with Him.

He is infinitely happy & to be one with Him can be the only way for us to be happy.

It is in us a rightful desire to wish to be something, to do something - & it has a cramping influence on the human being to repress this desire - We see that God goes forth & creates, that he has a pleasure, so to

f33v

speak, in manifesting himself ad extra, his object being to multiply his own happiness. Man has a similar desire when in a healthy state & to be one with God he must have similar objects -

But God does not say, if we could see the thought of God, I do this for my own glory, that men may say, It is God who does this, neither will man, if he is one with God, do anything for the sake of his own glory or vainglory.

To be one with God we must observe (in the same way as we observe ~~what~~ in order to be well what

f34

things agree with our bodily
health) - what occupations,
what kind of life, agrees
with us? what is to be
done? what abstained from -
God's/Man's business therefore
is, as it were, to create man -
to create him ~~in accordance~~/by means of
~~with~~ the laws of God -

f34v

To Printer
to be printed in the
foolscap half-margin form
like the preceding part -
Two copies to be sent to
30 Old Burlington St
F. Nightingale
Dec 29/59

f35

"Non quaeras, quis hoc dixerit,
sed quid dicatur attende"
said. G}

{Don't be concerned about who
said
something but pay
attention to what
is

I

~~Jacob Abbott M.S.~~

{in another hand: Vijun} ~~-1-~~
 Belief ~~M.S.~~ You ask ~~me why I~~/if we believe in a God?
 -
 in ~~J.A.~~ Yes, I don't know why you, who
 regard/if those who
 God ~~the authority of revelation, should/believe~~ disregard
 in a God at all - ~~still less,~~ and why you should/they
 believe Him perfect?
~~M.S.~~ The two questions have, ~~for me,~~
 one & the same answer. I believe in a Perfect
 Being, whom you call God.
~~J.A.~~ But why do you believe in God/Him?
~~M.S.~~ If you ask me that question, we
 come immediately to the definition of the two
 words "believe" & "God" What does "I believe"
 mean?
 What does ~~J.A.~~ It means the strongest conviction.
 "Belief" ~~M.S.~~ It means, in common language, some=
 mean? times doubt & sometimes affirmation. "Is
 means, A.B. in London?" "I believe so." Here it
~~convic=/persua=~~ "I do not know, but I think it *probable.*"
 "Why do you think he has been there?" "I
 believe his word." Here it means firm
 whether tion - But even here, I think you will find
 understood the belief modified by the modest "I," which
 means, "It is I who believe, I don't know
 others do." What is therefore to be
 by "belief"? Sometimes a sense of certainty,
 sometimes of uncertainty.
~~J.A.~~ I think we might as well look in
 Johnson.
~~M.S.~~ But w/What will Johnson tell us?
 The sense in which the word has been used
 by certain writers, called classic. Johnson

f37

-2-

account
other
are
human
nature & human nature makes progress.

~~J.A. Does it?~~

Does human nature make progress?
At least in ~~M.S.~~ In some things - Ideas make progress.

words which
express ideas cannot therefore remain the same - A house may mean a house in all ages, tho' even ~~with~~ in the case of

express things, the house which we build now signifies a very different thing

from
the house built by the ~~illeg~~ painted

Briton -
How much greater must be the difference in the sense of a word used to express a religious or political idea! Either

we
must have new words or new meanings -

~~J.A. Name, name -~~

Instances of change of meaning
To give instances:
~~M.S. T~~/their name is Legion. Johnson will

in words
define Religion as "Virtue founded upon reverence of God & expectation of future rewards & punishments" & will quote

Milton,
South, Watts & Law for this sense of the

word.
Another theologian (belonging to an

African
tribe) thinks Religion means jumping

over
a stick - If either of these be really

Religion,
we want a new word to express so

different
an idea as the sense we have of our *tie* to God.

~~J.A. But to return to the word "belief".~~

With
Meaning
of "belief"
in God.

what meaning then, do you "believe" in God?

~~M.S.~~ I believe that Man advances to a
consciousness & conviction that there does
exist a Perfect Being, (whom we may call
God,) exactly in proportion as his nature is
well constituted, well educated, well exer=
cised - I believe that this human nature,
when thus *well=born*, & *well=bred*, will
admit of his sense of this truth, & of

others,

inferred from it, being as strong & complete
as the sense of truth with which he asserts
that the tree before his eyes is a tree &
not a house.

God,

But we must be careful to know that the

whom we believe in, *is* a Perfect Being -
Men often *think* that they believe in a
Perfect God, when, in fact, they do not -
when they are really wholly incapable of
even conceiving of a perfect Being. For
instance, in the earlier nations, where
revenge was considered a virtue in man,
it would naturally be thought so in God.
Many imperfections, as we now think them,

were

once deemed virtues, & consequently

attributed

to a God who was *called* perfect. The
religious history of the Hebrews is

especially

curious on this account.

Again the God "of Abraham, of Isaac & of
Jacob" was certainly *not* the God "of the
whole earth". It is true that the Hebrews
served but Him alone - they *believed* however

in many. Their own God they revered, & despised the other Gods. But it was not till long afterwards that they rose, with increasing knowledge, to the belief that there was but one Supreme. Yet He cannot be perfect, if there be more than One. Is it, perhaps, that a knowledge

of

Natural Philosophy, such as cannot be attained by an infant nation, is

necessary

for the conception of One Supreme Being? The more we learn, the more cause we find to think that the whole System of the Universe is one scheme - Astronomy leaves no room, so to speak, for more than one throne - The same legislation prevails everywhere. All becomes one whole, with one Ruler -

{in another hand: Jones} ~~of the advanced state of knowledge & virtue~~

~~J.A. But illustrate what you say necessary for a nation to conceive of a~~

God

~~as perfect.~~

Advanced state of knowledge & virtue necessary for a nation to conceive of a God as perfect.

~~M.S.~~ Take those very Hebrews - Moses had learnt in Egypt, had matured in the Desert, his noble conception of a Divine Spirit - But his savage Hebrew tribe was incapable of it - & he himself was obliged to allow it to deteriorate to their level. Whenever one man has endeavoured to impose the more perfect idea of a Supreme Being, which has had its origin in his own more advanced mind, upon a nation less developed than himself, we see it degenerate -

If the stage of civilization be very low indeed, the race is incapable of conceiving of a God at all. One of the "Sisters of Mercy/Charity" (~~who are~~ the only real "women of the world") who see all nations & all conditions, told me that the ~~only race they had ever~~/single race within their ~~known/knowledge~~, who did not possess, the idea of any supernatural being, was a tribe in Australia, not far from Perth. They were in the lowest conceivable state of animal existence. She had with her one of their children, which she had bought for a shilling, when about to be eaten by its tribe - & which appeared to me little above an animal - except that it stood on two legs, & had no wings. It imitated me like an ape & stole from me like a magpie. x

I ~~illeg~~/related this to a Operative Engineer & he said, slowly & thoughtfully, "That is just the condition in which most of my fellow workmen are - & they do not know whether they believe in a God or not - Sometimes they do & sometimes they don't. I would lead them up to Science, & ~~that~~/Science would lead them up to God."

~~J.A. But what are you driving at with all this?~~

x This child is now at a school ~~at Isleworth~~,/in England, where it has advanced by the most rapid strides from an animal into a human being. It now believes in a God, & if He be not perfect, it is ~~because the God of its instructors is not so~~/not the child's fault.

f41

-6-

at the meaning
Meaning
to be attached to the word
"belief."
sense,
uncer=
certainty.
earnest?
truth
was.
believe, the
till, at
others
themselves -
Tendency
of this
age.
towns,
over/turned their faces

M.S. ~~Merely~~/I am trying to arrive
which we shall attach to the word
"belief" - to prove that the highest state of
belief, (viz., in the signification of the
strongest
conviction), must be the result of the highest
state of development - that therefore we
cannot be said to "believe", in this
except when we have reached that state
& at an earlier stage of development in
man, - "belief" will mean a sense of
tainty - at a later, a sense of
Is it not possible that this sense of
uncertainty it is which has led so many
lately into the Roman Catholic Church, &
~~those~~/some the most learned, the most
Scepticism, not belief, has brought them
there - They required their sense of a
to be stronger & more complete than it
The more they urged themselves to
less real was their feeling of belief
last, they took refuge in the belief of
for that which they had not in
J.A. ~~But you cannot be ignorant that~~/In
this age,
however, by
far the greater proportion of Mankind, ~~in~~
~~this age,~~ have
gone the other way - ~~that~~, in England,
~~all~~/most of
the educated among the Operatives, espe=
cially in the Northern manufacturing
have ~~brought men to infidelity~~/gone
to Atheism
or at least to Theism - ~~that~~ not three

in

a hundred go to *any* place of worship -
& ~~that all~~ the moral & intellectual

among

them ~~are~~/being, almost without an

exception,

"infidels" -

f42

~~-7-~~

{in another hand: Smith}

those/These

conscientiously,

which

discoverable

feeling

residing in/of the Perfect One, which wills Happiness - the

happiness is, by its

happy by exercise

natures like ~~illeg~~/

& man made one with

which

with

exercise of Man's

How it

begins

however, he always says immediately, "God is
incomprehensible,

shall

without

To find the

~~M.S. I am quite aware of it. Even~~

poor fellows ~~illeg~~/thinking so hard & so

leave out the best element in the food

they so earnestly seek - the most Divine
element, that which makes confusion into
order - that which makes the lowest into
the highest - for the highest

principle in existence, perhaps, is, the

thought of the Perfect One, that

~~essentially~~/essence, worked out for the

of ~~illeg~~/their own natures & of other

theirs -
Time is all that intervenes between man

God. &
~~man~~. Time intervenes only because that
would not be the Spirit of Wisdom to

it was possible to will, Man to be one

God, ~~except~~/otherwise than thro' the

faculties.

J.A. You are wandering from your
subject.

~~You see that, w/Whenever man rejects
revelation,~~

however, he always says immediately, "God is

we will not seek for Him, because we

~~cannot~~/not find Him." And he is left

a God, even where he does not deny the
existence of One -

~~Man~~/He will think it fanciful to look upon
the "Holy Ghost"

as a real existence

existence
of God

in Law

but the Love,

Righteousness,

expression

we may

whom,

~~M.S. I believe we shall find the "Holy
Ghost" a real existence.~~ Hitherto I have
rather
looked for it because it exists in the belief
of so many,

x ~~believed,~~ ^{have so} than felt it to be essential,

the Wisdom, the Goodness, the

the Power which we can with our thought
& feeling, recognise in Law & its

in the Universe, these, it seems to me,

better call the "Holy Ghost" than God,

(as so much of the Intellect of the present day says), we cannot understand . I think there wants a distinction between what we can understand & feel & what we cannot. Very much mischief has arisen from what has been said & written about the latter. That a Father of the Universe exists, but incomprehensible to us, I believe may be shewn, not by mathematical evidence, but by such strong presumption (by presumption too increasing with our knowledge & the improvement of our being) that ~~I believe~~ Man may live & feel in
 x in accordance with ~~it~~/the fact, as with much else not mathematically provable - But, with truth it is said that we cannot comprehend Him - and, disgusted by the dogmatizing of Theologians & Churches, many are refusing to believe His existence. Instead of saying, "I cannot understand the Holy Ghost," as I, with many have said - instead of His appearing in the Trinity one knows not why - I believe that it is a Holy Ghost *only* that we *can* understand, that we want an expression for ~~t~~/That which ~~of the Father~~ each man can feel & comprehend. of the Father.

I think Paul unwisely said what I have beforetimes
 so often admired - "Whom ye ignorantly worship, Him reveal I unto you." He could only reveal that which ~~had been given to him to feel & comprehend~~(was true, in

in his own revelation) of
 x what to him was the Holy Ghost - & only to natures capable of receiving his revelation - that revelation which came thro' the Law
 {in another hand 55 P}
 of the Perfect One that "treasure which we have

excellence of
the
~~His Son~~

in earthly vessels," not "that the
the power may be of God", but because so
wisdom of the Perfect One sees best ~~for~~

is

~~J.A. Then you quite agree with
these infidels
that we cannot comprehend God, & that it~~

How much
can we
comprehend
of God.
not

~~no use looking for Him.~~

M.S. If we were capable of understanding
the Laws, that is the thought, feeling,
purpose
of the All-Perfect, we should not require to
be
told what is doing at this present in Spain,
we should know that the Perfect would

Something,
&
the
the

be perfect unless one definite
which is going on there, were as it is -
consequently we should know *what* it is -
same as to any *past* time in any part of
Universe throughout Eternity. We should
know what God was doing 100 years ago -
Throughout Eternity the Son, in

successive
from
perfection.

generations, will be working his way
ignorance & imperfection towards

we
distinguish
Perfection,
Ghost,
Wisdom,
an

But now we cannot understand this -
cannot understand God. I would
God the Father, as the Spirit of
incomprehensible to us, - God the Holy
as the Spirit of Right, of Goodness, of
of Power, comprehensible to the Son, (as
individual) *not* the perfect Spirit.

remark=

that

was a Holy

thinking

who are

To "receive the Holy Ghost", what a
able expression that was! no wonder

those to whom it was addressed said they
did not ~~even~~ "so much as know that there

Ghost": This is just the state of those

& conscientious men of the present day

f44v

~~J.A. I do not understand the gist of your observation. What connexion is there between "receiving the Holy Ghost," & understanding or denying the existence of Jehovah?~~

~~Side note~~

~~Immense~~

~~schemes~~

~~built upon~~

~~a few words~~

10a

~~J.A. But we have attained. Why should we go back to the very beginning of all things? We have/M.S. attained to what?~~

~~J.A. To A knowledge of God & of Jesus Christ his son our Lord.~~

~~M.S. You think so? Do not you think that p/People have dogmatized illeg/about religion, building upon a few words in a book (& a book written by whom there is little evidence to say/the evidence of whose~~

~~authenticity is necessary to~~

~~master~~

~~immense schemes.~~

~~J.A. As for instance?~~

~~M.S. Upon the words, "Lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" the Bishop of Winchester has his £20,000/thousands a year, & the Bishop of London his two footmen in purple liveries behind his carriage.~~

~~J.A. But is that the reason?~~

called Atheists.

~~M.S.~~ To "receive the Holy Ghost", I believe, is to exercise the capabilities of Man, in as far as each is able, ~~on~~/in apprehending the Spirit of Perfection. Truly do these Atheists say, we cannot understand God, - so they leave the subject entirely as irrelevant. This true ~~feeling~~/consciousness of not being able to understand, to feel God, has led, on the one hand, to being "without" the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, "in the world" - on the other, to making Christ an anomalous B/being, called God, called not God. We cannot be too careful to admit our present ignorance & any essential incapability in our nature. Neither can we be too careful to admit no capability of attainment in human nature, while the individual human being, in successive generations of Man, can advance towards attainment.

[cut off]

& People have &c Vide opposite page

f45v

~~J.A. Then you will say, I suppose, that the knowledge of the existence of God is an empirical conjecture?~~

~~M.S. Well, I suppose, I/If you were to ask the Bishops of London & Winchester why they are there, will they not say because of those words?~~

{in another hand: Wheeler}

~~J.A. But all churches say the same.~~

~~M.S. Not quite. If we ask the Roman Catholic Church why they are there, they will say to hear confessions & absolve people - But we have no such plea- They have founded their scheme upon "Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."~~

We must admit, I believe, that people have founded vast schemes ~~have been founded on~~ upon a very few words.

Feeling the folly of this, other people say that we are incapable of knowing anything about God. We cannot be too careful to draw a line of distinction between what we can know positively & what we can only conjecture empirically, (i.e. see reason to guess is true) & leave to be confirmed by the exercise of the faculties of ages to come - at the same time acknowledging our ignorance where it exists on those subjects on which it has been asserted that mankind have certain knowledge -

~~J.A. Then you will say, I suppose, that Is all our knowledge of the existence of God is reduced to an empirical conjecture?~~

~~M.S. It is impossible to observe & reflect on what does exist & has existed, as cognizable by our various faculties, without tracing a vein of~~

f47

-11a-

benevolent will, a wise will & a powerful will?

Can it be denied that the signs, which make us assert that human will has been or is at work, when we see machinery ~~at~~/in ~~work~~/action (even tho' no possessor of human will is manifest to the senses) can it be denied that the same signs exist to

manifest

a will, differing from the human in possessing more wisdom & power to effect those same purposes which human will tries for?

But let us not go on to dogmatize, to assert that this Will is perfect & eternal. No perfect, no eternal manifestation has been recognized by Man - Mankind have only recognized in the past, a present varying, as far as they know of it, from any past present, - but they can assert nothing as to what was before such presents as they recognize, or as to whether

anything was before.

Let us be most careful to keep to accuracy in what we say we know, especially with these ~~thinking~~

~~men~~/reflecting & conscientious

men, ~~whom you~~ called Atheists, who

disbelieve what

may be known, because required to

believe

what cannot be known.

~~J.A. Then you admit that something may be~~

~~known about the~~

Eternal?

What may be known

~~M.S. Evidence, I believe,~~ may be brought of a Will for long time past active, ~~with~~ in which we trace

about the

some

Eternal?

benevolence, wisdom, power - But we are seldom called upon to act & feel only by

that

of which we have certainty - we often

have to act

empirically

~~J.A. What do you mean by acting & feeling~~

~~empirically?~~

What is acting and feeling empirically

~~M.S. The empirical must lead the way to the Certain Empirical Laws are those uniformities which observation or experiment has shown to exist, but upon which we hesitate to rely for want of seeing why~~

such

a law should exist. The periodical

return of

eclipses, as originally ascertained by

the

persevering observation of the early

Eastern

astronomers, was an empirical law, until the general laws of the Celestial

motions

had accounted for it. An empirical law, then, is an observed uniformity,

presumed

to be resolvable into ~~simpler~~/ultimate

laws, but

not yet resolved into them."

We find signs of benevolence,

wisdom &

conse=

future-

how

power, which look as if the Will, † in

quence of which that which exists does
exist) desires the well-being of that
existence at some time present or

But there is & has been much suffering
in every present, with which we are
acquainted - & we often cannot discover

f49v

~~J.A. But empirically you might suspect the
existence of an Imperfect God, who produces
the suffering, as well as of a Good God, who
produces the happiness.~~

~~M.S. Why should we be driven to this? one and~~

~~J.A. But that only proves that Man is the artisan of
his own happiness, not God~~

in detail.
 that it may
 future.
 Empirically
 the existence
 of an imperfect
 God might
 be suspected
 he has
 directions
 & here
 immeasurable
~~M.S.~~
~~Explain how~~ But do/Do not such observations rat/truly lead to
 Is man the
 artizan of
 his own
 happiness -
 not God?
 left in large
 race
 race itself -
 (shall
 suggestion
 evidence
 enjoyment -
 does not this

it can be leading to a happy future
 I believe, however, *in principle*,
 be proved to be leading to a happy
~~M.S. One & /One~~ and another cause of
 suffering
 disappears
 from time to time by the exercise of Man's
 capabilities. We can see glimpses of how
 others might disappear, if he used these
 capabilities differently from what
 done - Great increase of enjoyment
 has been opened in certain
 by exercise of Man's capabilities -
 too we have glimpses into
 enjoyment attainable by Man -
 the conjecture that the Higher Will
 intends
 Man to work the way from suffering into
 happiness by exercise of capability?
 The capability of each individual
 when
 born, the development & improvement of
 this capability ~~is~~/are obviously
 measure to Mankind. In no other
 is there this dependence on the
 Do not these considerations point
 we say empirically?) to the
 that Man shall perfectionize Man?
 And since experience is
 that increase of capability is
 that, without it, there is none -

the
Mankind
capability
calling
exercise, &
in truth,

experience point to the belief that
Great Will made the Happiness of
to depend on the exercise of the
of Mankind, ~~thus in order~~ thus to
for the greatest degree of
with it, ~~consequently~~ the greatest happiness,
possible?

{in another hand: Jones }

~~J.A. We are wandering from our subject -
Let us sum up - The gist of our argument
was, was it not? to attach some/a meaning to
the two words "believe" & "God".~~

Summary of
the meaning
of the words
"belief" and
"God."

~~M.S. Yes.~~ I have tried to prove that "belief"
was a *state* - which could not exist in some
stages of national or individual develop=
ment, but must belong to the more
advanced stages.

"empirically"

I then tried to ~~speculate~~/consider

on what a Perfect Being would do, if
there was one - & to prove that He would
appoint man to work out ~~illeg~~/his own happi=
ness. I ~~meant~~/try to ~~infer~~/deduce from this the
"belief" that there *is* a Perfect Being, a
God -

~~-14a/b-3-~~

~~sense of uncertainty - in the/at a later, a sense of certainty. - Is it not possible that this sense of uncertainty is what has led so many lately into the Roman Catholic Church? - Scepticism, not belief, is what has brought them there. - They required this sense of a truth to be stronger & more complete than it was - The more they urged themselves to believe, the less real was their feeling of belief - till, at last, they took refuge in the belief of others for that which they had not in themselves -~~

x

~~J.A. But have not all ages believed in a God?~~

~~M.S. - But h/Here we come to the definition of the word "God". It~~

Definition
of the word
God.

~~M.S. - But the word "God" has been used to signify the most different ideas in different ages & nations. Can you attach any similarity of idea to the God whom his people whipped to make him do what they liked, & to the God who sate enthroned in the mystic phrase of Zoroaster? Nothing is more common than to say, There never has been a race nor an age which did not believe in a God. A.~~

~~A. God indeed/certainly - But what God? What does the phrase/word mean? You might as well say, there never has been a man nor any age which did not believe in a /A cat? - a lamb,? - a~~

spirit?-

~~or a statue? These words are just as synoni=
mous as the different Gods in which different
races & different ages of the same race have~~

believed. When you ask me, Why do you believe in God? I must ask, ~~in w/~~Which of the ideas of Gods do you mean? ~~in~~ the God of the Old Testament, who commanded the extirpation of the Canaanites? ~~in~~ the God of the New Testament, who commanded submission to the yoke in ~~Romans?~~

X ~~In the God, whom we worship now who/many things in which, as~~

we worship Him now, we

~~commands the expulsion of the Austrians/ liberation of~~

~~Hungary from~~

believe that He commands the struggle for freedom? ~~from Hungary? yoke?~~

~~J.A. How do you know He does? this?~~

~~M.S. I do not think I should not be able~~

~~±/We could not to~~ believe Him a perfect God, if He did not?

~~J.A. But why do you believe in a~~

~~Perfect God? You have no authority for~~

~~believing your God to be perfect. I have~~

Authority ~~M.S. And do you think you/Authority does not~~

~~teach to~~

does not ~~believe in~~

teach ~~on/of a~~ a perfect God? It is evident that very few

perfect have believed that their God was perfect.

God. Some nations have not professed to do so-

others have attributed to him qualities

essentially imperfect, while giving him

the title of Perfect - For instance, the

Greeks did not ~~even~~ suppose their ~~Jupiter,~~

~~Zeus/Zeus,~~ Athene &c perfect. They attributed

to them merely human qualities with

superhuman power - In these earlier nations,

power seems to have been the principal

characteristic

of a God. He or she was merely an engine to

account for Creation - ~~of~~/Take all the thousand

f52v [maybe not in FN hand]

~~to be more perfect than we know~~

~~is to be incomprehensible - which is one~~

~~step in the idea of God~~

different meanings, which have been attached to the word "God" by different nations & individuals in different ages, & some kind & degree of power, above human, seems to be all that is common to them - In these days, we profess that we believe our God to be perfect, but we attribute to him all kinds of qualities that are not - ~~vanity~~ love of His own

glory,

anger, indecision, changes of mind - & we try to believe, if we think at all, that a God with these qualities is perfect.

2 If you would therefore let me leave unanswered the

59 question, why do you believe in God? -as not knowing which of these ideas of Gods you mean - ~~I would say instead, I believe that there is a Perfect Being, of whose thought the Universe is the Incarnation.~~

~~J.A. And why do you believe in a Perfect Being, if you set aside authority, antiquity, universal consent? if none of our Gods, as you call them, will satisfy you, I don't know why you believe in one at all.~~

Universal M.S. It is evident that all/every nations, every consent does time/age, could not believe in a Perfect Being - not teach that it required cultivation, development to of a perfect conceive the idea of Perfection - & that God. the higher all the ~~moral~~ faculties of an individual as also of a nation, have been the higher has been his conception of Deity/God, the/as the nearer perfection.

Intellectual cultivation does not teach of a perfect God.

{in another hand: ~~illeg~~ anff}

~~J.A. That is not the case, because/ It is true, some~~

of those called the most highly cultivated of the human race, Descartes, Laplace, Hume, have not been able to conceive of a God at all.

~~M.S. But have they been the most highly cultivated? Only intellectually so - And it seems evident that the intellectual idea of Him is not the highest. That is merely reducing Him to a Master Engineer, a~~

X Mechanician=in=Chief. Can there be a stronger ~~higher~~ proof that Goodness is higher than Intellect, than this, that the innocent child has probably an idea of God nearer the truth than that of Voltaire or Gibbon? ~~"Unless ye~~

"Unless ye Why else the testimony to the words of Christ -

become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven." We believe the ~~carpenter's~~

humility son, who ~~certainly~~/humanly did not know that the earth moved round the Sun, ~~approached~~

conception of ~~much nearer to a true~~/to have had a truer

Deity

than the philosopher, who had ~~sounded~~/fathomed the laws of Creation -

Intellectual cultivation ~~J.A. but, according to you, he would have approached nearer still, /had a still truer, if he had~~

contributes to a truer conception of Him. ~~known all that Laplace could have told him. ?~~

X ~~M.S. Certainly, I believe so - I believe that the more highly man's moral, intellectual, & spiritual faculties are cultivated, the more nearly will he approach a~~

~~as well as practically exercised~~

true conception of God - But I ~~say~~/believe, that, of Reason, Feeling & Conscience, Feeling, truly cultivated, so that which gives us the truest conception of God - tho', of course, a harmonious development of *all* these faculties, would give us a truer still -

Thus, the Goodness of God appears to me a higher attribute than His Wisdom or Power -

Experience
only teaches
of a perfect
God.

~~J.A.~~ But you have not yet answered ~~my~~/The question, why ~~you~~/we believe that there exists at all an Eternal Spirit of Perfect Goodness, Wisdom & Power ? -

~~M.S.~~ I can only answer, By experience & experience only. What Mankind can learn of the Past, the Present & the Future is in harmony with the existence of such a Spirit - Without it, is unaccounted for In earlier ages, it was thought that what we see about us could not be accounted for, except by supposing imperfect qualities in the Eternal Spirit - But if, as we make progress, we find a great many marks that He is Perfect, - if by chance degrees, we would find that that very evil, which had made us *doubt* His Perfection, is one of the truest proofs of it, shall we not come at last to ~~be~~ see that He has done in the Universe what we mean by perfect work/what

we should

had we been perfect?

have done

Thus, increased knowledge, knowledge of the laws of God, is essential to our forming this idea of His perfection - although a man in a dark room may often form a truer idea of Him than a philosopher ~~measuring the~~/observing the ~~orbit /revolution /rotation~~ of the Sun. ~~But~~/Still, besides

a man's *feeling* of what is *right*, his power of comprehending Providence depends on his knowledge of the Past, the Present & the Future -

Instead therefore of directly answering the question, why do you believe in a God? I would endeavour to set forth

I Whatever exists, exists, because there is one Will & one Power, which determines such existence to be.

II The nature whence springs this Will, in which resides this Power, is Eternal, is Perfect, is Goodness, Wisdom ~~illeg~~/Omnipotence &c.

Not the experience ~~J.A. And you would~~,/If it be said that this is

of one but of reducing the wise
mankind. & good God to the measure of ~~your~~/my own
understanding & heart, ? I answer,

~~M.S.~~ not to mine - to the accumulated & accumulating experience of all

Mankind, Sometimes the Ancients may have been wiser than we are -

I think the ancient expressions of *Wisdom, Justice, Truth*, ~~so~~ much truer than ours of a *wise, a just, a true* God. Athene was the Goddess of Wisdom - not the wise Goddess - Themis was the Goddess of Justice, not the just Goddess - So our Perfect Being *is* Goodness, is Wisdom, is Power, not a good, wise & powerful God.

The idea of [In another hand: Martin] J.A. ~~But separate your questions/propositions-~~
~~say, first~~

Eternity unat= ~~why you consider your God eternal. If you~~
 tainable. ~~consider Him/It is often said that we cannot~~
 conceive of God

as eternal, because, however remote the
 first creation may have been, there must
 have been beyond it, so far as we can see,
 an eternity of solitude & inaction - Unless you/we
 [in another hand: Martin] admit therefore that you/we receive the fact of
 His

eternity
 from inspiration, you/we plunge yourself
 into innumerable difficulties. For instance,
 you/we may say, that God may have been
 employed from all eternity creating - & that,
 though the whole series of creations has been
 eternal, yet ~~that~~ every particular creation
 may have been at some definite point
 of time - But this ~~matter~~ makes some
 matter itself eternal -

M.S. In answer, at first of all, that the idea
 of Eternity is wholly inappreciable by
 the finite mind - A part cannot con=
 tain the whole - But I do not ~~admit/see~~
 the difficulty about Creation. Matter
 is the incarnation or manifestation
 of God's thought - God's thought has
 been eternal, & therefore some manifes=
 tation of it ~~must~~ /may, must perhaps also have
 been eternal

With regard to the question, whence the
 belief in Eternity in those who wrote
 the Sacred Books, whether Egyptians,
 Hebrew, Persian or Indian, that is indeed
 a difficulty - The idea has been so
 dinned into us from our earliest infancy

that we can scarcely conceive of the stupendous effort ~~of~~/requisite in the first human mind which imagined Eternity - an Eternity behind him, an Eternity before him - It would be a curious enquiry to ascertain the first trace we can find of such a belief. The purely intellectual arguments, "Something can't come out of nothing", "Nothing can't come out of something", probably do not convince the *feeling* - do not make the belief present to us - Could we conceive the idea of eternity, of an Eternal Being, arising in the minds of ~~in the first believers in Eternity, in an Eternal Being, the idea arising~~ thus? - Look at the present state of things - whence came it? whither is it leading? Is it all confusion, springing from no will, tending to accomplish no will? In some aspects, it does indeed appear so - In others, distinct tho' imperfect glimpses of *Law* are discernible - of *Law*, that is of *will* determining the essential constituents of what is.

Determining them with what purpose? we next ask. Here again, in some aspects, all appears confusion - Sometimes there is the appearance of benevolent purpose, some= times the contrary or the absence of it, or the absence of power to fulfil it.

Is there consistency? Is there wholeness of purpose? becomes the question. All historical religion shews the search of Man for this consistency. The Devil, the Atonement, ~~the Christ, the Book~~ have been fruits of this search.

It would appear that the idea of Eternity has been ~~the/its~~ greatest result. ~~of this search.~~ There are ~~such~~/many signs of Benevolence, & yet, without the idea of Eternity, they would be incomplete. Through Eternity alone you come to consistency.

But the idea of Eternity alone enables us to discern in the finite & imperfect Infinity & Perfection.

~~J.A.~~ But w/Where ~~I~~/we recognize ~~only~~/nothing but the finite & imperfect, ~~why am I to~~/we can discern infinity & perfection

~~M.S.~~ ~~o~~/only thro' the idea of Eternity. When the moral feelings predominate in ourselves, we begin to attribute to God the principles by which we should rule the universe, were it ours - We conceive of Him as like, not our actual but, our ideal selves - Where the moral feelings of a people have advanced beyond their old mythology, scepti= cism follows, & no proof, no "Evidence" can make the old Religion, the old Divinity credible again. It is only by raising the moral condition of a people that we can raise their idea of a God. It is not always by raising the moral condition of an individual that we can persuade him to believe in a nobler God - The traditions of his childhood adhere ~~d~~ to him - & he perhaps thinks it wrong even to examine them.

or it may be that they are so repulsive to ~~him that he~~/his improved

altogether - ~~them~~ feeling that he rejects the subject but with a nation this cannot long be the case - Mankind enlightens mankind. When the North of Africa was civilized, Christianity took root & flourished there - when civilization became extinct with

[in another
hand:
Vijun]
How has
Mankind
arrived
at the idea
of Eternity?

the Moorish invasion, the burning of the Libraries
& the destruction of the schools, Christianity
disappeared.

~~J.A. But let me recall you to our~~
The questions, ~~which is,~~ first, how has Mankind
~~has~~ arrived at the idea of an Eternal
Being with a past as well as a future
Eternity? secondly, at the idea of a
future Eternity for ourselves? can be

~~M.S. With regard to the first, I can~~
only answered thus. 1. that the more we learn
of the laws of the Universe, the less we
can imagine a time when Goodness,
Power & Wisdom were ~~not -or-when~~
With regard to the second, 2 perceiving
as we do, such proofs of Wisdom, Power
& Goodness, & also ~~that there are~~ such innu=
merable beings, to whom existence cannot
be said to be worth having, we can only
reconcile such suffering with our idea
of Perfect Goodness, by supposing that
there is an Eternity for each, where
the purposes of Perfect Goodness will
be worked out -

~~J.A. But that brings us back to the~~
~~old question, why do you consider Him~~
~~Perfect?~~

~~M.S. I cannot prove it - But I believe~~
~~that I can perceive it - And that the~~
~~more we know, the more we do perceive Him~~
~~to be perfect.~~

The more we know, the more we perceive God to be perfect.

It is said by one class of philosophers that we know nothing of any first cause, while religionists say we know everything. The more we advance from ignorance to knowledge, from imperfection towards perfection, the more we find that which exists referable to *One Cause - this Cause being a wise and benevolent Will.* ~~If we are asked~~

~~J.A.~~ But h/How came this wise & benevolent Will into existence? was there ever a time when it did not exist? or is it eternal? are questions often asked

Questions about beginning of things of little importance

~~M.S.~~ ~~It seems to me that we may have all the peace Religion may give, without being able to answer these questions.~~ I do not see why they are held of such importance, why it is feared that religion must fall if they are not answered, & why therefore Religionists attempt absurd answers - or why some philosophers think that there can be no religion *because they hold these questions to be unanswerable.* The capabilities of our nature truly exercised, I believe, reveal to us a very wise, powerful & benevolent will, *in many instances.* In looking through existence we are led to question the existence of such a will *in other instances.* But the *tendency of improvement* in the knowledge & the being, ~~in/of~~ Man, is to increase the number of the former, to

decrease the most im=

number of the latter instances. Moreover this important observation opens upon us from actual experience - that much evil which

[in another
hand: 63.R.]

looked like absence of a good, wise and powerful superintending Will, is remedied by Man. This leads to the [question, May not all evil to man be remedied by Man? And to the farther question, If this *is* so, may not all evil point to a wise & good superintending will, to a will that Man shall have the means to be the means of rising from the ignorance & imperfection whence (alone) evil comes, to the knowledge & excellence whence well-being comes? If such a will exists, is it not a wise & benevolent will?

One man places a child in circumstances where he will have means to exercise his faculties aright. Another does the child's work for him - Which man's is the wiser will? Would you be of the bird's kind, who builds his nest unerringly with a smaller range of faculties - or of Man's kind, wanting & suffering, as he has ~~done~~/been, before his habitation was skilfully built? Would you be as the bird with its small range of duties & affections, - or as man, with his aching heart, his wounded conscience, wringing other hearts while his own is wrung - all in ignorance? But is not the ignorance blessed, which points to possibility, in removing it, of rising to the Divine and Perfect? Oh Man, bless you suffering, your agonies even, while gallantly you strive

to work out, through them, peace & bliss to Mankind - Rather I would hope that the bird, in another mode of existence, may rise to learn through suffering, than that Man may find peace in being instinctively taught his path. "Err bravely" then, so long as you are conscious that all evil to man comes *from* error, that nothing but *your*/the utmost possibility of each exercised to find the road from error to truth, will suffice.

~~J.A. You think now that you have proved as much as you can prove your second Proposition, viz. that the nature whence springs "the One Will" is Eternal, is Perfect, is Goodness, Wisdom - But what have you to say about his Omnipotence?~~

Omnipotence
of God

M.S. Does not a perfectly wise will include omnipotence - that is to say, *all power to fulfil the will*? Christ dwells constantly upon "faith". He seems to have had the idea that you could do whatever you *believed* you could do - "If a Man believes, he shall remove mountains" - How singular seems this idea! If a man is wise, he will wish only what is wise, he will purpose to fulfil only the wise wish, he will not believe that he can fulfil the wish unless he really can do so - If such a man believes he can remove a mountain, he will be able to do so.

~~J.A. But what do you think of the Bible? Do you believe in it or do you not? Sometimes you quote it in the way of~~

f63v

Is not law the "invariable" Wisdom, modifying & modified by the succession of events? The sun rises every day - Wisdom wills no change in that. One day is fine, another rainy. Wisdom wills changes in this. The Changing & the Unchanging alike come from the Wisdom which never changes.

{in another hand: Smith}

authority & sometimes in the way of
 contempt - I cannot tell what you believe
 What is to be ~~M.S. I suppose that/~~Perhaps in no book is so
 found in much spiritual truth to be found as in
 the Bible. the Bible. "In him is no variableness
 neither shadow of turning" - What an
 insight do these words shew. vide opposite page.

~~In t/~~The

placid sunshine ~~or~~ and the raging
 storm - ~~though~~ both spring from His
 Will, yet in that Will is no variableness -
 Time or the *succession* of events (it
 matters not which we call it) makes
 the only difference in the nature of
 events. That is wise in this phase
 of succession, which would not have
 been so in a former -

~~J.A. But can you leave such questions
 unsettled as those you have mentioned?~~

Unimportant
 questions.

~~M.S.~~ In proportion as we stretch
 our natures to comprehend His, many
 questions which puzzle us now, will
 appear unimportant - such as, could
 there be existence without beginning?
 is time what can be called an existence,
 or merely a succession of events? is
 Matter an existence? If we can
 make out to the satisfaction of our
 natures that the cause of whatever
 has been, is, or shall be is a wise &
 benevolent will - what matters it
 whether that Will has been eternal?
 Probably we shall not be able to help
 believing that it has been so, but what

matters it to us? I believe knowledge of all being, & improvement of our own, will bring into view eternity in front of us.

Without

~~J.A. But is it not/~~It is supposed to be of the very

Eternity
for each
& for all
of us,
there
could not
be a
perfect
God.

importance that we should believe in a future state with absolute conviction, with the certainty with which ~~†~~/we believe that, after ~~†~~/we come out of church, ~~†~~/we shall reach home?

greatest

~~M.S.~~ It is of the very greatest importance to us that we should believe that all which is, is from One Perfect Will. ~~†~~/That the trees of which I have a consciousness, as I sit here, exist in God's thought, that He wills them to exist in mine is all that concerned me. The rest I can trust to Him. I think the direction ~~in which~~ ~~I would wish to set my~~ of enquiry ~~is~~/should be,

may we

in truth believe in a Nature, a Being whose Law is Right, so that we may trust in it, so that we have only to learn what it is & how to incline our hearts to it, in order to

secure

well-being for mankind? Is there a Being whose Law so manifests Love & Goodness that we may love & revere Him? Is His Law so wise that we may trust to His having Power to effect what His Goodness desires? It cannot, I think, be doubted that to believe this would enrich Man's joys, support him in suffering, give him confidence to struggle through difficulties.

a desire,

~~J.A. Yes, but/~~It is said that Mankind has such

such a tendency to believe this that that alone is sufficient evidence to him.

desire to
to

M.S. But this is very doubtful. I have no
believe it or
to preach it, if it is not true. I cannot believe
it so as to do me any good, unless from such
examination that I should believe it
because it is true - not because I wish
it - I have a greater fear of believing
what is untrue than readiness to believe
what I should feel glad to believe -

~~J.A. I myself do not see the use of any
speculations about the existence of a God,
if you do not believe in the God of Revelation.~~

M.S. I think, too, t/There is little use in
speculations concerning the existence of a God,
or concerning His nature, if there be one,
unless He may be discovered to be the
object for truth, love, reverence - If not
thus practically helpful, I do not think
I should feel inclined for the question,
but would rather say *just* what the
conscientious Unbelievers of this day say,
"It is better to try to remedy the evils of
Man's life than to confuse oneself in
metaphysical speculations concerning
God's life." ~~But~~ I would rather, therefore,
enquire whether there is *such* a God than
whether there is a God & what ~~is~~ He is.

Religion not
revealed by
one faculty
but by all
the faculties.

~~J.A.~~ But with what faculties are we
~~you~~ to enquire? The Germans on the
Continent & Mr. Newman at home say
that there is a special faculty which
they call the *Soul* or "intuition" (*anschau=*
ung) which apprehends God - ~~There is a~~
which knows Him, as the senses know the

external world. There is a ~~school~~/school which says that this faculty is *intellect* - & that man apprehends religious truth by a process similar to that pursued in any other scientific investigation. Mr. Martineau has looked to the moral nature of man, & shewn that man cannot appeal to his *conscience* without coming to religion.

~~M.S.~~ I cannot see why Mr. Martineau or Mr. Newman or the Intellectual School should expect to find religion revealed by *one* faculty, independent of others. If we wish to estimate a Man rightly, to hold right intercourse with him, all our faculties are wanted. We shall not rightly estimate mankind, or live well among mankind, unless every faculty we have is in exercise. So I believe it should be as to Religion. A man will be really religious in feeling & act, will apprehend religion rightly in proportion as *all* his capabilities are rightly exercised, & in proportion as the society, in which he lives, is organized so as to afford full & free exercise for his nature.

[in another hand: Umlauff?]

Does Law
ever exist
without a

~~J.A.~~ But the conscientious Unbelievers of the present day say that, when all is said & done, ~~all~~ and the whole of the faculties exercised

Law=giver?

all that we can discern with these faculties is &c,
nature?.

the Law of

~~M.S.~~ Is there not an absurdity in saying that all we can discern is that whatever *is* is, according to Law? For is it not our

experience

of Law that it *always* springs from a Will, from a Religion?

~~J.A. Give me an instance.~~

~~M.S.~~ There is a Law that a person distilling without a license shall pay a fine. Is it not inconceivable to us, ~~unimaginable to us~~ that, (though we might not be able to prove any Being who made that law, whose will & purpose it was), we should say, "the existence of Law is all that we can say of the fact that a man privately distilling is liable to a fine"? If we went to some new country & found a Law in operation, but could have no information, no trace of the person who willed, who purposed in that Law, we should, none=theless, feel an entire certainty, a conscious=ness that Will & Purpose had existed in regard to that Law -

When we discern a Law of Nature, we can, generally, at the same time trace *purpose* in it; is it, then philosophical, or reasonable to say, "we can know nothing as to whether there is, or has been a will, a Purposer-" we having so much experience that, where there is Law & Purpose, there is will & a Purposer? In the Laws of Nature, we can trace will & purpose of the same kind as exists in man - for instance, love of order, love of beauty, benevolence which wills convenience, ease, comfort.

~~J.A. Then why, if it is so, do not the thinkers of the present day recognise it?~~

~~M.S.~~ Mankind has been jarred

by circumstances unsuited to right constitution, right development, right exercise of the nature - The thinking part of Mankind has been irritated & disgusted by dogmatic assertion of superstitious notions - A revulsion takes place. Some thinkers say in consequence, "I will do my work & believe nothing but phenomena recognised by my senses" - Reason & Philosophy are in arms against superstition & dogmatism rather than in peaceful search after truth =

Now it would seem to me that Reason & Experience suggest, when we trace Law, a Will & a Purposer -

~~J.A.~~ And what next?

~~M.S.~~ It is very evident that this will & purpose concerns Mankind for the whole of our existence, (our existing at all as man & as our mode of existing,) is in accordance with these Laws, springs, in fact, from these Laws - All the power which we have to influence our own mode of existence, or that of any of our kind, or, ~~in fact~~/indeed to influence any mode of existence, material or other - is by working in accordance with some Law or other, whether we know what it is or not - Can it ~~Can it~~/then be uninteresting, can it be practically unimportant, to enquire into the nature of the *Willer*, the Purposer of these Laws?

We find, in some cases, marked, unmistakeable purpose to secure human

well=being - as, for instance, in the Laws of Astronomy & Anatomy, which concern human habitation & the human frame -

In these instances, Power, Wisdom, above human in degree, though like human in kind, are evident in the will & purpose.

In other instances, the effect of these laws on human habitation & the human frame is suffering -

But can it ever be said that malevolence, or a wish for suffering, becomes evident? If it were so, would not the evil be irremediable & permanent? But can we point out any evil & say, "there is strong reason to believe that the united efforts of Mankind never would be able to prevent its recurrence"?

~~J.A. No, but we may say, "we see evil which, during the present mode of existence of the sufferer, is irremediable"~~

~~M.S. But we know this mode of existence to be temporary.~~

J.A. It seems to me that Prejudice is setting in a contrary direction to Credulity & prompting to disbelieve what Reason & Philosophy would prompt us to believe - viz., that Laws of Nature are discernible, - that Reason & Experience say that Law implies a Legislator with a purpose - that this purpose in the Laws of Nature is discernible to be a wise & benevolent one, - benevolent where it causes well=being - benevolent where it causes suffering, which it does, *unless* man's faculties are exercised aright.

What can
we discern?
{in another
hand: Jones

~~M.S. Oh! I am very glad you go so far as that. And Now suppose we discern, as you say,~~

1. Law
2. a Legislator, implied by Law
3. a benevolent & wise purpose in the Legislator, - what then?

~~J.A. Is there any practical benefit to life from this?~~

M.S. If the whole of Man's nature were penetrated with this, as Truth, there would be practical benefit to life. i.e., if he thought & felt & acted congenially, consistently, in accordance with this belief.

~~J.A. What would be the practical effect?~~

M.S. In theory, I believe that the admitting thus much would lead to, not *proof*, but assurance, (not differing in its practical effect from proof) of an Eternity before Man, in which each individual would attain to the perfection of goodness & happiness through the exercise of his own nature & that of Mankind. If not only the reason were convinced, but the feeling were imbued with this belief, man would, even in suffering & privation, feel himself sharing the omnipotence of God. He would feel "I wish no Law altered." As to the present ~~illeg~~/effect of Law in causing suffering and privation, he would consider all this to

arise from that part of God's Law, in consequence of which Mankind are to make their own way out of ignorance to truth, out of imperfection ~~to~~^{pr} towards perfection by the exercise of their faculties - God in His various Laws supplying means & inducement.

Would not the practical effect of a belief be to inspire vigorous effort, where effort can be made - calm patience where it cannot be made, ~~wh~~ not doubting but that the time will come, when effort can be made?

Would not love be inspired by One whose Law was Love, - veneration by One whose Law was Wisdom? -

~~J.A. But~~ ~~t~~/There seems a difficulty in imagining the nature of God, when we try to think of Him as an Eternal Will, manifesting itself in Law - ~~We suppose~~

~~M.S.~~

~~Yes,~~ ~~w~~/We suppose all existence to depend on this will in Difficulty in the conception of an invariable Will.

order to be at all, to be what it is entirely by & through this will. But when we have said this, in relation to the nature of God's existence, we have ~~an uneasy feeling,~~ a dissatisfied feeling as if we supposed something after the imagination of the Hebrews, who thought that victory in the battle depended upon Moses holding up his arms. One cannot hear this without an uneasy feeling at the barrenness of Moses's task of holding up his arms. [1:29]

Our arms ache & our spirits are weary under the imagination - and we feel something of the same sort in reference to the nature of God's existence, when we have used the words about Law which I have done -

~~J.A. Now really, even I can get over that.~~
Go to the Sistine Chapel however & imagine the nature which painted that roof. There was a Will without which that roof would not have been, - that Will determined each stroke of the pencil - but the first stroke had regard to the last & to every intermediate one. Was it a weary existence thus to will? Perhaps you will say, "no, because the artist varied as he advanced, & was occupied in thought." But, in proportion as a man is a great artist (whatever be his work) he does *not* vary as he advances. Is he making a speech, organizing a society, arranging a battle, building a hospital, painting a set of picture for a church, writing a book of history, poetry or meta=physics - in proportion as he does well - will his first *will*/volition determine the whole - his first word or stroke of the pen or pencil concern the whole. It is not because he varies in thought that he will not be weary of *willing*; on the contrary, the more oneness of purpose, the greater his interest & satisfaction - The great mind, through its work, is developing one will throughout, & that mind has most interest & satisfaction.

God is not
"developing
himself"
any more
than any

human Artist
is developing
himself in
his creations

It is not more
impossible to

understand
how God wills
without hands
than how an
artizan wills
his hands to
work.

~~May we not imagine/assert if the Supreme Will~~

~~M.S. I do not think we can imagine/assert Him~~

~~J.A. But we perhaps we can have the
idea that it may be, without our being able
to imagine/assert it. May we not have the
idea/conceive~~

that His/God's present Will is one with every
stroke of the Past & the Future, which is &
will be ever developing itself? The Artist
who begins upon 12 pictures to fulfil one
purpose, has one Will throughout, by which
will they are developed into being. He is
not those pictures, but they are the mani=
festation of his will when done, its deve=
lopment while being done. Is it not so
with all external existence, with regard
to God? the God whom Oersted fancied
"developing Himself into planetary geologies
& polarized light." Why developing *Himself*?
no more than Michael Angelo was developing
himself, when St. Peter's dome arose at
his will - no more than a painter is his
picture, when his picture develops at his
will - does it appear to me that God is
developing *himself* - ~~The p~~

~~M.S. But~~

~~J.A. How it comes to be that they/the
painter's/user~~

hands mediate
between the will & the canvass, we understand
no more than how the Highest, without
hands, develops His pictures before us -
"The whole Universe a single intellectual
aim" - we might add a *single aim* of the
Spirit of Love, of Beauty, of Order, of Right=
eousness, of Benevolence, of every attribute
which man can appreciate as right &

good & true, - of others, it may be, which
 he cannot appreciate.
 The Consistency & ~~M.S.~~ The reason of our suffering the
 comprehensiveness grievousness of inefficiency is the want in
 of God's will us of this consistency & comprehensiveness
 is what forms of Will - If I knew how, I too would have
 our difficulty a *single aim* of righteousness & love &
 in conceiving comprehensiveness, connection, consistency -
 of Him - is In *this* only can I be comprehensive &
 what we are consistent, I can say, "thy will be done", I
 always accord with that will, I acquiesce in
 seeking after waiting till we find out how to be compre=
 in ourselves. hensible & consistent, till we attain that
 blessed Oneness -

x ~~J.A.~~ There is an oneness of seeking external
 amusement, of doing what it is convention=
 ally agreed is to be done, *this* saves present
 suffering, but does not help on Mankind.

x ~~M.S.~~ Better than such an oneness, there is a
 blessedness, even
 in the suffering of ignorance & inefficiency,
 in trusting that \mp /we shall work ~~my~~/our way to
 light at lat - Then, when \mp /we remember
 these days of darkness, may it be with
 the wish to deliver others from suffering &
 privations which \mp /we have known by
 experience -

God ~~J.A. I want to know, I/Is it an insu=~~
 Without perable difficulty for us to believe that
 Beginning Love, Goodness, Wisdom which we can now
 trace as the spring of Law, have *always*
 existed? Is the constitution of our nature
 such that we cannot help believing that
 whatever is, must have begun to be?

M.S. To me it appears more difficult to suppose that Wisdom & Goodness began to be from not being - than to suppose that the nature which we discern to possess these attributes, is eternal, & that all other

beginnings

merely changes of one present state to another (though all manifestations of one unvarying purpose) - these changes arising from the existence of this eternal nature -

Does matter exist or not? and what is the practical importance of this question?

J.A. With regard to matter, it is probably impossible for natures like ours ever to prove that it exists at all - We see no means of approximating, of advancing one step towards proof -

M.S. Nor does it make the slightest practical difference to Man whether it really exists or not - otherwise than as the thought of God - Grant a nature, eternally possessing perfect Goodness & Wisdom, & you account for all that is. One existence consists with, is harmonious with another - All spring from the same will, tend to the same purpose - The more we penetrate into the effect which they are calculated to have upon each other, the more traces we find of such a nature - The Geologist, the Antiquarian, as he opens ~~illeg~~ the closed

leaves

of the history of existence, invariably shows us the Will at work consistently, harmoniously with this one thought - viz - Mankind, or preparation for Mankind, i.e. for a race of Beings, whose nature it is to *attain* the divine nature - God providing in Eternity means & inducement

for each & all - The true prophet will see vistas in the Eternity before us, as the eye, which penetrates into the Past, sees them in the Past Eternity, all disclosing this same Will -

Experience and consciousness, if not Revelation, ~~J.A.~~ But w/What are to be our witnesses, ~~?~~ is often asked -
not Revelation, ~~M.S.~~ Experience & Consciousness - Are our witnesses they not that, to which we have to refer of God. for truth, as to our *feeling* of the existence, the presence of a God?

~~J.A.~~ But m/Many say "our experience & consciousness tell us nothing of a God."

~~M.S.~~ We are not to conclude from this that there is no God. It is man well=born, well=~~bred~~/developed, & whose present nature

is in

right exercise (when he tells you his experience & his consciousness), to whom you ~~may~~/are to refer - And he cannot be well=born & well=bred & in present right exercise of his nature, unless many, besides him= self, are & have been well=born & well=bred.

~~J.A.~~ If each individual were to refer

to his own experience & consciousness, & question whether there is a God, what would the answer be supposing him to refer to no authority of book or word, - merely to the Spirit as interpreting itself, manifesting itself to his Spirit - if it does so manifest itself?

~~M.S.~~ A man is not to set himself down satisfied that there is no God, if

his experience & consciousness tell him nothing of One - That the blind man is not conscious of trees & flowers does not prove their non-existence - That the farmer, who has looked at trees & fields, in reference only to value of crops, is conscious of no spirit of love & wisdom speaking in them, does not prove such a spirit a fable - Even the conscientious aspirant after truth who says "O God, if Thou dost exist & dost intend that I should know Thee, tell me of Thy presence," may not conclude that, if he receives no answer, therefore there is no God - For to ask that question *thus* may not be the way in which the spirit of Truth & Righteousness sees that it is to be answered.

{in another hand: Wheeler}

~~J.A. - Then what are we to do?~~

What is each mind to ask itself, then?
 M.S. I would ask each mind to ask itself, ~~are~~/is there not, if I look through as much of existence as I can take cognizance of, am I not conscious of some degree of wisdom & goodness & power above man's, as the spring of *some part* of the existence? If so, is it not important to try to make out something concerning this power & wisdom & goodness? If it is important, let us be ready to wait, still enquiring while Mankind is so imperfectly constituted & cultivated that we cannot trust his answer on a

subject which requires the right exercise of all the faculties of all Mankind to answer it. My own consciousness is that there is appreciable to my nature a Spirit, a Will of Righteousness, Goodness & Wisdom in the Universe - a Spirit of the same nature as that of which I, at times, am conscious in others of Mankind, & in myself - Thus much I believe I can say without any straining after Mysticism. When I seek Truth, if I am not seeking it from Man, I believe it is from this spirit that I seek it.

Of whom do we seek Truth? Whether I seek Truth as to a (comparatively speaking) great or a small thing - "is there a God?" or "what shall I eat/be my food?"=

or as to some scientific fact - or in order to arrange the intervals of music so as to produce a scientific & harmonizing effect, I believe that I am seeking Truth of the Source of Truth.

J.A. Will it not be asked, are you not seeking it of yourself?

M.S. Have I any consciousness that I am the source of Truth? - I have a consciousness that I am a means of finding Truth by the exercise of my faculties -

~~J.A. Shall I sit here? or shall I walk there? Of whom do I ask this? of myself it will be said.~~

Baconian
method
wanted
in Religion

~~M.S.~~ How much there ~~seems to want~~/is wanted a Baconian way of treating these subjects! Man studying physics says now, "my assertions & my conjectures shall be founded on phenomena recognized by man's senses."

May we say of subjects *not* recognized by the senses, "my assertions & my conjectures shall be founded on experience & consciousness? To trust to the senses, they must be in a healthy state - to trust to the consciousness of a Being, the being must be in a healthy state -

But man does not say this, he does not go to his experience for facts, when studying these subjects - he goes to a Book for authority.

~~J.A. It is so dangerous to speculate upon religious subjects.~~

"Speculation
is dangerous"
Exercise of
man's nature
essential
on these
subjects.

~~M.S.~~ That sort of exercise of the mind called speculation is indeed not suited to the nature of the case. But most of those who "speculate" have not a full consciousness that the time is coming & now is, - when on the exercise of man's nature is to depend whether mankind have a religion or not. ~~We can~~ Scarcely any of us, who have been brought up under a supernatural religion, can feel ourselves absolutely dependent on the exercise of mankind's nature for our conviction. On more or less impression of a supernatural revelation of religion, most of us, who *have* any religion, depend. By degrees the Astronomy, the Geology of the Old Testament have been *generally* rejected as not true.

Some now see that the Political Economy, the Moral Philosophy of the New Testament is not always true. ~~It will remain~~

{in another hand: Martin}

~~J.A. And what will remain?~~

What will remain?

M.S. It will remain that Christ will speak to all Eternity the truth that is in him - But *what* is truth (of that which he is reported to have said) will be sifted by Man - & it will be discovered to have sprung from the exercise of *his* nature, as in other cases, in which man attains truth. Let us bring ourselves clearly to see the state of the case. Then we shall see that our consideration of these subjects is not mere speculation for the amusement or gratification of the intellect, but that the question is approaching, Have we, or have we not, a religion? - I think that probably, many speculators are not conscious that this is their question. Vague feelings, which the having taken for granted a supernatural religion has implanted in them, prevent this consciousness - Oh! let us awaken to a sense that our question is, Does religion exist? That Christ's words, or the words of the followers of Christ

Religion in these days can be no "speculation" for the intellect The question is come, Have we or have we not a religion?

contain

not J.A.

much of mistake as to God's nature & laws, as to Man's duty & destination, - discoveries, since his time, prove as certainly as such discoveries prove mistakes in the Astronomy &c of the 1st chapter of Genesis. The discovery of such mistakes will, in no wise, prevent our appreciating that which was true & right & loveable in him; but the discovery of

such mistakes *will* prevent our feeling that we may believe in God & a future state, because Christ speaks of God as existing, & of a future life for Man as to exist - Let not what we say be supposed to mean that a mode of being, called Man, is, by exercising its faculties to discover a mode of Being of different nature, called God. I believe that the exercise of the attributes of God, as existing limited by physical Law, will reveal those attributes existing, unlimited by physical Law - I believe that God, working truth into the concrete, God, manifesting truth in life & work will discern the thought, the sentiment, the purpose, the law, in accordance & with which the Perfect becomes the Imperfect, & the Imperfect *lives* truth progressively, till it rises again to the perfect comprehension of the whole .

Oh! before belief in the supernatural is exhausted, let us strive to work out belief from the workings of our own nature. It is *right life* which must prepare true belief to be *general*

~~J.A. And you, who feel such a shrinking from talking to almost anybody on these subjects, how can you expect your religious ideas to become general?~~

~~M.S. A few must work them out, & those few must endeavour to make *Life* prepare others for them.~~

~~J.A. But that is as we should proceed with
children~~

Mankind
in children
in Religion
& Philosophy

M.S.— And a/Are not almost all mankind
children? in Religion & Moral Philosophy?

If I/we knew how, I/we would endeavour to
organize life for children, so that it would
exercise all their nature - I would then
endeavour to have ready, at each step.
assistance for them to *express* the feelings
which such exercise would naturally
call out. I believe the Life would
awaken the Heart to ask, x & the Heart
would awaken the Intellect to answer
its questions. I would have Matins &
Vespers, such as the Heart & the Intellect,
thus awakened, would want - as soon as
the child was developed enough to accept
assistance gladly, in order to express feelings
beginning to want expression. The true
feelings of the importance of the day
begun upon, the true feeling of union
in their common work, of the general
purport of their common work I would
endeavour to awaken - as also a true
appreciation of the All=comprehensive
nature, - &, when awakened I would endeavour to

help it to

the enjoyment of feelings of Love, Trust,
Sympathy towards this nature - The peace
of the early morn, suitable music & singing,
appropriate expression from Architecture
& painting, all the sources to give to *my*
children ~~the~~ enjoyment of the feelings
x Comte's idea.

which I believe would be natural to them,
I would seek, with which to begin each day.
Each should be a *holy day*, a holy day for work
pursued with zest, not the misnamed

Note. "holiday", so often wearisome -
{in another hand: Wheeler}

~~It seems to me that the regenerate
striving to help the unregenerate, would look
to the *life* to awaken the feeling, the Divinity
within, which works, in Man, through physical
modifications. The regenerate are to keep
constantly improving, adapting, modifying
Life - the Heart setting the Intellect to
work to find *right life*. In the unregenerate,
this right life, which the regenerate will
organize, will awaken the Heart.~~

~~J.A. However you have left the question
with which you started, which was, what
are we to depend upon for our belief? You
have a wish to enquire how far we may depend on~~

~~revelation.~~

How far
we may
depend
on

Revelation.

~~M.S. Say rather an earnest wish to be awake
to the consciousness that we are not
depending on any supernatural revelation,
& that t/The time is coming on when, more
& more, others as well as we/ourselves, will
discern~~

the little dependence to be placed on
supernatural revelation - consequently,
let us search to the utmost the *real*
grounds man will have for a religion,
when the unreal grounds crumble away
beneath him. The divinities of Greece &
Rome, how powerful they were! But they
are laid low. not a trace of belief in
them remains - The belief in all supernatural

foundation for religion will give way, in like manner. Many ideas in the present theology appear to me more opposed to natural feeling than those which prompted the worship of some of the Pagan deities. E.g. Law is *traceable* in all existence, in history of every kind, history of successive generations, of their opinions, their characters, their actions - In vain, then, should we expect the doctrines of particular Providence & of Forgiveness of sins, to retain their hold on our belief. Yet these doctrines are the staples of Religion, as now believed, or as taken for granted. Law is *traceable*, i.e., Law was traced in Astronomy & Geology. Genesis ceased to be authority in those sciences. When Law is traced in the history of events, & in Moral Philosophy, Christ will no longer be considered as supernatural authority, speaking, as He does, of providential interference & forgiveness of sins. And when this day comes, oh where will be our religion? It *might* be more felt, more comprehended, infinitely more influential on life than it ever has been. But let us work that it shall be so - Nothing comes without work - If your work helps another, it is by helping him to work. If circumstances of any kind help a man, it is by helping him to work. Let

us not suppose that our highest & best knowledge & feeling can come but by work. All shall work to reveal our common Father. All shall work that the Father, in the Son, may live His thought - that the life of the son may raise him to partake in the All-comprehending thought of the Father.

{in another hand: Umlauff}

Note to P. 47

What
education
in religion
is given to
children.

~~I rather think that c/Children are naturally early disposed to religion, & that, if they had some help, they would accept it gladly.~~

~~J.A. But they have help. At least, some help is offered to all.~~

~~M.S. What is the help offered to them? Doctrines, sermons, prayers, alike for the old & young, springing from the thought & feeling of ages ago - I believe that Religion means the feeling of the Perfect, modified by Physical Law, towards the Perfect, existing as all-comprehensive thought & feeling. Whatever, therefore, checks feeling must be bad in the attempt to develop it. I remember myself my religious feeling, at 8 or 9 years old, how it found satisfaction in certain modes of my own, certain prayers & the reading of certain books - but I never remember the least interest in any of the prayers or sermons prepared for me, tho' I did not object to them, but took it for granted that they were right - A child of six; of mine when, I should think, about that age or rather younger, said to his governess, quite simply, "You don't think about God, I'm always thinking about God." - The husband of Lord Byron's first nurse says of him that, when "a mere child," he was~~

"particularly inquisitive & puzzling about religion" - How was this tendency developed? "I was sent at 5 years old to school. There I learnt little, except to repeat by rote the first lesson of monosyllables, (God made man. Let us love him.) by hearing it repeated without learning a letter. Whenever proof was made of my progress at home, I repeated these words with the most rapid fluency, but, on turning over a new leaf, I continued to repeat them, so that the narrow boundaries of my first year's accomplishments were detected, & my ears boxed (which they did not deserve, seeing it was by ear that I had acquired what I had)"

~~I think I can remember myself a/the feeling something like my child's that grown-up people did not care about religion as I did. I should like to know how it is with other children.~~

J.A. Comte thinks that there is an inevitable resemblance between personal & social progression & that the "individual" will pursue his "proper evolution" in rising from simple fetishism at the beginning to real Polytheism, as did the race before him.

M.S. I recollect no confirmation to this, in recalling my own state as a child, nor have I ever observed any thing to confirm it in other children. Such an opinion goes against that which, from experience, we find to be the case, viz. that it is a part of Law that the nature is *influenceable*.

f89

~~-3-~~

"Social progression" is according to Law. So is "personal progress" - But it is a part of Law that the *wise regenerate* may develop truly the *ignorant unregenerate*. There is no compelling the unregenerate to go thro' a definite course of error, as would be the case if each individual must be a Fetishist & a Polytheist. Till the influence of the regenerate can arrive at the unregenerate, he does so, he sees objects inverted & double &c, but the purpose of education is to lead from ignorance to truth, not through falsehood. To present that which is truth to the regenerate, but incomprehensible to the unregenerate, would not indeed be leading from ignorance to truth. A true education will gradually develop following the lead of the questions which seek answers, the feelings which seek gratification - Such an education will not drag each individual through Fetishism & Polytheism to Truth.

f90

30 Old Burlington St

Jan 5/60 {in another hand: Welsh}

II

Belief

AND BELIEF AS INCLUDING SPIRITUALITY -

{in another hand: x - 7}

~~St. Ignatius of Loyola, Jacob Abbott, M.S.~~

Belief

II. 1.

~~St. Ig But w/What right have we, what right has any human being to say "this will be" this will not be"?~~

~~M.S.~~ Have we not certain faculties to guide our belief? or are we sent here to be in doubt about every thing, to consider ourselves presumptuous whenever we do believe? Has not God given us means of belief? The senses assure us of some things - the Reason, the Feeling, the Conscience of others.

[Side note]

~~St. Ig But h/How can I/we know that my/our reason, my/our feeling, my/our conscience tell me/us true.~~

~~M.S.~~ If the eye is diseased, we see falsely - if the reason, feeling &c are so, we judge & feel untruly - In both cases, we must take care to keep our sources of information in a healthy state. "If thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light."

[Side note]

~~St. Ig But h/How are we to purify our guides, to be sure that they are the Oracles of God?~~

~~shall/will~~

~~M.S.~~ "If ~~ye keep my commandments, ye/any man~~

~~do his will, he shall know of the doctrine/shall know whether they are/it be of God" or not.~~

If you will carry your belief into your practice,

you will soon find out whether it is true. ~~This is the only test.~~ What do we do with our impressions of the senses? We test their conclusions by comparing them with those of Mankind. But do we do this with regard to the conclusions of Faith? We compare them with those of two or three ~~others~~ who lived two thousand years ago - at a time when printing, science, philosophy were unknown - when men had little communication with each other & scarcely any knowledge of the laws of God.

~~St. Ig Then you believe in no Inspiration, no Atonement, & no Christ?~~

Inspiration
Atonement

~~M.S.~~ Christ indeed came into the world to save sinners, to wash them in his blood. To deliver man from sin & its consequences, to establish the kingdom of Heaven within him, to at-one him with God were truly Christ's mission & that of many more upon the earth. These things will be attained & would not have been attained without Christ. He suffered & not only he, but all have suffered for the sins of man, ~~kind~~ we all bear their sins in our bodies - & souls. If there be any gratitude & if there be any p/love, to him must ever rise our love & our gratitude, when our hearts are warm & our feeling is true.

~~St. Ig But not our worship?~~

Worship ~~M.S.~~ With regard to worship, I do not see what true feeling the word worship expresses -

Unitarianism ~~J.A.~~ ~~Then are you an Unitarian?~~
~~M.S.~~ The Unitarians say that no man is divine, none an incarnation of God - the Trinitarians that there was one - ~~In as far/~~So strong is my conviction that all are incarnations of Him, & receive inspiration from Him, that all are divine that I think in so far as one is better than none, Trinitarianism is a truer doctrine ~~perhaps~~ than the other.

Authority ~~St. Ig~~ ~~Oh! to be as you are without authority for a faith! I would not be in such a condition, no, not for worlds -~~
~~M.S.~~ I think with ~~you/~~the Roman Catholics that it is dreadful to be without authority. But we have authority. ~~Do you/~~Is not ~~call~~ God Himself authority? We are but the vessels. He fills them - & we must keep the vessels unsoiled & pure -

not admit ~~J.A.~~ ~~But you/~~ It is said that those who do "authority' when it is God that speaks, & when the excitement of a cup of coffee - ~~How can you~~ that they cannot tell if ~~your/~~their vessel is pure ? Swedenborg's was pure, & Comte's ~~is/~~was pure - yet they ~~come/~~came to different conclusions -

which was ~~M.S.~~ I think that we can see, in many of these cases, what part of the nature it was left out in coming to the conclusions in question - Unless a proposition can be proved by the Reason, felt by the Feeling, approved by the Sense of Justice, conscience in whatever other faculties we perceive in man, it ~~cannot~~ ought not to be admitted as a truth.

[in another hand: Swift]

Where one or more of these faculties are deficient, it ought not to surprise us, neither in ourselves &/nor in others, that a truth supposed truth is not perceived. It is probable that a man, without the idea of Causation, which generates the impression of power or cause - without Imagination which gives the sense of reality, & dresses & invests our idea with form, "a local habitation & a name" - which enables us to form a conception of something not perceived by the senses & to give it a presence & life - without the faculties which produce the desire of accounting for phenomena, of finding an Intelligent Personal Power, whose thoughts correspond to what we observe without - it is probable that, without these faculties, man would not arrive at any idea of a God at all - & faith in Him would be impossible.

~~J.A.~~ You are/I am supposing that you/we give up the usual means of receiving Truth from Church or Book.

~~M.S.~~ And that we seek it from God through our own faculties - including the Spiritual, the Affectional, the Intellectual, & the Physical - and including what these can receive from God by means of the same faculties in Mankind as well as in our individual selves - It seems

important that the thinkers of the present day (men disgusted with Church & Book as authority) should be fully aware of this - understanding, however, that from Book & Church we may learn, in as much as therein is also to be found exercise of human faculty.

~~St. Ig.~~ But each man individually is to be called upon, ~~according to you,~~ to make out *what* his faculties can accept as true of the exercise of these other men's faculties.

~~M.S.~~ And here is, in reality, no difference from the present state of things in one sense, though in another there is such an essential difference, - ~~f/~~For now every man in reality decides for himself.

~~St. Ig.~~ No, he does not/It is said ~~¶~~the Church decides for him.

But, ~~M.S.~~ ~~I/~~if he does not decide by reason, he ~~does/~~decides by *feeling* or by *some* exercise of his nature what he can or will accept be he Roman Catholic, Church of England man, Methodist, Quaker, Atheist, Deist &c &c &c - We believe that all the faculties receive the revelation of God to man - The Roman Catholic, Church of England man, &c &c &c exercise a very limited number of faculties in what they receive as revelation - Mr. Newman's school professes to exercise only the "intuitions",

Mr. Martineau's the Conscience, the old Unitarians the Intellect.

~~J.A.~~ But/When you indeed we have settled with ~~y/ourselves that such/~~what is the nature of Revelation, ~~you will/~~we shall still unconsciously derive

y/our

belief from former sources of belief.

~~M.S.~~ Great care ~~is/will~~ be necessary that it should not be entirely so derived. And, in as far as it is, it will gain less hold upon those inquiring minds, whose strong impulse it is to doubt, to fear prejudice.

~~J.A.~~ Well then, let us come to the point - How much do you say that you can assert, without the aid of Church or Book?

What can we assert without authority? Wisdom superior to Man's.

~~M.S.~~ Perhaps *Wisdom*, superior to Man's, is the only attribute, undoubtedly, distinctly revealed (not by inference) in the existences among which we find ourselves & which we are capable of investigating.

Benevolence greater than Man's?

~~J.A.~~ And not Benevolence?

~~M.S.~~ To say that Benevolence, greater than Man's, may be recognized in the Universe, seems to me an assertion distinctly provable. I can believe there may be & may have been, among Mankind, ~~those/some~~ of infinite *Benevolence*. Men have been found (& women too) eager, to the utmost possibility of each, in well-wishing or benevolence - ready to do, to sacrifice to their utmost possibility. How can we assert God to be more benevolent

than this? For *Righteousness'* sake, too, men have been found willing to do, to suffer anything possible to them.

{in another hand: Dyke)

~~J.A. But Power, you can assert without danger that Power, above human, is distinctly discernible.~~

Power above
human?

~~M.S. As to Power, perhaps its essential is Wisdom. In the course of Eternity, we shall perhaps make out, in considering these subjects, that Man will rise to perfection of Wisdom, to entire union with the Father - to being, in fact, of the Father. But, at present, we may safely/we not assert that such Wisdom, i.e. such adaptation of means to purpose, such conception of righteous & true purpose is not possible to Man?~~

~~J.A. I think we may safely assert that.~~

~~M.S. Do you know, I feel more doubt, of the latter assertion than that the former cannot be made?~~

~~J.A. Do not say so - Many will be shocked at this it~~

thinking

~~M.S. Shall we be Shocked at what? A/at~~

that the perfectly Righteous, Wise, Benevolent, Powerful should wish/will that, in the course of Eternity, His child, Mankind, should partake in all He is & has - not as a gift to passive recipients (the notion of which would be a contradiction to Wisdom & Righteousness) but as worked out in & by themselves, for themselves & for each other.

~~St. Ig. Well, then, in the way of assertion, all you come to is this, I take you upon your own shewing) to fix the limit of your~~
~~assertion~~
~~here is this W -/That we may discern, in the~~
 Universe,
~~Wisdom greater than Mankind has been~~
~~or is capable of, is therefore/then perhaps the~~
~~assertion we can directly make -~~
~~J.A. We can have such a great, tho' confused,~~
~~fear of referring to material nature to~~
~~reveal God to man -~~
~~M.S. We see, indeed, that Material Nature,~~
~~where its Laws are best understood, frequently~~
~~does not reveal God. It is notorious how~~
~~little of Spirituality, of feeling of Religion~~
~~there is among Natural Philosophers, generally~~
~~speaking. The nature must be in a state~~
~~to venerate, to admire, to love, to sympathize,~~
~~to comprehend & distinguish purpose. Or,~~
~~in one of its most interesting moments, (that~~
~~of death/dying) with great knowledge of material~~
~~Laws, it may be occupied, (as was one~~
~~of our most distinguished Scientific men)~~
~~in trying whether, in that interesting~~
~~moment, it can do a sum - instead of~~
~~being, at that/such a moment, attuned to~~
~~communication with God, to affectionate~~
~~communication with Man -~~
~~J.A. And does not all that prove to~~
~~you how unsafe intellectual appreciation of~~
~~God is?~~
~~M.S. It was the wisdom & benevolence~~
~~perceptible in material nature which~~
~~of God.~~

only
 Reference
 to material
 nature to
 reveal God
 to man.

 spiritual

 Intellectual
 appreciation
 of God.

revealed God to the simple & feeling nature of an Operative whom I once knew & who had been an Atheist - and he looked to this revelation for those other natures with which he was best acquainted. "I would lead them on to Science" he said "& "Science would lead them up to God." Such revelation by no means does away with Spirituality. Perhaps Wisdom, distinguish= able as above that of Man, as fulfilling a purpose which Man has a spirit of Right= eousness & Benevolence to be ready to fulfil *if he could*, may be the most distinct revelation of the All to the part - of the Spiritual unconnected with matter to the Spiritual connected with & limited by matter. In proportion as man increases in righteousness & benevolence, he will rejoice to trace a nature in existence, with which his own is in sympathy, but which has Wisdom *beyond* his own present ~~prob~~ possibility, which present possibility, however, he may be constantly increasing.

[Side note.]

2.
Belief as
including
spirituality

~~J.A. I have two questions to ask before I can let you go on. First, I must call upon you to define the word Spirituality -- for I think you are falling into the error which you deprecate in Newman. Secondly, are you not now in contradiction with yourself? why have not Natural Philosophers more feeling of religion, if we are to look to a revelation in material nature?~~

Spirituality
~~What is it?~~

M.S. It has been truly said that ~~the~~ a great advance in any one line of human

thought demands "the parallel movement of all the rest" - otherwise Spirituality declines - I believe that Laplace, Comte, various natural philosophers, anatomists, political economists, (who have acquired great knowledge of truth in one direction for Mankind) have yet made "~~only~~/but an exchange of ignorance;" ~~of~~/for

ignorance in

a domain of truth more essential to well-being than that in which they have worked.

~~J.A.~~ But ~~t~~/There is no part of truth in which ignorance of some other part does not impede the benefit of the former to Man.

~~M.S.~~ But it would seem that progress in some [in another hand: Pebody]

domains of truth may be made, irrespective of ignorance in others -

Why have not
Natural
Philosophers
more feeling
of Religion
if a Revelation
is to be found
in material
nature?

The Astronomer, for instance, may inform himself of the Law, ~~in igno~~ while in ignorance of the Legislator - But he who studies the nature of the Legislator cannot advance so well without knowledge of the wisdom revealed by His Laws -

Whatever contributes to the advance of Man's nature from the imperfect towards the Perfect - whatever helps ignorance to knowledge - helps us to know & feel the Father, to enrich His Holy Spirit, as existing within each of us -

It was wisely felt by an Atheist who once said to me that "to try to remedy the evils of Man's way of life was a necessary preparation for the study of God's nature, if there were a God." But to carry on the study of His nature, at the same time, would help to remedy the evils of Man's life.

f101

-11-

Decided ~~J.A. But are not g/~~Great attempts are now
being
advance in made ~~now~~ to remedy the evils of Man's life
Education by the philanthropica~~t~~ Political Economists,
but not in the enlightened Educationists of the present
the Education day? ~~I look upon~~ Dawes, Combe, Ellis, Owen,
of Spirituality Mill, Comte, ~~as~~ all, though of such different
creeds, ~~making~~/have made a decided advance in the
line of benevolent Social economy -
M.S. ~~So do it-~~ And if, to the influence of
teaching/~~whom you have mentioned,~~ could be
added a religious influence, ~~I think,~~ such an
influence might succeed in so uniting human
beings in the sympathies of love, duty, trust
as to effect a right social state - But never
will this be, while the Holy Spirit is banished,
while the Sun of Man's existence shines not
within, while the Son is without reverence,
love, trust, duty towards the Father, the
Perfect - ~~I think t/~~There is one singular
similarity in the teaching of all those ~~whom~~
~~you have~~/above mentioned, dissimilar as they are
in other respects - a want of spirituality.
Comte's "Grand Etre", what has it been if
you read Man's history? have you there
food for reverence, love, trust? can you live
on the wish to improve this abstract Grand
"Etre"? ~~Do you/~~Does he say God is
incomprehensible,
this "Grand Etre" comprehensible?
spirituality J.A. ~~It comes to this, w/~~What do you/we
What is it? mean by Spirituality?
M.S. Is it not f/Feeling, as distinct both
from Intellect & from the affection of one

human being to another? We do not call love, admiration, reverence for a human being Spirituality - nor the trust which one human being has in another. These we call humanizing consciousness of a presence of higher nature than human, unconnected with the material, - these I believe we call spiritual influences - And this we are conscious is the highest capability of our nature. Whenever we love, admire, reverence, trust this higher Presence, whenever we sympathize with, partake in the purpose, thought, feeling of this Highest Presence - those are our best moments.

Sympathy with Man, interest in any right or innocent object is not excluded by this higher state, is never indeed perfectly right & healthy, except in connection with it.

~~J.A. And how are we to obtain this state?~~

How to obtain
spirituality

~~M.S. There are modes (all in accordance with Law) of vivifying & strengthening spirituality or sensuality. The "Puseyites" (as far as I am aware) were among the first in England who asserted/revived the obligation/assertion of~~

a perfect

moral law/code as binding upon young men at college - & the possibility of maintaining it. They (those "holy youths", as we may well call them) checked sensuality by means accordant with Law - ~~It~~ They had rules for the purpose - I believe that we might practise modes of increasing spirituality as/equally

definite.

~~St. Ig But what are ?-~~

these modes.

Fasting & prayer? are usually supposed to be

~~M.S. All undue or inappropriate care for anything checks spirituality - The Saints~~

discovered this - experimentally I dare say. So they took to banishing *luxurious* fare & light converse - even where not wrong - Their idea has been very ill appreciated in after ages, which the mistakes they made have sent wrong in a contrary direction - To deny the flesh its due, except in a few great instances (St. Bernard ~~& our friends there~~, St. Ignatius of Loyola, St. Vincent of

Paul

&c) made it cry out, instead of leaving the Being free for highest things - But the wish, the seeking for spirituality, which inspired a few among the Saints, was, perhaps, higher than anything now existing -

{in another hand: Tonkin}

~~J.A. But you surely think that there was something intensely selfish in the Monastic life--~~

Monastic Life

~~M.S.~~ Many went to convents & hermitages, hoping to win heaven or ward off hell, many to be applauded or gain in some way in this world, many thinking to do God service or give Him pleasure ~~Him~~ by sacrificing *themselves* or worshipping *Him*. But ~~I hope~~ there is evidence that a few sought a spiritual state of being as their object -which I think no Church, scarcely any individual seeks now - Spiritualism is dormant, let us hope not dead. Oh! how to revive it, to rekindle it into life!

~~St. Ig. But do you not find it among the Catholics?~~

Safety the

~~M.S. I don't now enough of the-/It is said that the~~

object of Religionists now.

Roman Catholic Church in France of the present day, Montalembert's school ~~to judge whether it/is~~ trying to

revive it.

~~exists there.~~ But it seems to me that *safety* is what mainly has attracted

converts to Roman Catholicism & Puseyism - here.

~~The spirit~~

~~J.A. Well, if you don't see spirituality in the Church, do you see it among your unbelievers?~~

Spirituality
in England

~~M.S. The spirit of our operatives is far from being spiritual. It is quite in an opposite direction. So are all the tendencies of the age - In a much more ignorant & savage age, it does not appear to me to have been so - Man goes a weary course away from Spirituality while learning the laws & capabilities of Matter - Oh! is not the time come when he may return to it, with reason & knowledge as a foundation for what was before unconscious impulse?~~

~~St. Ig. But give us an instance in history of what you mean.~~

Among the
Jews.

~~M.S. The Jews (perhaps naturally) shewed examples of more than common spirituality, because they were less adapted (through their laws & government) to advance in improving the material world. They were a striking failure as a people, but perhaps with a few examples of spiritual natures, not to be equalled elsewhere - Compare the words, which dropped unstudied from the spirit of Jesus, with the words of Marcus Antoninus, thought out with care, wise in all but the Highest wisdom.~~

~~St. Ig. Ah! you know I can't admit your comparison. Because I think that Jesus was God - Let us return to the spirituality of the Saints-~~

Among the
Saints.

~~M.S. Those who have desired to commune with God have generally fled from~~

Man - An old Saint I once knew (I never had any liking to him - he used to live alone, always writing, receiving any who wished to consult him) ~~said to me when I asked~~/in answer to my

question
 "have we nothing to do in life then?" said, †
 "Yes, much to do - it is as if we were eggs - there is much to be done to keep off that which would destroy" - a natural error, since, practically, as things are now, man destroys the spiritual in his association with man - Perhaps, in a blessed moments, man (or rather I should say woman) is 'with' God in lonely places - But is it so often so in company? The prayer=meeting of our poor Wesleyans is an attempt to unite in seeking the presence of God in the heart - But is there any such attempt, in or out of Churches, in general, where man meets man, now? We go to church as a "duty", not to meet God. Do we not, in general, part with God (if we had somewhat realized His presence) when we enter man's presence?

{in another hand: [illeg]

~~J.A. That is a melancholy fact, if it is true.~~ But we must enter it/man's presence, to do our work.

~~M.S.~~ And our work, though right to do it, is it not generally such, or in such circumstances, so ill understood, either in theory or practice, that it separates us from Him? Sympathy, in high things, is, as life & companionship are now, impossible to most. Most do not even know what it is. Those who appreciate its worth seldom can have it. The Convent was an attempt to secure training for God's work, association in that work,
 sympathy in highest things, for those who,

then, as now, without its support, could not have had these ~~things~~

What/Where is spirituality is then to be found?

~~J.A. I understand your enthusiasm for the Monastic life better than I did. But I want to know, a/Are then those who can appreciate sympathy in high things but cannot have it, necessitated to starve?~~

~~M.S. "The peace of God passeth all understanding" "God is Life" - "God is Love" - His peace shall dwell with us - His life & love shall be life & love to us, even when we cannot have sympathy - not to stand in place of it - but to keep us ready for it, to nourish us when we are without it.~~

Is the name of God being lost in England?

~~J.A. But there are so many now who don't believe in a god & there will be more.~~
~~M.S. It seems very strange that, when such men as St. Ignatius of Loyola, St. Bernard & Wesley could find no peace without finding God - & travelled up & down the earth in search of Him - all the most moral & most intellectual o there/very~~

strange that

there should be ~~are~~ some now denying that there is a God, others saying that we cannot know any thing of Him, if He exists - The world, at least in England, so I believe, is very near losing His name - "To proclaim the name of the Lord," or rather, the *character* of the Lord, what a mission that would be for a Saviour ~~now~~/of this day! The most moral

&

the most intellectual of the English artisans are now learning to live very well without Him, & really ~~don't~~ seem to think it does not ~~signifies~~/signify His not

being there.

And I don't see that they are likely to feel

f107 [large X in margin on left top par]

~~-17-~~

any want - They live in a state of triumph -
And they have morality - they have sympathy,
They have benevolence, they will not feel these wants. If a man
were alone,

these say, "I don't know whether there is a
God or not, but if there is, I cannot
understand Him & it is therefore no use to
seek Him." It seem curious that it should be so while others,
in former times, have felt His presence, &/felt
that it was the one essential to make Life
worth having & that all else might be
dispensed with, if that remained. Oh! how
to keep that sunshine in our hearts?

{in another hand: Duffield}

Experience must show to each - *Experience*,
a word misapplied by the Methodists,
because their experience was not of
what was wisely sought- of what was
ignorantly, unwisely sought. Thus they

[Side note] thought that *that* was come from God,
Revelation of a which came from distempered spirits.
Spirit of Wisdom J.A. ~~We have wandered far from your~~
by its manifestation

To return to the assertion ~~which was~~ that we are made
conscious

of the existence of a Spirit of Wisdom,
(above present human possibility,) by
its various ~~manifestations~~ (& not only ~~is~~
material) manifestations -

~~M.S. Yes, there~~/Material manifestations may go on, for ever,
without Man having consciousness of the
Spirit of Wisdom - Revelation of a Spirit
requires existence of a Spirit to which it
is revealed - Sounds are heard by many
an ear, sight beheld by many an eye, -
the ear & the eye being formed ~~by~~/with all
cunning skill - but no chord is struck on
a spiritual existence - To some, a solemn

voice of Time will say "it is time to dress for breakfast. What that is amusing, who that will think about me, will be there?" To others, that solemn voice will seem mystically to lay open divine things, high objects, a Great Presence in the coming

day.

We cannot take too much care to separate the questions, "what is?" & "what ought to

be?"

Yet we are perpetually confounding them - Sometimes the former really answers the latter - but how often it is supposed to do so when it does not - I mean how often is the 'what is' supposed to be the 'what ought to be' -

[Side note]
What belief in God
ought to arise.
from contemplation

~~J.A. Well, for the present let us stick to the question, How can/ How ought belief in~~

of material existence?

~~a God, arise as you represent to arise from~~

the

~~(we will not say, how does it arise?) from the~~

from the Contemplation of material existence?

~~M.S. I believe that Oersted's aim is to establish that "throughout all worlds are beings fundamentally similar in their rational faculties, both to each other & to the eternal living reason of God." This I~~

can

understand for I believe that, whenever rational faculties exist, *there* exists God. But Comte, whose "*Grand Etre*" is Man, I cannot understand. For what I would ask is, Does not what we recognize of existence call upon us to believe that there is a thought, a sentiment, a purpose which

{in another hand: Colmer}

comprehends all existence? Such a thought & purpose certainly exists in [no man, nor in all men put together - All Mankind long thought themselves living on a flat stationary surface. Whose thought & purpose was this star among stars

revolving around the Sun? I cannot understand how this question can be avoided. In all cases, where such thought & purpose have been manifested as consist with Man's faculties, we unhesitatingly answer that Man has been the thinker & purposer. Why, when thought & purpose of the same nature are manifested, only exhibiting capability more than Man's, are we still to say, Man is the only thinker & purposer, or to say, ~~a~~/All that exists is developing itself into perfection by some self-resident nature. To account for this development, it seems to me that I want a thought, a purpose, a Will in which resides this development. I am afraid of offending by using the words "Father," "Son" & "Holy Ghost" - & I cannot trace that those, from whom they sprung, thought as I do - But thus only, to my mind, is there consistency ~~in~~ in all existence, concerning which we know anything - And does not any attempt at accounting for what exists mean the finding one existence consistent with the same thought & purpose as another? This consistency appears to me to be found only in supposing a perfect thought, sentiment, purpose to exist - in supposing the nature of this existence to be Perfect Goodness, Benevolence, Wisdom, Righteousness - *If* such a nature existed, what would be

{in another hand: Suffell?}
its will? To *communicate* such a nature
But would it be Wisdom, to communicate
itself entirely into the finite & imperfect?
Would not the development then want
a thought, a purpose, a developer, whose
will should be *wise & right development*.
That *developer*, that Will, I call Father.
or "*Grand Etre*" or God - That which is
developing I call Son or Manifestation.
Thus it appears to me is consistency in
all existence. If I may believe in this,
all that I know of what is, what has
been or appears likely to be seems to me
one consistent whole, attributable to Θ /One
thought & purpose - I cannot indeed
prove such a thought & purpose to
exist - But the more man has learnt
& done, the more evidence, it appears to
me, comes into view for it. Through
much of man's existence, there has been
such a want to believe in a Father, or
there has been such a sentiment that a
Power above Man's did exist & did
influence Man's fate, that Men have
betaken themselves to sacred Men & books
for proof of such a Power.

As men grew wiser, in some respects,
than these sacred men & books, they have
cast them off - & such men & books
have now an actual influence against
belief in a Developer - The difficulty I
chiefly feel is this - Is this Developer,
the spring of the development, *merely*
a *Will*? We cannot call it a *superintending*

f111

~~-21-~~

of Will, for, in each present time, the whole

Eternity exists as a Will in the Developer. To superintend means to direct particulars. Perhaps here we come to our acknowledgment that we cannot understand the Father.

We cannot understand the nature of His
{in another hand: Swift}

existence. We can only say Perfect Wisdom, Goodness, Power wills the right development of Eternity.

What is the communication between this Being and us?

~~J.A. But I/~~If there is such a nature, what would such a nature say to me,? how would it direct me,? what would it feel to me? how shall I *at=one* myself with it?

M.S. This, ~~I think,~~/may be called, our intercourse with the Holy Ghost.

that the

~~J.A. Then you/~~We can only make out that the Father exists as a *Will*, willing

whole shall *thus* develop itself, *because* thus only can Being become *well=being* - that the Father exists to communicate His nature, in proportion as the Son, the recipient, by development & exercise of *his* nature, fits himself to receive it - that the Father is the thought & purpose & will which develops, the Father is the communicator, in proportion as the development of the Son makes it possible to him to receive the communication. that the Father *is* Wisdom, Goodness, Love, Righteousness, Power - ~~Do I rightly interpret you?~~

~~M.S. Yes such is my belief. Oh! how~~

~~J.A.~~

We must But how shall I understand Him, how receive His communication, receive Himself? is our cry

put ourselves
into circumstances
to understand
Him.

[in another hand: Illeg]

this,

~~M.S.~~ Ask yourself what would Wisdom Love, Righteousness, in each particular instance, say. Exercise your nature so as to be wise, loving, righteous. Thus you will understand Him. Thus He will become

part of your being - It is true that, for

you must put yourself in circumstances wholesome for your nature. Then you will discern the Father, then you will love the loveable, trust the Wise & Omnipotent, sympathize with the Good & True.?

~~J.A. Then am I to wait
circumstances?~~

Not wait passively for ~~M.S. No,~~ We are not to wait passively for such

those
circumstances

circumstances. We are to think, to work for them - Or, if ~~you~~/we have them in the present, we are to try to

prepare

~~your~~/our being, ~~your~~/our nature for the

time in

which the opportunity for such work is sure to come - ~~sure & certain.~~

~~J.A. Why sure?~~

would

~~M.S.~~ Sure & certain - Otherwise there

be no Father - no perfect Spirit. Try for accordance with that Spirit, try to be consistently with what you believe - Then shall waters gush out of the rocky Desert, which shall keep you alive till you have passed through it to rich & fruitful regions.

f113 {this entire page has a large X draw through it}

Plan {in another hand: Welsh Newton}

of ~~St. Ignatius of Loyola, Harriet Martineau,~~

Creation ~~Jacob Abbott, M.S.~~

III ~~M.S. — But w/~~What was God's purpose

God's in creating us? ~~St. Ig.~~ Some say he created us for His glory, to

in creating us. honour
& to serve Him. Others say that this is ascribing

~~H.M. For the glory, do you think? For His vanity you mean — What a motive you ascribe/viz. vanity to God — one which~~

we should
not dare to assign ~~even~~ to a good man — in whom, ~~on the contrary,~~ all regard for

~~His/his~~
own glory is ~~always~~ supposed to be extinguished.

~~M.S. By His glory we do not mean His vain glory. All things were created for His glory, that is, for the manifestation~~

of ~~Himself — Man is created to serve God & all other things are to help him to attain the end of his creation. The world was~~

~~made too~~
~~as a means for this end — to help man to serve God.~~

For our ~~M.S. — Do not you/~~Some think that God created man for happiness? Others say that they only

~~H.M. — I wish I saw it. — I see suffering. —that~~ either happiness is not God's purpose, or if it is, He fails in it.

But how is ~~M.S. — But if/~~The argument that suffering brings

this borne forth
out by the greater general happiness than there could be

fact? For without suffering is ~~negatived~~/met by the argument

we are ~~J.A. — T/~~that God is in that case wanting either in Omnipotence or in Benevolence. If He is

not happy.

f113v [large X through this down to Not by creating]

~~-7-~~

{in another hand: Newton}

~~Or~~

~~M.S. We can only enter into this question thus -~~
Taking, ~~for the moment,~~ for granted that is the existence
of perfect Goodness, Power, & Wisdom, what are
likely to be the purposes of such a Being, &
what his plans for fulfilling them? ~~Or we~~
~~may then/Let us compare these plans with what we~~
see & learn in his Creation - the "what is?" with the "what
ought to
be?"

What is the satisfaction, what the happiness
which Perfect Love desires, judging from what
we see of the same attribute existing to a limited degree
in man?

~~J.A.~~ To this question answer is made:- Happiness in other
beings than himself

& to the perfection of Love in God can no degree
of happiness be satisfactory, short of the
greatest which Eternity can admit of.

~~H.M. But how can infinite Love be~~
~~satisfied with finite Happiness at any time?~~
~~After all is said & done, there must always~~
~~remain a want -~~ The happiness it has
created, being finite, remains inferior to the
desires of its love, which are infinite. In
perfect goodness there is no limit which can
be satisfied, for *infinite* good cannot be
~~communicated/communicated.~~

~~M.S. Shall the/Not by creating another Being then/certainly,~~
to think His thought, to will His will, to be the being
of God, by His direct volition? We at once
perceive an essential difference between
such a being & God, inasmuch as this being
would think, feel & will, - perform all, in short,
in which happiness consists, - not by his own will,
for he has no will, but by that of another Being.

4 7 [go on to P.8, reverse of P.2]

f114

-2-

{this entire page has a large X draw through it}
benevolent, He will desire to avoid all
suffering,
if He is omnipotent, He will be able to do
it

~~M.S. But He will not desire to do it,
if suffering is to be the best means of
producing
the highest general good.~~

~~J.A. Why could not an Omnipotent being
i.e. to secure the highest good without the
suffering?~~

If perfect
Happiness is
to be the
creation of
Perfect
Benevolence,
then there
must be
two Gods -
the Creator &
the Created.

~~M.S. Is not that/This is really saying
that there
can be no existence but God's. &
yet,/although, if
there were no other existence, He would
not be God -~~

~~J.A. I do not understand the enun=
ciation of your proposition.~~

~~M.S. For t/there is no perfect
happiness but
God's. you say.~~

~~H.M. less I don't admit that
It is vain to say that "to each being must
be its own~~

~~happiness", that the
drunkard finds a different happiness
from yours - & you again a/one different
from that of the Being, whom you call God.~~

one

-

confusion

~~M.S. But that/This is merely the~~

~~of a word - You cannot call the drunkard's
enjoyment happiness, nor indeed that of
most of us -~~

~~H.M. Then what a cruel Being you make
your God, who denies to almost all His
creation the happiness which He enjoys
Himself.~~

~~J.A. What is happiness?~~

~~M.S. For is not happiness the right
satisfaction of all our capabilities,~~

whether

~~of Mind, of Soul or of Heart?~~

f114v

(2)

-8-

To give man will, an identity, a freedom of his own - & yet so to arrange that his will shall become freely one with the will of God, is the problem of Human Existence - for the will of God, being the will of perfect love & wisdom, is the only will that can lead to perfect happiness - The † will

bein
g
††/†
ove

of man, therefore, in order to attain happiness, must be the same as the will of God.

Can this problem be solved ~~other wise than~~/otherwise than by giving man such a nature & such circumstances ~~as,~~ acting upon his nature, as shall induce it to be his will to do that which is for the happiness of Mankind in which his own is included?

How else can we reconcile the desire which we know must exist in the Spirit of Love - and in which we cannot suppose the Spirit of Wisdom & Omnipotence to fail - with its apparent abortion, with the misery we see & feel?

We admit that His happiness & ours consists in the same thing - that our thoughts, feelings &c can only be happy in as far as they are like His, which are truth.

f115

-3-

{in another hand: Faurin}

~~H.M. But that is saying that there is no one who is happy now -- since/Now the man does not exist & has perhaps not yet existed all whose could say that his~~

faculties

were ~~all~~ receiving employment & satisfaction - including Reason, Feeling,

Conscience,

Imagination or whatever other

~~classifications/~~

faculties

may be assigned in your nomenclature ~~may assign~~ to man. & ~~faculties.~~

For without

~~M.S. You admit then that t/Therefore there is no~~

perfect goodness & perfect wisdom, there can

perfect happiness but God's - Because He is the only Spirit of Perfect Right & Truth. And without perfect right & truth, there can be no perfect happiness.

~~H.M. That is true, & therefore, I/That is the~~

be no perfect happiness.

very reason why, say many, we would not have created man - had I/we been God -

~~M.S. Yet if He, the perfect Benevolence, did not desire other happiness than His own, He would not be God.~~

~~J.A. then why does He not/And if He~~

were to

create other

being perfectly good,?

~~M.S. And perfectly wise?~~

~~J.A. No, that would be creating other Gods -~~

~~M.S. And/For how can beings be perfectly good, if they are not perfectly wise? If you are to suppose a limitation of their faculties, there must be ignorance~~

-

error,

& if there be ignorance, there must be

unhappi=

& therefore sin, & therefore partialness.

What beings should we then conceive that God would create?

f116

St. Ig. ~~Well, Let us suppose God in the act of creation - no other Being yet in existence~~

J.A. ~~But we know that such a state of things is impossible - that we can form no idea of beginnings.~~

St. Ig. ~~Yes, I am only supposing ourselves cognizant of no other existence but God's - What beings should we now conceive that God would create?~~

{the above paragraph has a large X through it}
What beings should we suppose

that Perfect Righteousness would create?

M.S. Unless we admit that to will limited (though progressive) happiness is consistent with the Spirit of Perfect Right- with the existence of perfect benevolence & wisdom - & of omnipotence to effect the will of perfect benevolence & wisdom - we come at once to a direct contradiction - We assert that no nature but that of God the Father can exist - & yet, if no other nature existed, He would not be God.

J.A. ~~How so?~~

g/granting that

M.S. ~~Our first assumption is/For~~

perfect nature is essential to perfect happiness - ~~therefore~~/then in God the

Father

alone exist the attributes essential to perfect happiness - namely, perfect goodness, power, oneness with all truth.

Being would happiness,

J.A. ~~But I/And, if you say that the not be perfect who willed limited~~

M.S. ~~T/then you assert that a perfect Being would not be perfect who willed other nature than His own - in other words, that either there is no perfect Being~~

a

being perfect, there is no other - that is, that only God can be, consistently with God, & that, if only God is, God would not be. For that would not be perfect Benevolence, ~~what~~ who willed only His own Being, who, possessing Omnipotence, did not will other nature than His own to which to communicate His happiness.

{in another hand: Dyke}

~~St. Ig. But might not the Omnipotent, by His will, cause all existence to be perfect as his own?~~

Can God will something to be and not to be?

~~M.S.~~ Does it require explanation to prove that that would not be the Spirit of Truth, to whom it were possible to will something to be & not to be? To will another nature like His own would be to will His own not to be, since, as has been said, that would be willing two infinite existences. Must we prove that two Infinite Beings cannot be?

~~St. Ig. Well, we return to the question What beings then shall God create?~~

What beings then shall God create?

~~M.S.~~ God's thought is truth - God's feeling is happiness. God's ~~action~~/will is wisdom - How will He cause other beings to partake in these things is the question. Will His plan be to effect that they shall, by His decree, think His

thought,

feel His feeling, do His work? to oblige each thought, feeling, act to be what it

is.

Will He make a creature which cannot go wrong - instinct, or the voice of God always telling it what to do & being always obeyed?

~~J.A.~~ Such beings do exist, but we call them beasts,

~~M.S.~~ W/which never make a mistake & never improve - & are incapable as far as we know of happiness, that is, of God's happiness.

~~J.A.~~ The problem, then, to solve appears to be how shall our thought, feeling, act be like his, yet not thro' the exercise of His powers but of ours - not by His will obliging each to be what it is, but by our own springing from our own nature. How shall God, in other words, communicate His own happiness, the essential of which is activity, without depriving our happiness of its essential, our activity?

[go on to

P. 7,
reverse
of P. 1]

~~M.S.~~ You admit that the object/purpose of God's Providence is that man should attain his happiness. Let us consider what His plan is for his attaining it.

~~St. Ig.~~ But how can we, poor finite miserable beings, have any insight into God's plans?

~~M.S.~~ God gives us Reason, Feeling, Conscience, all of which, under the one

name-

~~of Faith, shew us glimpses into Eternity - while Perception gives us glimpses into Time.~~

~~J.A.~~ Our faith would lead us to expect that God would desire each individual to be as happy as Himself - Heaven knows

[the struck out paragraphs also have a x through them]

~~we are far enough off from this. How can we reconcile this desire which we believe/hope we might exist in the Spirit of Love & in which we cannot suppose the Spirit of Wisdom & Omnipotence to fail with its apparent abortion, with the misery which we see & feel?~~

~~— M.S. We admit then that His happiness & ours consists in the same thing, that our thoughts, feelings, as to &c can only be happy in as far as they are like His, which are truth. {the above has a large X through it} {in another hand: Pebody}~~

Let us ~~now~~ see what His methods are for communicating His happiness.

All existence depends at each moment on God's will. ~~By His/He wills I mean~~ not a special decrees, but certain uniformities or constant ~~unconditional~~ relations of succession & of co-existence, which we call Laws, & which we might ~~just as well~~ call Habits or Rules of Nature - These we can ultimately refer only to God's will - explain only by saying that they are His thoughts.

For example, each human being ~~that/who~~ has lived & lives differs from every other. This arises not from God having decreed "A shall come into existence with exactly such & such ingredients in his character, B with such & such other ingredients" - but from these uniformities or laws willed by God - thus, the sparrow falls to the ground, not because God has decreed that that sparrow shall fall from that tree but because God has willed that a property, an essential of matter, (without which Matter i.e. would not be,) is attractive.

Without entering into the question of the beginning of Mankind's existence, that ~~he is~~ A is what he is at the moment he begins to exist arises entirely & in every most minute particular from God having fixed every relation whether of succession or of similarity which concerns Man's existence. During every succeeding moment of A's existence, his perceptions, thoughts, emotions, volitions depend upon its having been & being the will of God that such shall be in constant co-existence with such organizations & such circumstances. Exactly the same antecedents never arise - therefore never exactly the same perceptions, thoughts, emotions, volitions in one individual as in another - But the relations are not the less constant.

What is ~~St. Ig. Certainly. But a/~~All these relations the end or object of Man's creation? are merely means & inducements supplied by God to enable man to attain his end - And his end is ~~to serve God~~

feelings, ~~M.S. Should we not rather say~~ to be one with God? ("I & my Father are one") to have the same object, the same thoughts, wishes? The son is to have every thing that the Father has - not as a gift - but to be obtained by mankind for mankind. In this way man will partake even the omnipotence of God - when he desires nothing but what God desires - Then will he, by the laws of God, accomplish everything that he desires - And what can God do more?

f121

~~-11-/8-~~

According

The argument of ~~(so-called)~~ Christianity is this: ~~man~~

to

~~St. Ig. How can you thus exalt God as on a~~

Christianity?

~~par with God?~~ Man's end is to praise & to serve God, & all other things are

created

{in another hand: London}

as means to help him to this end. All circumstances are *means* for this end, all are means *fitted* for this end, & those which he supplies to each of us are the means *most* fitted for this end for each of us - For God is omniscient, therefore he *knows* what are the means most fitted for us - He is omnipotent, therefore he *can* give us the means most fitted for us - He is love, therefore He *will* give us those most fitted for obtaining that end to which He has called us. And if we could see, we should choose those (& none other) which He has chosen - for He chooses always the means best suited to the end. Therefore position, employment, health, place, all has come to us from the hand of God as means & the fittest means to obtain our end - ~~You admit that e/Every minuteness of life/disposition of life,~~

small or

great, except sin, is a consequence of the will of God - Therefore ~~you~~/we have no

right

to alter it. "Thy will be done" means

nothing

unless it means that we are to carry it out to its most minute & ultimate consequence.

According to

~~M.S. I don't accept quite the whole of your~~

the highest

~~argument, or rather I think it capable of being raised still higher . Will you let~~

view we

~~me say wherein I differ, w/While entirely appreciating the truth & beauty of~~

can conceive

~~your~~/this

view as a whole, let me say wherein I feel

it capable

of being raised still higher.

I cannot think that God wants man to be always praising Him - How tiresome it must be to Him to hear us continually saying, how good you are, how great you are, & when we don't think it at all. It can be only flattery, for I am sure many of us, in saying so, don't feel him good, (unless the expression is accompanied with Music) He wants us to have a sympathy with him - But as for praise, it annoys or amuses a good man, & His is the Perfection of human Goodness, the same in kind, but not in degree - to praise & honour him I cannot think that *He* considers man's object - And to serve Him, to worship Him I cannot but consider as words without meaning now, dating from a time of Oriental despotism - Surely God must think it a much higher & truer destiny for man to be one with Him, in accordance with Him, than in servility, in subjection to Him, crawling before Him.

~~I quite agree that~~ God undoubtedly gives us only means & inducements. But ~~your~~/the Christian proposition sounds as if God apportioned, by express & special decree, to each individual the means best fitted, (whatever he may think,) to communicate to him the attributes of God - not that individuals were/are to discover, by the united sense of all Mankind these means - According to ~~you~~/this doctrine, it would be certainly wrong for any individual to alter

or modify his circumstances in the least possible degree. ~~I feel entirely with you in regard to/as~~ a consequence to God's

Omnipotence,

Omniscience
& Love & follows undoubtedly that ~~therefore~~

"His

will be done"-
extends to the most minute particulars -
Without His will not a sparrow falls to the ground - Only, what is His will? That we should find out, that is, that mankind should find out for mankind *what are* the circumstances to develop in man the attributes of God & to satisfy them.

Is the proposition of universal Law

~~St. Ig. But how is this reconcileable with t/~~The proposition that the smallest circumstance comes to us from the will of God?

consistent with ~~that~~ the proposition that the smallest circumstance comes to us from the will of God. And in what sense?

~~M.S.—That~~ is true in this sense - A man is & does what he is & does, because it is the will of God that certain definite perceptions, thoughts, emotions, volitions shall succeed or co-exist with certain organizations & circumstances. It is not true in the sense that each particular perception, thought, emotion, volition is caused directly by the desire of God that so it shall be. In the former sense, it is our business to discover, to desire & to attain the circumstances & organizations which produce the right volitions &c, that is, those which are one with God's - which discovery we are intended to make by experience not our own individual experience alone, but the collective experience of all Mankind.

f124

~~-12-/-13a-~~

If it were not invariable that such characters flow from such circumstances (& in many cases we can actually predict it) man would be acting at random, he would never discover with certainty, either for himself or others, what course would lead to right X God does not play such tricks with us -

In the latter sense, could we imagine what is probably a contradiction, viz Man necessitated to think or feel or desire this or that by the immediate will of God, he would be a machine with the attributes of a human being - But now, in the midst of the severest suffering which, by my ignorance of God's laws, I have brought upon myself, I can still thank God that I am not a machine, (which this dreadful consequence plainly shews) & capable therefore of the highest ~~happiness~~, of God's own happiness. A machine never suffers. It is guided by another power than its own - Mankind is to have all that is God's - Even His power of Creation will He share with us - Mankind is to create Mankind. - Cretins and

Stuart Mills. It is
in man's power to
deteriorate in race
to Cretinism. It is
in man's power to
raise his race to
Newtons and
St. Pauls.

And

can he do this if he remain a machine?

~~St. Ig. But still, according to your/~~This view, it is said, makes a man's sins ~~are~~ attributable to God - ~~You don't~~ imputes these to His Creator - They ~~would~~ are then ~~be~~ God's fault. What mind, it is said, not utterly ~~all~~ corrupt, will not shrink from such a conclusion? It is ~~our~~/the Christian's faith that everything which happens to us, *sin excepted*

is so by the disposal of Divine Providence

position,

[In another hand:
God.

illeg Lorun?]

that you have that employment, that dinner,
those clothes, that illness is the will of

Everything *but sin* comes to us direct from
the hand of God.

Sin cannot

~~M.S. But I don't see how you can /Sin
can be~~

be excepted
from the

~~sin. It seems to me that that is only by a
quibble.~~

proposition

~~You can hardly be satisfied with that
yourself-~~

that every
thing comes
to us from
the hand of
God.

The hand which gives all that forms the
character gives that which flows from the
character, whether it be sin or whether
it be virtue.

~~St. Ig. No, No, no, Man says the virtue
is God's,~~

is ~~our~~/his own.

the sin

how

~~M.S. Oh human nature! how much
more beautiful in thy instincts than thy
reflections! how true is thy intention,~~

If everything

defective thy reasoning! how much better
art thou than thy belief!

~~J.A. But you make/ It is said that it
is making/~~

that man is
is the result
of foregone
arrangement,
how can he
be other
than he is?
And what
is the foregone
arrangement?

this doctrine makes man as complete a
slave & automaton. ~~to me as Loyola For doer~~
For, if every thing that man is, is the
consequence of foregone arrangement, how
can he be otherwise than he is /than he is?

~~M.S. But what is the foregone ar=
rangement? The foregone arrangement is
that man shall attain for himself -~~

And what is it that man wants? Is it
the sense of merit for what is right in
him,

the sense of guilt & repentance for what is
wrong that he thinks he ought to have thro'
a consciousness that what he is arises from

himself. It will involve him in contradictions at once. It must have been he, then, who made all existences which have had influence upon him, without his own consciousness or intention- Moreover the common feeling of Mankind is repugnant to any claim of Merit. They even construct far-fetched theories, in order to satisfy their true feeling that man cannot claim merit when he is what he ought to be. They say, God has all the merit, I have all the blame. The same man who, with truth, repudiates the idea of claiming merit for himself, will be shocked at not believing all that is wrong in him entirely his own fault, for which he is to feel remorse & receive punishment. But there is much truth in this confession, as in all popular feelings. It is true that the wrong ~~in~~ a man does comes from within, that he must undergo suffering or privation till that wrong is right- & that he must be conscious that he is wrong, ~~& suffer~~ As is the case of a man who is ill. That illness arose, partly from the physical circumstances, which concerned the beginning of his existence - partly from those after his birth, before he could have any part in his own destiny - partly from those after he could know what was right, which prevented his knowing how to make his volition right. It is one thing to know what you ought to do - & another to know how

to do it - one thing to know the law & another to know how to incline your heart to keep that law. But the sick man must be conscious that his physical frame is in a wrong state, must suffer the consequences of its being wrong, perhaps during life, perhaps till it can be put into a right state - and nothing can exempt him from them.

{in another hand: Newton}

It is, therefore, a true feeling that the wrong, whether physical or spiritual, which a man has within himself, must produce for him suffering, which no one can bear in his stead.

Must man

~~J.A.~~ But/It is said that it is very hard that man must

suffer for what is not his own fault but God's?

suffer for that which is not his own fault, but God's, according to ~~you~~/this theory.

~~M.S.~~ Hard that man should attain to perfect happiness? Man possesses Reason, Feeling, Conscience, *capable* of unfolding so as to be one with God, that is, to think His thought, to feel as He feels, to will that His will shall be done, & thus to share His happiness, His power. Is this hard? God, it is true, gave him no instinct *how* to cultivate the capabilities aright. Mankind has to learn by experience, 1st what are his capabilities, 2nd what are all the various laws of God concerning them, 3rd that it is desirable to cultivate these capabilities aright, 4th which of these laws

enable him to do so, 5th how to keep them, 6th how to incline himself to keep them. All this man has to learn & to practise before he can be one with God.

But the first man had had no experience. He would be *certain* to be ignorant of most of these laws. It would indeed be *impossible* for him to discover them all. It *is* impossible for us now. Time is the great word to God's thought. It requires ~~the~~ united ~~efforts~~ of Man in all time to discover all. When we pray to be "kept this day from all sin", to be "delivered from evil", we utter a prayer for that which is impossible -

{in another hand: 97 c c}

Unless we have perfect knowledge of every one of these laws, we *must* err - Our prayer is a contradiction. If we were "delivered from evil," the world would be ruined, its only safe-guard gone - God's plans are all for Eternity.

Are the Laws
necessary
for the
existence

~~J.A.~~ But ~~I~~/If we wonder that, with this desperate ignorance, man does not come to an end - perhaps it may be answered that

of Mankind
to be discovered
only by
experience?

~~M.S.~~ ~~I think that,~~ p/Probably no experience is probably required to know those laws which are necessary for the existence of Mankind. The discovery of those necessary to his *well-being*, God sees it best to leave to him - as well as those necessary for the continuance of each individual man. (nearly all lives perhaps being shortened by ignorance of law)

{in another hand: Tonkin}

But those laws, without the knowledge of which Mankind must have come to an end, are probably taught by instinct - instinct being

Or by ~~J.A. But what is instinct?~~

Instinct? ~~M.S. Is it not a teaching, not by experience, but by its being the will of God that the being shall want & shall know how to satisfy that want.?~~

~~St. Ig. Perhaps so - But with regard to God's plans, are you not enquiring into things which it is presumptuous in us to deal with, even in thought, profane of us to inter-meddle with? "Such knowledge is too wonderful for me."~~

Origin ~~M.S. Is it not rather/If we believe that all God's~~

of Sin ~~dealings with His creatures are to be enquired into, & with trust that they will be found to arise from goodness & wisdom, or/otherwise,~~

they ~~would not be God's dealings? we shall come~~

~~J.A. The great question of the Origin of Evil I believe you never can trust.~~

Evil may ~~M.S. But is it not to this that the Origin of~~

~~also be in this way, from ignorance of one or more of God's laws that sin became introduced into the world?~~

~~H.M. But what is sin?~~

feelings, ~~M.S. Sin being something untrue in our~~

~~our thoughts, our wills, something unlike the thought, the feeling, the will of God.~~

~~St. Ig. But you say that our thoughts, emotions, volitions, are all, to the very smallest particular, caused by the will of God.~~

~~How can He cause that which is unlike Himself? may be asked.~~

~~M.S. But a/As an infant stumbles & the mother sees it better that it should stumble rather than never learn to walk alone; so that you may say that/it may be said~~

that the

is ultimately caused by the mother's will - thus the sin may be caused by the will of God the Father, & yet be unlike His own.

Now ~~I believe that~~ all sin arises from ignorance of God's laws at some time or in some individual.

How can sin

~~St. Ig. From ignorance it is said/asked when "I knew it~~

be caused by ignorance?

was wrong."

~~M.S. You knew it was wrong to do what you did at a particular time - but there was a time when that in you which led to this sin was called out unknown to you - when there was nothing stronger than it in your character.~~

~~St. Ig. But, with the grace of God, I could have resisted it.~~

~~M.S. What, if there was nothing stronger than it in your character?~~

~~St. Ig. Then, what remedy is there?~~

God's

~~M.S. The remedy of finding/ is to find out~~

laws & under which of these to place yourself.

late.

~~St. Ig. But/On earth it often it may be too~~

~~M.S. In eternity it will be possible for all with regard to that in us which is eternal.~~

physical

~~St. Ig./J.A. And with regard to our~~

being?

~~M.S. With regard to our physical being also, all suffering, all privation from the enjoyment of which man is capable, arises~~

{in another hand: Pebody}
 from ignorance of God's laws, either our own
 ignorance, or that of those who have preceded
 us.
 Did this man ~~St. Ig.~~ "Did this man sin or his parents?"
 sin or his ~~M.S.~~ That question implied a false idea,
 parents? ~~Sin is~~
 implies regards those laws only which concern our
 spiritual & moral being, that is, our feelings
 & wills
 a false towards God & our fellow=creatures. That
 idea a man is blind implies some ignorance of
 physical law - either on his own part or on
 that of those who preceded him.
 Physical laws often ~~St. Ig.~~ But t/Those physical laws may have
 disregarded been disregarded in consequence of something
 in consequence wrong in the spiritual life?
 of something ~~M.S.~~ Certainly Disease in the spiritual
 wrong in Being will often lead to indulgence in
 the spiritual malpractices in the physical. But the
 life immediate cause of blindness is a physical
 law. And it is untrue to regard a
 physical evil as a punishment, that is,
 an arbitrary infliction, for some spiritual
 evil.
 Is man ever ~~J.A.~~ But/If the question is asked, shall we
 ever
 to learn all these laws? Do we even know one of them? learn all
 the laws of
 God? ~~M.S.~~ In time, that is, in Eternity, we
 shall. God has formed us in the image
 of Himself - & therefore we cannot doubt
 that Man's happiness is to be the same
 as that of His Father. It is to be the happi=
 ness of love, of/& its exercise, of beauty & its
 production by skill, of truth & its production

f132

-20-

by wisdom. Creation arises from the love & goodness of God, willing that others than Himself shall be happy as He is happy. They are words without meaning which would talk of the possibility that a Being possessing Love & Goodness could be happy, without communicating happiness.

God has provided that mankind shall attain, therefore, by their own efforts, to be continually progressing towards being & doing as He does.

~~St. Ig. But/And if they fail?,~~

~~M.S. T/their will may still be one with His - & this oneness with Him in will shall give peace where the finiteness of created nature prevents their being & doing as the Infinite.~~

Is each individual to be made perfect, preserving his individuality? with

~~J.A. But you would make men perfect?~~

~~M.S. "Be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect" Yet will man never be God but one with God - & when he suffers, he will yet have joy in feeling "Thy will be done."~~

~~J.A. You are falling into/This is not Pantheism You believe/which asserts that man will be merged~~

God

& lose his individuality.

~~M.S. No, "The spirit returns to God who gave it" is Pantheism. And this cannot be true, I believe, in the sense that it ceases to have a separate existence. Why then its trials? Can we suppose that God sent forth~~

f133

-21-

a being to suffer & struggle, merely in order that it should be re=absorbed into God's existence. Most lame & impotent conclusion! Why send it forth? To what end its suffering?

[go to Pl 23.]

~~St. Ig. But what right have we,~~

~~is divine, an incarnation of God — the Trin-
itarians say that one was — In as far as one
is better than none, Trinitarianism is a
more attractive, truer doctrine perhaps
than the other.~~

~~St. Ig. — I would not be without authority
in my faith, as you are, no, not for worlds —~~

~~M.S. — I think with you it is dreadful
to be without authority. — But we have
authority — no less an authority than God
Himself — We are the vessels — He fills
them & we have to keep the vessels pure.~~

{in another hand: Colner}

~~J.A. — Yes, but you/we do not know whether
J.A. they are pure or not. — However/Well, let us return
to the plan of God — According to you, the~~

Plan
of
God
in
creating
man.

The human being comes into existence here with
a certain degree of capability depending
not in the slightest degree upon himself,
but entirely upon certain laws of God which
regard the influences which make his
being what it is —

~~M.S. — And on the development &
balance of these capabilities depends the
man's character, from which proceeds his
life. I am not attempting any explanation
of what man's faculties are, how much
they depend on the brain, how much on the
temperament &c. I only mean that he is
what he is at the moment of his birth in
consequence of certain laws of God, of which
he knows nothing & over which he can have
no influence. These powers do not remain as~~

they were when he began existence. There are other laws which regard the manner in which they are developed - & of the effect of these on the child after he is in the world is less distinctly & generally acknowledged than that of the laws which influence his organization at his birth, which is too obvious to be denied.

~~J.A. But how can man be accountable when God has had such entire control in the formation of his character?~~

~~M.S. As for the word "accountable" I do not think it applies to this particular relation between God & his creatures -~~ But I think we can/may see into God's

plan & see it not only to be one of entire perfect goodness & wisdom, but the only one by which man could share in the Divine Happiness, - become individually one with Him in will, yet remain an individual will while doing what God wills, not a machine - & be for ever advancing to share his power, his wisdom & love - the ~~only~~ one which gives us the strongest excitement to try to find out ~~what~~ & to do what is right - All this I believe may be ~~illeg~~/proved ~~in~~/by the Reason, felt by the feeling & approved by the Conscience.

Never let us

give our belief unless reason, feeling and conscience are all satisfied

~~J.A. But how can you bring it/Can it brought home as~~

satisfactory to my feeling & to my reason that it is so? If not, if, though to my reason it appear so, yet, if its being so would be against my feeling & my conscience, it will be true in me to suspect that my reason had not mastered the subject.

~~M.S. Certainly~~ Never let us give our belief

unless our reason, feeling, conscience are all satisfied - even though we cannot satisfy reason, feeling, conscience by ~~an~~/any other belief. Rather let us remain respectfully in doubt. I must not only compare my vessels of belief with those of other - I must compare my own vessels with each other. Feeling, if in a healthy state, is as important a source of belief as Reason - which may also be distorted, but never self-denied. The phrase "human reason" appears to me devoid of sense - Is Reason more human than Feeling, or less superhuman than Conscience? Let us listen to them all for these are the voices God has given to be our guides.

[in another hand: illeg]

~~J.A.~~ But ~~e~~/Every body it is true feels & reasons ~~so~~ differently - while all see & hear alike. Every man, unless he is blind, sees that that is a cow & this is a horse, ~~but~~/while upon this subject of Moral Philosophy, we have all a different opinion.

What is the difference between the Physical senses & the Moral senses?
Why do the ~~first~~/former tell all men pretty much alike - while the latter give the decisions a different opinion to each?

~~M.S.~~ It is necessary, in order to prevent Mankind from coming to an end, that the Physical senses should be developed earlier & with less cultivation than the senses of the Soul - Still the Indian's physical senses tell him a thousand things that yours do not - which shews that even these come to different decisions. If all human Souls gave the same decisions, we should truly regard these as equally certain with of the Physical senses - The latter are far easier to ascertain - but give the decisions they will not be more certain than the former when ascertained.

Among a thousand people, 999 will declare the grass to be green, & only one perhaps will call it red - He does not shake our conviction. We say that his sight is defective. It is far more difficult to arrive at the decisions of the Spiritual sense. If we give up the idea of there being any book or person constituted by God an infallible vessel for His truth to fill, for us to draw from, we have to enter into two questions. How must we cause our own vessels to be in a healthy state? How much must we take from other people's vessels? In proportion as man's capabilities have been developed in accordance with God's laws for their healthy development, their dictates may be depended upon - in regard to *any subject upon which they have been truly exercised*. But, by many who possess much power, something has been set down for granted - something taken up from sympathy, antipathy, authority or blind assimilation - & the capability in such for arriving at the truth must not be taken as a guarantee that he has arrived at it. We may ~~think~~/say to ourselves, How can I be so presumptuous as to believe what such & such a mind, far more powerful than mine, does not? But it would be a miracle, it would indeed by Inspiration if I were to have an opinion upon Army matters equal in value to the Duke of Wellington's - & it would be perhaps equally beside the mark if his opinion were to be taken upon matters of Moral Philosophy.

But Moral Philosophy is the only subject upon which men are supposed capable of judging without study, thinking without thought & without reflection.

Unless ~~the~~/a man's whole being has been cultivated & unless the whole being has been at work upon the particular subject of enquiry, his belief ought not truly to have an influence ~~upon~~/in regard to that subject. To Mankind, though not to one man, God has given the means of arriving at equal certainty in the domain of the Soul's Senses as in that of the Body's.

I believe that we may arrive at such certainty - i.e. that ~~is to~~/we may know so as not to doubt ~~b~~ & ~~to~~ have always present to our belief & our feelings such propositions as the following

1st that what we will arises from God's laws - ~~with~~/which regard ~~to~~ our own being & that which affects it.

2nd that we have power, (i.e. not each *individual at all times*, but *Mankind in Eternity* has power) to influence ourselves & others, through God's laws to will truly, i.e. in accordance with God's laws for the promotion of true happiness - not "to will what we please" or "to do what we will", that is not the question, but to will truly - & that it is for us to find out how thus to influence.

3rd that there is Eternity for each individual, in which every one shall make these discoveries & shall advance towards God's perfection & happiness.

I believe you will acknowledge it impossible that a man could make himself or be made by influence out of himself exactly like another man in character - shewing how great is the original diversity when the individual begins existence. You will also acknowledge that any man placed under different circumstances from those he is in, would have been different from what he is. His volitions would have been different from what they have been, had his life been passed in a different family, nation, age, climate, had his associates & his teachings been different. Out of volitions grow habits, out of habit character.

{in another hand: Tomkins}

~~J.A.~~ What is habit?

What is
Habit?

~~M.S.~~ Perhaps one of the few spiritual laws we can point out is that a volition strengthens by repetition - the part of the nature, from which sprang the volition is strengthened by exercise - ~~is not t/~~This is *Habit*

When Habit
does not
strengthen
the nature

~~J.A.~~ But it does not follow that, in all cases, what we do becomes easier each time because some other part of our nature which has been left unsatisfied, may crave more loudly for satisfaction the second time of being thwarted than the first.

~~M.S.~~ ~~yes, w/~~We must take into account the whole of our nature. Because I have got up early for two mornings, ~~I may perhaps not get up~~ it perhaps may not follow that I get up more easily on the third, there may be more craving for sleep

For every change which takes place in the state of a human being there must be the antecedents, the necessary conditions or relations - One

thought

is in his mind at one moment - it leads, according to the laws of his being, to another - a person may also lie in bed in the morning, though neither sleepy nor enjoying in any way, because a change requires the activity of something - Everything in our spiritual & intellectual nature acquires a great activity by exercise, but also requires a greater stimulus to excite activity, if not exercised - Unless

some

other law be called out, such as that long privation, in certain cases, acts as a stimulus - ~~I merely meant t/~~The question of Habit, however, is here merely touched upon as an illustration of Law.

Difficulty of the Origin

~~J.A. Yes, and you do not appear to me to have touched t/~~The original difficulty in the least, of the Origin of Evil ~~you have~~/is not removed

of Evil.

by merely

stating that so it must be - that Mankind is not responsible for Evil, but God - & that Man is so entirely under the influence of his organization & his circumstances that he cannot help himself -

Is the kingdom of Heaven within man's capability to bring about?

~~M.S.~~ A good natural constitution of the material framework, - good development & exercise of every part of the nature, - full & free communication of man with man, - this would ensure the kingdom of Heaven - All this is in human capability - The Father is eternally offering means & inducements in His Laws - Mankind, the Son, has only to attune himself to receive them so that they bring his nature into right exercise.

f141

-30-

often "What is the origin of evil?" the question so

asked. "The Wisdom, Goodness & Righteousness of the Perfect" is the answer - who

{in another hand: Newton}

wills that the Son, by the exercise of his nature in accordance with the laws of Right, shall rise from ignorance to truth, from the Imperfect to the Perfect

What is Wisdom?
what is the

~~J.A. But explain, explain~~ How can man or the Son, ~~as you call man,~~/it may be asked, exercise

purpose of wisdom in willing being?

nature at all, if he is a slave to his organization & his circumstances? It is they which do it for him.

three/

~~M.S. What is the purpose of being?~~
~~this I mean~~ To this question we must answer by

other questions: - What is the purpose of Wisdom in willing being?

~~J.A. First of all,~~ what is Wisdom?

~~M.S. Is not of Wisdom is right means taken for a right end?~~ -

~~J.A. Why not merely right means for any end?~~ - for

~~M.S. R/right, or appropriate means might/may be taken to make an infernal machine.~~

~~J.A. Well, I allow if t/~~The end must be right in order to constitute Wisdom -

~~M.S. And a/~~What is a right end, or the right end to all being, capable of having a view or purpose?

The purpose of being is well=being.

~~J.A. The purpose of being, essentially, is well=being.~~

{in another hand: Newton}

~~M.S. The well=being of the finite & imperfect depends on the constitution of thing established by the Perfect & Infinite.~~

In inquiries concerning human nature, we always drive home to this point - 'so it is, because human nature has been so constituted.' But when we speak of the Perfect nature, we no longer say 'so it has been constituted' - "Virtue", it has been truly said, is not a creation of the Divine Will, but the nature of the Divine Will - "The mind of man is a creation & therefore indicates, by its characteristics, the character of Him "to whose "will it owes its existence". We are not taught to consider vitality as successive evolutions, not creations - We have also a difficulty, perhaps an impossibility in conceiving with any distinctness of *life*, except in connection with Matter. And thus man, perceiving that material life is not created, but merely passing thro' evolutions, frequently now questions "then why look for a Creator?" for there is no Creation - St. Thomas Aquinas tries to prove that the act of Creation is compatible with the unchangeableness of God. May it not be that Love, Righteousness, Wisdom, Benevolence, Power are not "creations of the Divine Will" but identical with the Divine Will?

Let us be careful not to palm upon ourselves words without meaning.

~~J.A.~~ We cannot be too careful not to palm upon ourselves more than upon other people words to which, in reality, we attach no meaning. When we talk of a Living Wisdom, of a Spirit of Wisdom,

{in another hand: Pebody}

I am not sure that we know what we mean -
~~M.S.~~ But I think that we shall know
 what we mean, if we speak of an Existence
 not human, though powerful, wise & bene-
 volent, which has thought & *feeling*, (as
 we indistinctly call it) after the same
 manner as Man has thought & feeling.

What evidence
 have we for
 what is not
 recognised by
 our senses?

~~J.A.~~ But if ~~you are~~/I am asked upon what
 evidence you speak of such an existence,
 since it is not recognized by our senses?

~~M.S.~~ I answer, manifestations of thought
 & feeling are recognized by our senses - of
 thought & feeling of the same nature as
 that which we recognize in Man, but not
 appertaining to any individual man or to
 any collective existence of Mankind -

It is not our senses which recognise
 wisdom, benevolence in the material being
 which we call ~~Mrs. Chisholm~~/Sir Joshua Jebb or

Dr.

Howe -

the wisdom or benevolence, which we do
 recognise as appertaining to them, we take
~~it~~ not in our hand to examine it. It is a
 manifestation - It is manifested in what
 they do - It is manifested in their thought
 or sentiment, which reaches our nature
 through the intervention of articulate
 words of the voice & the ear. Or it is a
 manifestation by means of the intelligent
 eye, or the features telling of benevolence.
 But it is the *manifestation* which is recog=
 nised by our senses - In the case of man,
 this manifestation reaches us sometimes thro'

another (materially existing) man as well as through our own material existence - but not always - I recognise the wisdom which invented the steam engine, but not through the existence of another human being as well as myself.

~~Let~~ Now let us refer to the heavenly bodies & to the anatomy of man -

Is not wisdom (i.e. right means in *Being* to attain *well=Being*) manifested herein?

There is wisdom manifested which does not appertain to any material being cognizable to our senses.

This wisdom assuredly does not appertain to any material being cognizable to our senses -

~~H.M. M.S. J.A.~~ But w/Why attribute it to any Being? is often now asked.

~~M.S.~~ But here *is* wisdom - & is not Wisdom Being? May I not safely affirm "here I recognize the existence of Wisdom."

~~H.M.~~ But what practical difference does this make to *your/our* existence? ~~True,~~

you/is

again

~~recognise wisdom~~ But what then? asked

~~M.S.~~ In referring to the heavenly bodies, & human anatomy, I recognise *Power* above human - If Man could form a living Man, he certainly often would do so but he cannot - & therefore we may say, in every man he beholds he recognises a power beyond his own. The wisdom he recognizes includes benevolence, for, as we have said, wisdom *is* benevolence. For it is right means to a right end or purpose & the right purpose of being is *well=being* - Now is it unconnected with our practical

existence to recognize power, wisdom & benevolence, as manifested in our abode & in our material nature?

If power, wisdom & benevolence are recognized by the various elements of our nature, by our thought, by our feeling, will not love & trust be the consequence?

If we recognise this wisdom

with our intellectual faculties only, no love or trust is the consequence.

~~J.A.~~ If we recognize this Wisdom with our intellectual faculties only, ~~I am sure~~ no love

or trust is the consequence.

~~M.S.~~ ~~No certainly~~ For myself, I really loathe the "compliments" paid to the Creator in books of Science. I feel that I have something to get over in every book which gives instances of God's skill & wisdom, & makes for us the remarks which it is supposed we ought to make for ourselves. Nobody can do anything for any body else - but least of all can *one* feel for *another*.

But is there any true philosophy in saying, "I recognize power, wisdom, benevolent purpose in the heavenly bodies & the anatomy of man) of the same nature as power, wisdom & benevolence which I recognize in man - but greater in degree. But when I have said this, I have nothing more to say, nothing more to think, nothing more to feel, I will go back to my work-"

And is not a part of your work to think where & what & why you are, & where you are going, what you are going to be, since be you must, at all events unless you try to end some part of your being - try whether you can make yourself no longer conscious of it

{in another hand: Pebody}

You have learnt that you cannot destroy the material part of it. Do not be too sure that there may not be some other part of your being which you cannot destroy -

If it is a part of your work to ask such questions because, whatever else you may have to do, your manner of doing it may be influenced by the answers to them - then can we say that there is nothing practical in this recognition of power, wisdom, benevolence?

We also
recognise
Power
apparently
without
Wisdom or
Benevolence.
~~There is~~/Those are less
~~wisdom~~/wise who
recognise no
Power at all
for good or for
evil, - than
those who try
to propitiate
evil Power,
recognising
evil - viz.
savages.

~~H.M.~~ But I also recognize Power, without wisdom or benevolence. The heavenly bodies, do they always manifest benevolence? I saw a poor fellow struck in agony to the earth by the flaming sun - I saw a poor creature writhing in the severest suffering from malformation of the system.

~~M.S.~~ Are not those who, if they see signs of an evilly-disposed Power, try to propitiate such Power, wiser than those who say, I will enquire nothing about a Power for good or for evil, though I recognize the existence of both?

But may we not assert that it is in the power of Mankind to prevent *coups=de=soleil*, & in all probability, defective organization? I feel as sure of the latter as I do of the former, so strong appears to me the evidence *tending* to that belief. I am not conscious of a difference in the strength of my belief in the former & the latter case.

And is there not ~~tendency to believe~~/evidence
tending to the belief
that the evil does not exist which
mankind cannot remove?

f147

~~-1-~~

~~Abbott, M.S.~~

IV
Origin
of
Evil

~~J.A. Do you say that/Does the Evil does not
exist which Mankind cannot remove?~~

~~M.S. The difference between myself &
myself is so great under different
circumstances that I am led to believe/and I~~

observe

~~that it would/to be as great in other people -
& that I am led to ask whether all the sin &~~

suffering

in man is not removeable -

~~J.A. But that does not explain the
Origin of Evil~~

Question as
to the
Origin of
Evil
becomes
irrelevant
when we
come to act.

~~M.S. If we saw men struggling in a bog,
or in a pond, in which occasionally only
they could raise their heads above water
to breathe, should we stand speculating on
the Origin of Evil? as thus - "how is it reconci=
lable with the power & benevolence of God
to see men thus struggling & suffering?"
"there must be a deficiency either in power
or in benevolence, unless man is invariably
infinitely happy &c &c." Yet this is exactly
what we do with regard to moral evil. Men
write & preach volumes to explain how
God would have kept man out of the bog
& the pond, but the Devil invited him in,
and he went, and there he must have
staid for ever but ----- what did God do?
Did He, through the faculties of Man, reveal
to him how he was to get out to safe &
pleasant land? No - He committed suicide
& murder. He caused to be put to death
Himself & His Son - How man was thus to
be extricated from the bog & the pond does~~

not come home to the human faculties. It is a "mystery" - God has taken care of His own justice. Christ of His mercy - ~~Really t/~~This is the orthodox Theology - I respect & admire it, because it alone embraces the idea that God goes through sin & suffering for man - that the work of the flesh can be of no avail, unless accompanied by the work of the Spirit - that what appertains to the flesh is only valuable as receptacle of the Spirit -

~~J.A. But does there seem to you no exaggeration in looking at the question of Evil in this way? Do you believe it~~
Is it not as possible to human nature, to extricate all mankind from every kind of suffering & evil as to extricate a certain number from a bog or pond, into which they see them fallen?

[in another hand: illeg]

~~M.S.~~ I believe it ~~is/~~to be just as absurd to be speculating on the *Crux* to the human understanding of the existence of evil, as it would be ~~so~~ to speculate, if we saw men in the fire or the water. We have discovered the gas which will, in an instant, put out the fire & leave them in safety - the life=boat which will enable us to rescue them - Should we have done so, if we had stood by wondering how a good God could ~~permitted~~ in them those sufferings? Physical suffering cries out so loud, that *Mankind* is summoned to the rescue & he who rescues is called the friend of Mankind - But moral suffering & privation ~~is/~~are silent -

~~is/are~~ blamed - ~~blames itself~~ - ~~is/themselves~~ are avoided. We

are preached to to be contented, not to complain, if we are fainting with hunger & thirst - If we are diseased, we are avoided - or, with benevolent intention, something wholly inappropriate is brought as a remedy -

~~J.A. Still I cannot but look upon the existence of evil as a great mystery. First, how did it come there? Secondly, how will it ever be removed?~~

"Mystery"
of the existence
of evil.

~~M.S.~~ Divine & human nature, understood ~~so/as~~ far as man *may* understand, will reveal that there is no mystery in the existence of evil. God's laws are ever in activity, ever open for the investigation of Mankind- To understand & them & to act in accordance with them ~~is/are~~ our means to turn all evil into good. All existence except the Perfect would not be perfect unless he destined the finite to rise to the Infinite - Let us not lament & despise our finiteness, but rejoice to ~~think~~ look ~~upon/at~~ it as the mark of our "H/high €/calling"

to

ascend.

~~J.A.~~ But will there be always evil?

~~M.S.~~ There will be always evil, because there will be always ignorance - But there will not be always masses of evil, lying untouched, unpenetrated by Light & Wisdom (in as far as man is concerned) except now & then a temporary improve=ment by *chance*, not after a type & purpose

{in another hand: Pebody}

Each advance
has always
brought evil
with good -
Why?

~~J.A.~~ But e/Each advance has always brought
evil with good

~~M.S.~~ Yes, because each advance must, in
some degree, be hypothetically made - But
mankind when they work after a type
will more & more speedily, turn the evil
into good. We shall not wish to part
with evil, in the abstract, when it is
understood to spring from ignorance,
when all the faculties of all Mankind
are directed to expect evil from ignorance
& to remedy it. Then, though it will be
the essential attendant on the imperfect,
finite in its progress towards Perfection
& Infinity (through exercise of Mankind,
of *each for each & for all*) there will be
a perpetual & rapid change of evil into
good - thence fresh temporary evil - thence
fresh permanent good - And so on, through
the Universe, through Eternity - the Perfect
essentially transmitting Himself into the
Imperfect by His Laws which furnish
means & inducement to raise the imperfect
to the Perfect - there again the transmission -
thus, as it was *without* beginning, is now
& ever shall be.

~~J.A.~~ But all that does not satisfy
me about the b/Beginning of evil in this
world - ~~why it ever existed~~

possibility

~~M.S.~~ If we see no evil, ~~exists~~ the
of removing which ~~we~~ does
not ~~lie~~/exist in *Mankind* (as a whole), ~~the~~
~~possibility of removing~~, why are we to
stand wondering that God permits evil?
do we want him to give us no work?
or to do out work for us? would that be

wisdom, benevolence, love, in Him? Let Mankind fulfil its possibilities - That will answer the question, is the existence of evil compatible with the existence of a Being of perfect Wisdom & Benevolence? When we see a man about to be drowned, saved by the wisdom & kindness of a fellow-creature, we do not *then* say, can the Being be benevolent, who allowed man to be liable to be drowned? We admire in Him that He gave the Saviour capability for the work of Love, that Man is saved by the exercise of the capabilities of Man, by Divine wisdom & love manifested in the "earthly vessel."

{in another hand: Jevitz?}

God has no mysteries for us, any more than the teacher has who commits a problem to his pupil to be worked out, the which could not benefit him but through the exercise of the pupil's own nature.

Thus much we know - viz. that a human being, constituted in a certain manner, & that constitution co-existing with certain circumstances, will manifest those attributes, the manifestation of which is all that we know of the Being, whom we call God.

We also know that it is in the power of human beings to affect the constitution & the circumstances of themselves & each other - that, in some instances known to them, they have

power to affect the constitution & circumstances of themselves, of their children, of their fellow-creatures in such a way as to increase or lessen the manifestation of the divine attribute in them.

And there seems every reason to think that we may learn more & more of co-existence. At present what we know perhaps chiefly ~~in~~ that certain co-existences or successions will have a bad effect, - as the marriage of cousins, marriage where there exist certain maladies &c.

We can trace no connection between a certain state of the optic power & consciousness in a human being of the presence of an object which is as we say, seen. There is absolutely no connection comprehensible to us between a certain definite state of the optic nerve & a certain consciousness - I know not how we can consider it as other than a hint of the Almighty that this co-existence shall be. And we may depend that every co-existence or succession will be, which is right, wise, good - We may depend that such co-existences or succession will be as will involve continuation of the identity of existence, if that is right, wise, good.

{in another hand: Tomkins}

This is the one abiding Will & Law that, through Eternity, shall be such succession of present to past as effects well-being in Eternity's course. This is *the* Law, this *the* co-existence, viz. that thro' Eternity the present shall be that which, in the thought & feeling of the Perfect, effects well-being. There is but one mode of

well=being. We have no occasion to talk of greatest happiness to the greatest number. The Law which cut off one for ever would never promote the well=being of another. Our means, then, of judging as to whether there will be a future existence depend upon our means of estimating what *is* wise & right; for that which is wise & right is the Law, is the Will of the Omnipotent. It is certain that we are capable of *increasing* our power of estimating what is wise & right. It is certain that there are means by which we may improve estimation of what is wise & right. The more we learn of the nature of all existence, the more we learn of the history of existence, the more we shall be able to read the future. But to know truly we must elevate our being, we must feel truly.

Let us not think it a praiseworthy humility to say, that we cannot understand God's ways, because "His ways are not as our ways" - Mankind understands His way very imperfectly indeed, because they have as yet attained little comprehension of His thought, His sentiment, His purpose, His character. If they had, would they offer as a tribute to Him their "forms of prayer"? It requires the union of Mankind to seek Him. If they seek Him aright more & more shall He be revealed to them - More & more shall love & veneration to Him, trust in Him fill the heart with a true & peaceful rapture, the head & hand with work.

f154

{in another hand: Pebody}

Question
of Evil

~~J.A. But I do not see what all this has
to do with the question of evil.~~

~~M.S. It will perhaps be said that a
world of so much suffering, so little of what
can be called present well-being is not
evidence for that One Law - viz. that every
co-existence or succession in the Will of
the Almighty is the Will of Wisdom and
Goodness - that it requires a miraculous
revelation to assure us that though now
"we see through a glass darkly," a future
existence will reveal this to us -~~

It is true that this evidence has to
be worked out by time & experience.

Some deeply interested in these
subjects have felt that they were so
important, that God was so good, man
so small, that man could not learn
concerning God's nature, will & purpose,
as he learns other things - that, therefore,
it was to be expected that God would
in an especial, in a miraculous way
reveal His will & man's future. And this

III

g g

expectation has led the earnest to [believe
that God has made this manifestation -
This earnestness of the few has led to an
indifferent acquiescence in some - to an
energetic acquiescence in others, in the belief
of the earnest few -

It is evident that there can be but
One Perfect Thought, Feeling, Will - Whenever
more than one Being has been believed
in as superior to human nature, those

[in another hand: illeg]
superior have not been believed to be perfect. What are we led to believe, by such experience & consciousness as we have of the good, to be the nature & will of the Perfect? It is in vain for the Imperfect to attempt a full conception of the Perfect. That which comes home to our consciousness, that we may say. If we permit ourselves to look at the matter thus- if the observed uniformities which, if proceeding from a Will from which they proceed can be estimated by us as righteous, as benevolent, as wise & powerful - All this we can assert upon the ground that laws to the same purport are felt when they proceed from human nature, to be righteous, benevolent, wise. *Such* laws human nature has not the power to will. But it is susceptible, I believe, of proof that laws to the same purpose, as far as human nature has power to lay them down as to be kept, are estimated by man to be right, benevolent & wise.

Let us grant, for the present, that known existences, past & present, assure us of a righteous, benevolent & wise will, with power superior to Man's possibility - & that, the more human knowledge im= proves, & the more the individual & collective nature of man improves - the greater appear the righteousness, wisdom & benevolence of this Will, - so that,

irresistibly, arises the question, "if we knew all, might we not probably find this Will to be perfect?" Then come questions as to what would be the mode of being & the will of Perfection - Truth is the thought of the Perfect, the feeling of the Perfect - This our own individual experience & consciousness & those of Mankind assure us - The more Man's thought & feeling harmonize with all those qualities which do not limit each other, - such as righteousness, love, goodness, benevolence, wisdom, love of beauty & order - the more truth we are conscious of in his mode of being. But the more excellent is a man's being the more: (1) his thought & feeling seek to resolve themselves into, to manifest themselves in life & action, (2), the more he rejoices in, seeks the satisfaction of other happiness than his own - finds, in fact, one of his greatest sources of happiness in the consciousness of happiness in other being than his own - While we are distinguishing qualities the same in kind (though ~~higher in degree~~/in a more powerful nature) as those apper- taining to the best we know of human nature, our consciousness & experience lead us to expect that these qualities will resolve themselves into, will manifest themselves in life & action The Perfect will wish the greatest possible well-being to other mode of existence than His own. Now can it be effected? - It is susceptible, I believe, of proof that,

f157 [input by LM]
diagonal Newton

to will the laws of Righteousness, Benevolence, Wisdom--leaving other beings (called into existence and existing in accordance with them) to work out a right life by the means & inducements they afford--is the only way [1:101] effecting this.

Experience & consciousness teach us that that which comes to us through exercise of some part or parts of our nature is of more value than that of which we are passive recipients--or, rather, we may perhaps say that such is our nature that it is impossible for us to be passive recipients of any good thing. Should we not expect,

[side] Solution
of the Origin
of evil
question

then, that the will of God, or of Goodness, for the beings whom His will calls into existence, would be a good original nature, well exercised in life? -It may be shewn, I believe, that such is His will. Suppose we were to imagine that those beings, whom His will calls into existence, possessed the best of natures, viz., His own, and that God's laws were adapted to exercise these best of natures, as righteousness, benevolence & wisdom decree. I believe it to be susceptible of proof that such is actually the case. Would it not be a contradiction to suppose that Perfect Benevolence would will to other beings a nature less perfect than His own, less adapted to goodness & happiness? But it would also be a contradiction to suppose Him willing another Perfection (since, essentially, Perfection is one), or willing an eternal *Imperfect*, with such degree of value as could be imparted to it by its being a passive recipient from God. Avoiding these contradictions, may we not, without

{in another hand: Dyke}
contradiction or absurdity, pronounce that
the Perfect would will limits to His own
perfect nature, according to a Law of Right-
- these limits to be enlarged by the individual
& collective exercise of mankind? - That this
is actually the fact cannot, I believe, with
truth be denied. There are Laws with respect
to the material nature, which material nature
is the limit to the Divine nature. According
as that material nature *is* after a certain
type & is exercised in a certain mode, the
Divine nature becomes more & more apparent.
This, I believe, fact will prove - and could,
otherwise, the expectation be realized that
the Perfect would will His own nature to
other than Himself? Could the expectation
be, otherwise, realized that, thro' exercise,
not as passive recipients, God's benefits
should be attained by men? - And let us
observe how exercise, for each & for all,
would thus be called forth. Man thus be=
comes, in some sort, the creator of man -
Oh! let him be deeply sensible of the power
thus vested in him! Suppose the laws of
the material nature, discovered, - suppose
mankind, individually & collectively, thro'
successive generations, earnestly seeking
to keep them aright - can any doubt
that the limits, now existing to the exercise
of the Divine nature in man, would be
enlarged - Is this fanciful? - Does not
experience warrant such a belief? - Suppose
that, instead of life being regulated ignorantly,
with little definite purpose, - Mankind, indivi=
dually & collectively aimed to organize life

{in another hand:} Colner}
 so as to improve character, i.e. so as to extend
 the limits of the Divine in man - can we doubt
 that thus man would, by exercise for himself
 & his kind, become more & more divine? -
 Thus shall man advance to the utmost point
~~that~~/which human nature permits in this mode of
 existence. Does not our consciousness of
 what is divine lead us to believe undoubtably
 that, - whatever limit exists, when physical
 human nature ceases here, - opportunity, in
 accordance with the everlasting Laws of
 Right & Love & Wisdom, will follow to work
 on, for ever & ever, till, through exercise in
 life, that perfection is realized & manifested, -
 which, as thought & feeling, is but perfect
 thought & feeling, ~~but~~ requiring to be resolved
 into concrete work & life to be complete?

The divine nature in man is so ready
 to love, to venerate. What has it not loved
 & venerate? Christians are apt to despise
 the Pagan Gods, - & it would seem that Justice,
 Benevolence, Purity, Self=sacrifice have been
 worshipped by Christians as they never
 were in any other religionists? - But, ~~when~~
~~we~~/let us consider how Justice, Benevolence, Purity,
 Self=sacrifice (all perfect as such qualities
 are) are supposed to have been manifested.
 I believe that the Truth will prove to be
 that God (i.e. Wisdom & Goodness) wills that,
 through exercise only, comes well=being to
 man. But the current Theology teaches
 that through the sacrifice of Christ only, is
 man saved - saved from what? - not from
 the ignorance & imperfection of a finite
 nature, but from God's justice.

{in another hand: Pebody}

If man has loved tenderly & earnestly,
 has suffered joyfully for the sake of a

Being who, if examined, would appear incapable of calling forth his love, - may he not, with all his being, devote himself to the Perfect, who lives & suffers for him, whose Law is so perfect that it could not, - ~~but~~/except where ~~for~~/there is want of knowledge or of feeling, ~~illeg~~/but call forth all the veneration, all the trust of which he is capable.

{in another hand: Tomkins}

Let us take care not to abandon ourselves to fancies concerning the Divine Nature. Let us ever remember that the finite nature cannot comprehend the Infinite. But let us not the less hold fast that which men's experience & consciousness, the sense of all our knowledge, can reveal to us concerning the Divine Nature.

It will be asked, what is our intercourse with the Perfect? - The sense of His presence, of His love, of His appreciation - harmony with Him, trust in Him.

Let us not be *driven* by His Law, which in Wisdom & Love, drives those who go not with willing step; - but let us heartily accept the being the workers=out of His holy will. Let us study His Law, when unable to comprehend it - let us wait, not attempting impossible contradictions to His Law in our nature, but seeking how we may keep His spirit alive in us for His sake. Thus let us be ready to rejoice in work, to rejoice in suffering - even in that hardest of suffering, if it must be - in waiting.

That which we may learn concerning the Perfect reveals Him with none like unto Him. The higher & better human

{in another hand: Trim}
nature rises to be, [the better it can support the absence of any like unto it; - but the more it can enjoy the presence of an equal, though a different nature. There can be no equal communication for the Perfect. And, because three of the highest enjoyments of a good nature cannot, without absurdity, be attributed to the Perfect, we conceive the Perfect to include the Imperfect - These three are, (1) mutual communication of sympathy & affection, (2) exercise of the thought & feeling in work, (3) attainment of progress by work. All these the better a man becomes, the more he enjoys. The perfect thought & feeling, then, will essentially limit itself, in order to partake of these, though remaining perfect as the eternal Guide by willing the Laws of Right. The imperfect thought & feeling, the imperfect knowledge of truth is ever, directly or indirectly, in progress towards the perfect. The perfect thought & feeling ever wills to resolve itself, to manifest itself, to communicate itself through live & work. So also that greatest bliss, - two hearts working, as one for God & for man - is destined for each - they may be separate - they may meet & be separated again, going through different phases of life, but they are eternally destined to each other.

~~Jacob Abbott, Harriet Martineau, M.S.~~

V

Future
Life
Why are
we not
satisfied
with supposing
that our
existence
ends here,
as our senses
tell us?
The heart
which mourns
over death
prevents us
from resting
satisfied.

~~H.M.~~ The question whether human consciousness will be continued after the existence of man, such as he is in this world, ceases - whence does it arise? - The plant withers & dies - we never think of asking whether there will be any continuation of its individuality - we are satisfied with observing that matter never ceases to exist, but only changes from one mode of existence to another. Of this the senses assure all who attend to the subject.

~~M.S. Aye &~~ Still more
the heart
over ~~crime~~/sin.

~~J.A.~~ But very many are not satisfied to take it for granted that, when man dies, the change which results in his material form is all that remains. The heart which has loved & sympathized, revered & admired, asks, "Is this dust all that results from qualities of the same nature as those to be recognised in the Perfect? The heart which has watched suffering asks, when in vain trying to relieve it, "Is there no relief but unconsciousness?"

Still more the heart which mourns over a vicious existence, conscious that, if this be all, for this man it would be better if he had never been born, since his existence is not worth having, - yet conscious also that he had no power to make it otherwise, asks whether there may not be future opportunity in which the experience of the past may lead to a better future.

V
Future
Life

The capabilities of the nature of the plant are fulfilled, but behold man to whose capabilities none can put a limit in themselves, that is, in their own nature, but only in death - is he to share the fate of the plant? Look at the man full of high object, making discoveries, or otherwise exercising his faculties, so that his life is enriching mankind!

~~Does the fact~~

~~H.M.~~ But he pours out it is said the riches of his

If the existence of the individual, when cut short for himself, benefit future generations, does this satisfy our moral ~~sense~~/feeling for himself?

nature to posterity when summoned to become insensible dust.

~~M.S.~~ Each individual is an idiosyncratic nature, different from every other that is, or has been, or ever will be - It is impossible that he should communicate all that he is, all that he has to communicate, except through himself. Whatever are the possibilities of his nature, he has to realize them by *exercise*. To be able to communicate requires other exercise in himself - But it is himself only, his own exercise of his own nature which can enable him to realize his possibilities of attainment or of communication, - & of neither does it seem that there is any necessary close before death. Many live to old age in healthy possession of their faculties till death - That many do not may be owing to mistakes in the mode of life. The affection which any one feels for another

f164

-3-

V
Future
Life

whose life he has shared can never be repeated by any other. Fresh affections may arise between individuals of fresh generations - But can succession equal, in kind or degree, continuity? During the space of a brief human life, what ~~have we~~/is there not to do? There is

to

prepare the nature for such attachments - to find out, by the experience of actual life, the persons capable of being mutually inspired with them - there are the mistakes to be made, ~~the feeling~~ each other's characters to be felt after in the dark -

Mistakes
which must
be made
during a
temporary
existence.

~~J.A.~~ Yes, & heart=aches from having misunderstood or not adapted ourselves to the characters we are attached to -----

~~H.M.~~ But, granting that, each generation transmitting its experience, man will arrive at not making such mistakes, - that, by dint of this experience transmitted by one generation to another, he will attain to a well=constituted nature, - to a good organization of life so that the most will be made of life - then that time will not be lost by mistakes -

{in another hand: Cuth}

Such

~~M.S.~~ And t/But then still more will it be felt

destruction
of what is
valuable
inconsistent
with the
existence of a
Spirit of Love
& Wisdom

that the ties of sympathy, of capability of communicating mutually, between any two are different from what can be between any other two - that, ~~T~~/to put an end to such ties would be to destroy that which, by the laws of God, can never be again. such destruction of that which is valuable - - of that which, by the nature of God's laws, can never be renewed, would not be consistent with the existence of an omnipotent Spirit of Love & Wisdom.

What is inconsistent
with Love & Wisdom
does not become
consistent by
supposing
that Love &
Wisdom
omnipotent

~~J.A.~~ Shall the "clay" judge the "potter"?

~~M.S.~~ That which is inconsistent with Love & Wisdom does not become consistent by supposing that Love & Wisdom omnipotent - To compel one man to sacrifice himself for many more, would this be right in a human being? Yet a man of vicious life is thus compelled, for, from the nature of vice, the life of a vicious man is not worth having to himself - The only way in which his existence can be reconcilable with the existence of an Omnipotent Spirit of Love & Wisdom is his attainment here= after, by means of the exercise of his own capabilities & those of others, to well=being.

It is impossible
to sacrifice one
for another,
if we would.

~~H.M.~~ But what is it that assures us that it would be contrary to right to compel one man to sacrifice himself to others? Is it the constitution of our nature?

~~M.S.~~ It has been thought right, in some

That which
is bad for one
is bad for all.

stages of society, to compel one man to sacrifice himself for others, which would not be the case, if it were in the constitution of our nature to feel it wrong. Is it not experience which teaches us that, whether our object be selfish or benevolent, it is not in the nature of things, to be gained by sacrificing one for another? It is impossible indeed to sacrifice one for another, if we would. That which is good for all is essentially good for each. That which is bad for one is bad for all. It would, therefore, be bad for all, a loss to all that any individual nature were put out of existence for each individual nature contributes to the whole, has the capability of contributing to the whole, in a way that no other nature can.

~~H.M. But may we not~~ To suppose that each individual does contribute his portion, & then retires from existence to make room for others?

~~M.S. I think that it would be/is~~ inconsistent with the Spirit of Love & Wisdom - i.e. to raise, by exercise, capability which, from the nature of things, no other will have - & then to destroy that capability - It is true that *something* is transmitted to another generation. But I believe that experience will prove that no mode of existence is wasted or destroyed - It is all Evolution, Development, Order, Progress - never Destruction.

f167

-6-

Is the change
of a human
being to dust
& gases a
satisfactory
conclusion?
~~my soul!~~

~~H.M.~~ But to this ~~may~~ it ~~not be~~/is answered
that a human being does not cease to exist
at death? It is change, not destruction,
~~that~~/which takes place.

~~J.A.~~ Do you mean the change from a
human being to dust & gases? Oh ~~Heaven illeg~~
think what a human being is, think of the
divine Nature existing in kind, only
limited in degree, & ~~tell me~~/say if you can
think dust & gases the development,
the evolution to a human being in the
thought of the omnipotent Spirit of Love
& Goodness?

Are the
means to
be indestructible,
the end cut
short?

~~M.S.~~ Is it not obvious, too that the physical
being exists, as the means or mode for
the existence of the Divine attributes,
for the attainment of them by exercise
for their exercise when attained? The
physical being is the *means*, the divine
nature, or the attainment & exercise of the
divine nature the *end*. Shall we suppose
the means indestructible, the end cut
short? And why do we suppose so?

Do our
senses tell
us nothing
about it?

~~H.M.~~ Because it is said our senses tell us
nothing about it.

~~MS.~~ They do tell about it. They are
the means by which we gain a
comprehension of the nature of the
omnipotent Spirit of Love & Wisdom -
They tell us, in the same mode in which
they tell me the character of Dr. Arnold,-
~~to~~/of which you will not tell me that I know

nothing. I feel *certain* that Dr. Arnold was not influenced by interested motives in his conduct. I do not see a disinterested man as I see a fair or dark man- But through my sight & my hearing & my feeling &c, I come at the comprehension of the existence of a disinterested man, & having comprehended & felt this existence, I can be sure that such an existence will not act inconsistently with its own nature.

In like manner, by the senses also, I come at the comprehension of the existence of an omnipotent spirit of Love & Wisdom,

& having, through the senses comprehended/perceived such an existence, & through the feeling, felt it, I am assured that this existence will not act contrary to its nature of

{in another hand: Mumson}

Love & Wisdom -

Is the
omnipotent
Spirit of Love
& Wisdom a
Being of a
different
nature from
man?

~~H.M.~~ Still if we ask, can Man comprehend what is Love & Wisdom in a Being different from himself?

~~M.S.~~ The omnipotent Spirit of Love & Wisdom is *not* a Being of a different nature from himself - Progress in *degree* in the Love & Wisdom which we recognize without degree as *unconnected* with physical limits, is proved by experience to be possible within the physical limits of human nature. The more we attain of a wise love, the more we can judge of what would be the will of an omnipotent & perfectly wise Love -

f169

-8-

~~H.M.~~ But how are we to know whether our love is wise or not?

~~M.S.~~ By comparing it with the law, the principle, as far as we can discover it, of that other Love.

Are we to

~~H.M./J.A.~~ But then you are /This is saying that,

~~Do we~~ judge by our own wisdom what is wisdom in Him, by His what is wisdom in us.

our own wisdom, we may judge what is wisdom in Him, by His what is wisdom in us.

by

~~M.S.~~ Yes, I do -By observation & experience I trace that God makes the right exercise of the individual nature & the collective nature of mankind the means & measure of the well-being of the individual & the race. And I find, by experience & observation, that this must be the means & measure of Man's benefit to Man - Having discovered this, I may infer that God will not destroy, when attained by exercise, that which it is His purpose by exercise to be attained.

No idiosyncrasy can be transmitted to any other

~~H.M.~~ And I say that e/Each idiosyncrasy being different from every other, & having passed through circumstances different from every other, there is that gained by the experience of each which cannot, in its nature, be transmitted to any other & that therefore there would be waste of that which is most precious- if any of these idiosyncrasies were cut off -

f170 [page cut small]

-9-

Is it a very poor dependence to depend simply on the character of God for the argument for a future life?

~~H.M.~~ Granted. ~~But you admit, I suppose,~~ that every material argument is against a future existence - that it is impossible to believe memory continued where the system of physical relations is changed - ~~You/We~~ depend, simply & solely, upon moral evidence, upon the moral character of God for ~~y/our~~ belief in a future state.

very

~~M.S.~~ And ~~you think that~~ /this is thought a poor dependence. ~~I a~~ /Acknowledged, we have no other. But - whatever

co-existences or successions are observable,
~~I believe that~~ the only fundamental source
~~of all/~~of all or any of them is the Will of the Spirit of Right,

of Love, of Wisdom. We ask, "Is *this* possible? is *that* possible?" The fundamental question is, "Is *this* or *that* consistent with the Spirit of Love, of Right, of Wisdom?" We are apt to think that those co-existences which we believe to be invariable arise from some connection in their *own* nature, but their nature springs from the Will of Love & Wisdom, from no other source - Experience proves to us the capability of Man to make [*some* advance towards the comprehension of the nature of Love & Wisdom. Experience proves that this capability increases by the exercise. We have, therefore, reason to believe that it is in our power for ever to advance in the comprehension & estimation of what will be the will of Goodness & Wisdom. {in another hand: Nelson}

Each mode of existence is, in the present, a development out of a Past into a Present, thence to develop into a Future. We must study that which is, always with this comprehensive view that it is ever a development from a Past towards a Future. We cannot otherwise truly comprehend any mode

of existence - & in proportion to our ignorance of past & future development, must be our 'respectful doubt' concerning what *is*. From this study of what has been & is & of what ought to be, shall we advance to the comprehension of that Thought & Feeling, which "was *without* beginning, is now & ever shall be."

Mankind is apt to suppose God a Being to whom there is no impossibility.

In what sense are all things possible with God?

~~J.A. — "To God "All things are possible with God:~~

~~M.S. — "All things are possible with God",~~ which it would not be a contradiction to the nature of God to will. On the other hand, Man is apt to suppose possibilities to depend on the nature of things, whereas each mode of existence depends on the Spirit of Righteousness & Wisdom - which determines all existence, co-existence, development.

There exists eternally a Thought & Feeling which comprehends Eternity. This Thought & Feeling is ever manifesting itself in activity.

Thought, Feeling, Purpose, Will in the One are ever the same - Activity is the manifestation of that Thought & Feeling in

a successive development. It would not be consistent with Wisdom that its manifesta= tion should, like its Thought, be always the same - On the contrary, its manifestation in each present varies from its manifestation in each past & future.

That is not Perfection which has not verified itself in activity, in life, in work. Such is the thought of the Perfect Wisdom.

J.A. But would one not expect, then, to see the Perfect Thought invariably manifesting itself in the perfect life?

How is God to bring about the activity of more than One Will, His own.

M.S. Were it so, there would be only one Will in activity - The activity of various wills, all omnipotent, all wise & good is the Will of the One. This is attained by the Will which makes Mankind self=creative, self=developing. The course of each human being, however winding, is ~~assured~~/ensured to be towards Perfection. But the Son must work his way from ignorance & imperfection to Truth & Perfection before ~~He is One in~~/he is

one in

being with the Father. The Holy Spirit developed within him by the Law within & around him, shall lead him onwards till his being is one with God - Then shall the Spirit of God again set forth on the work of fresh development & manifes= tation.

J.A. But setting aside these ~~mystical/~~ considerations ~~speculations, you will admit that we have~~

{in another hand: Nymark}

V

~~Jacob Abbott, Harriet Martineau, M.S.~~

Future
Life

~~J.A. You must have faith it is true that we~~

have

no real "foundation" but "faith" for believing in a future life.

Faith We are told that Faith will remove
this may mountains - Faith will remove all the
be called - difficulties, which I acknowledge lie
this dependence high in the way of believing in a
on a future future state - A future state is, in itself, so
state. impossible ~~that it is useless to reason about it.~~

What is
"Faith"?

~~M.S.~~ What is faith? Is it belief that
God will break His own Laws, that He
will vary from the nature whence they
spring? No, it is belief that His nature
& consequently His Laws are invariable.
He has given us the means to recognise
what Goodness & Benevolence & Righteous=
ness & Wisdom are. Men have varied,
indeed, & do vary as to their conceptions of what these

are.

So they have done & do concerning other
truths which are yet within human
ken. Some think it right, wise, bene=
volent to try to help people in a way
which does not induce them to help
themselves. Others have other schemes
of benevolence. But on every subject
there is a Truth. And Unity of opinion
will come just in proportion as Mankind
gain knowledge of Truth & improvement
of being.

With respect to religious truth, we have
set it on a different footing from any
other. We have supposed that it came
to us in a different way. Why? A

Power above man was recognised, before it was known what Wisdom, Goodness, Righteousness, Benevolence really were - Power first comes home to human consciousness. Might is Right in an early state of human nature. It was discerned that there was an existence, or various existences, with power above human - This power was supposed to be used as the man of that day would have used it, if he had had it. Religion, *then*, consisted of man's interpretation of the phenomena within & without him, directed by a Superior in power, using that power as *he*, man, would have used it. The dealings of superior power were considered, as they are, so important that many could feel nothing but fear concerning them - The few, of more powerful minds, or nerves or more imaginative natures, ~~set down~~/noted their impressions, often believing themselves inspired by peculiar communication, ~~sometimes~~ saying what they themselves believed (as many do now in books & pulpits) & taking for granted that their belief was true - Some feigned a belief from selfish purposes -

Thus was a belief compounded for the many - *Now*, ~~in~~/by some from reverence (in consequence of having been brought up from infancy to consider the subject of religion as not to be approached like any other subject), ~~in~~/by some from indifference, ~~in~~/by some from disgust at superstitions revolting to the understanding & the

heart & from taking for granted that religion offer nothing else, the subject is not enquired into. People habitually acknowledge that God is wise & good. They say so to Him, when they address Him. But they do not examine whether the way in which they suppose Him to use His power *is* wise or good.

What can we
know except
by the senses?

~~H.M.~~ But we can know nothing except through the senses it is said & ~~therefore it is vain~~

~~dispute about any thing else.~~

~~M.S.~~ T/It is true, if I could not see or hear or feel or smell or taste, I could not come to the conviction that A is disinterested; but having that conviction, I can, in certain respects, assert what ~~illeg~~/he will do, & what he will not do with more real certainty than that the Sun will rise tomorrow. For every being essentially wills according to his nature. A's nature is such that his disinterestedness will not change while "he is himself" The nature of God never changes - It was, is & will be benevolence, goodness, wisdom, righteousness -

What is
Benevolence?

~~J.A.~~ But how do we know that it is not wisdom, goodness, benevolence, righteousness to give man living thought & sentiment for a time then to put an end to it, in order to give place to another man?

~~M.S.~~ Benevolence is *wishing well*. But it is not wishing well to a Man to give him an existence which can be shewn to be an

evil to him, as may the existence of a wicked man.

Righteousness? Righteousness, what is it? what it {in another hand: Edmonds}

is *not* may be illustrated by imagining a Being inflicting upon one man a life which is an evil to him, in order that other men may live lives which are a good to them.

Wisdom? Wisdom means taking the best means for the best end. The best end to a benevolent Being will be the greatest possible happiness to as many beings as can exist without deteriorating from the amount of happiness.

~~H.M. And how will this amount of happiness be most increased?~~

How will the amount of happiness be best increased? ~~M.S.~~ Suppose that individuals, profiting, as we know man does, by the experience which has gone before them, have attained a state of being really worth having, that they share the Divine attributes, whence alone springs what may be called happiness - suppose them ~~they are~~ in fullest

pursuit & enjoyment of all that is right & good, suppose them ~~they are~~ happy in love of God & love of man, then comes old age & death & quench all! The affections towards each other, so keen, so strong, so tender - more vivid, though less elevated than the feelings of which we are capable ~~to/towards~~ the Perfect, - are these

to be quenched? Much of life is spent before

Man may be
satisfied but
God could not
for him that he
should contribute
to the common
stock of happiness
himself
disappearing.

they are at maturity. Many are the
difficulties, the disappointments which
frequently attend all human affections.
Is man but to have a glimpse how he can
love, can sympathize - and is all over
then? - The noble nature of man may be
capable of saying, "I willingly retire to make
room for another - I go into nothingness -
Another comes for a taste of God's eternal
joys." But will the perfect nature of God
be satisfied with this? "We know in
whom we have trusted" - We do not know,
if thus we can believe of Him - *To know*
would be to believe in a future state of
existence to Mankind as much as to
know Dr. Arnold or the Duke of Wellington
is to know that what they will do will
be beyond all now or interested motives -
That which is wise & good & benevolent &
righteous, *that* He who is the Spirit of
Wisdom & Goodness & Benevolence &
Righteousness will do -

{in another hand: 125 L.R.}

How can we

J.A. [But how do we know, ~~if~~ask/it is again
asked,

understand
God?

~~again~~ what would be Righteousness &
Wisdom & Goodness & Benevolence? in an
omnipotent Being?

M.S. Have we, have we not the
power of comprehending, of feeling ~~that~~
what is absolute Righteousness, Wisdom,
Goodness? The possessing *Power* does not
alter the nature of absolute Wisdom &
Goodness - *Degrees* of Power alter, indeed,

what would be a wise manifestation of good feeling. But we are considering God to be omnipotent, i.e. powerful to effect whatever is His Will. We consider Him so, because that which is effected is so great, far beyond human power, that it leads us to suppose His Power to coincide with His Will. If this be so, His benevolence which we consider also unlimited because, the more we learn & the more we improve ourselves to appreciate it, the greater we find it, - will cause that He will desire & effect the greatest amount of good & happy consciousness possible.

Is there any limit to divine possibility?

~~J.A.~~ But when we say the greatest amount possible, is there any limit to Divine possibility?

~~M.S.~~ His will is to ~~partake~~/share His attributes,

Is there anything which can be called Happiness except in the exercise of those attributes? - There are, indeed, sensual enjoyments in the Animal creation. But can we ever call these happiness except in connection with such attributes? And as to intellectual enjoyments, Comte well says that such, that intellectual exertion either is little higher than physical enjoyment or exertion, unless at the call of Feeling -

~~H.M.~~ Grant, then, that from the exercise of the Divine attributes in man alone comes happiness, ~~you~~/we have to prove

f180

To prove
that the
Will of Love
& Wisdom
would be
continuity
to all
conscious {in another hand: Dyer}
existence.

What is
the greatest
happiness?
The exercise
of all the
nature in
harmony
with God.

~~-19-~~

~~(1) the existence of an Omnipotent Spirit
of Love & Wisdom~~

~~(2) that the Will of Love & Wisdom would
be continuity to all conscious existence -~~

~~M.S. We/I will apply myself /try to prove the
second proposition first.~~

Love, we know, would desire the greatest
happiness possible without a contradiction -
the greatest quantity & the best quality of
happiness - Now experience must prove
what is the greatest happiness?

~~H.M.~~ And what does experience prove
to be the greatest happiness/

~~M.S.~~ Is it not the exercise of all the

with individuals whom mutual attraction
brings together to love & to work together?
If this is the greatest degree & the best
kind of happiness, will it not essentially
be the will of Love & Wisdom to continue
such natures, such ties, which, in their
nature are adapted to happiness, in the
present, increased by, founded upon the
Past? Does not experience prove to us that
the Present owes its value to a conscious
being from having a Past & a Future? And,
is not the value of the Present in proportion
to the attainment of the Past, the scope for
attainment in the Future?

~~H.M.~~ But may we not say that the

f181

-20-

May not a
general Past
give value to an
individual Present?
an individual
Present to a
General Future?

Past of humanity gives value to the Present
of humanity? Will not a life limited to
this world be of more value in consequence
of the past exertions of Mankind? And
may it not be thus that humanity is to
have a Past & a Future?

~~M.S.~~ But is it not the experience of each
individual that his present owes its value
to *his own* past & future? Mankind have
helped him - But how? By helping him
to work himself. And does not his present
increase in value to himself & to all, to
whom it is of value, just in proportion
I do not say to the time, but to the good
exercise of the Past, & to the scope for
good exercise of the Future?

~~H.M.~~ ~~I am not sure of this~~ Is there
not however sometimes in the Being, unconnected
with past work or exercise, a present
power whence arises happiness? We
cannot say indeed that this power does
not arise from past exercise. But we
have no proof that it does -

~~J.A.~~ ~~But let that pass.~~ Certainly, ~~I/If~~
we grant the existence of an omnipotent
Spirit of Love & Wisdom, we take for granted
also that His Will will be for whatever,
in the estimation of the Spirit of Love &
Wisdom, is the greatest amount of the
highest kind of happiness -

~~M.S.~~ Human nature also is capable of a Spirit of Love & Wisdom. In proportion as it gains this Spirit, it will be enabled to harmonize with, to partake the estimation of the perfect Spirit of Love & Wisdom as to what would be the greatest degree & the highest kind of happiness.

~~J.A.~~ And what would be our estimate from experience of the highest kind & greatest degree of happiness?

~~M.S.~~ Granted, the existence of an omnipotent Spirit of Love & Wisdom, which hypothesis also grants, ~~as you say,~~ that His Will will be the greatest degree & highest kind of happiness - find out by experience & observation what will be this, & you know His Will - Is not that the problem? What, then, from our experience & observation is our conception of such Happiness?

Each individual is different from every other. This points to a future state for every individual - not to a future for humanity.

~~H.M.~~ I am/We are content with this definition ~~which you give~~ - the exercise of the capabilities of our nature, at the impulsion of Love & in accordance with Wisdom.

~~M.S.~~ This is the divine Happiness as Perfection - This is the divine Happiness as Imperfection, attaining by exercise to Perfection. But this is a happiness which, in its nature, increases in kind & degree

in proportion to its comprehensiveness in individual experience & consciousness. One generation communicates a part of individual experience to another - The whole it cannot impart. No individual can impart the whole of his experience to any other, so that that other can work upon it in the same way & to the same degree as upon his own, because no idiosyncrasy is like any other. Thus no individual can contribute the whole of his experience from which *he* might work the better for mankind. This is one argument for a future state to each individual - Another is that, since the conscious exercise of Love & Wisdom constitutes happiness, in proportion to the degree of Love & Wisdom is the degree of happiness. An individual, beginning in a certain state & advancing by exercise of his own nature, would, at the end of 100 years, have advanced more than two individuals in 50 years. I believe the evidence for a future state to be founded on these two moral reasons. There would be a greater amount of happiness by each individual carrying on his experience himself, than by transmitting such part of it as can be transmitted, voluntarily or involuntarily, to those who come after him. Each individual differs from

every other - If each were cultivated to his best possibility, it would be impossible for any other to be or to do that which each other than himself can be & do. Each original constitution, each experience through each present is different from every other.

Will God permit
waste of what
is most
precious by
destroying
the individuals
-while providing
for a kind of
general progress?

~~J.A. — But what do you/we infer from this?~~

~~M.S. — that~~ Improvement comes from exercise. This we learn from experience & observation - One person can help another only by calling some part of his nature into exercise - one generation can help another only by calling into exercise the natures of its successors.

~~H.M. —~~ But since one generation does thus call another into exercise, may it not be accordant with the Spirit of Love & Wisdom that one generation, having worked & enjoyed, departs to make room for another?

~~M.S. —~~ Even if we might say that each individual of each generation works & enjoys, - by such succession, instead of progression, there would be waste of what is most precious.

~~J.A. — I don't see that.~~

~~M.S. —~~ Take for example *Watt*. He invents the Steam engine & sets the world to work after he is no longer in it. But the exercise of *his* nature in that invention has done for him what he cannot do for any one else. He

through that invention, is in a state
which no one else ever was or will be -

~~J.A.~~ But it often happens that an invention is used, ~~for purposes~~ by genius &/or industry, for purposes which the inventor did not possess & for which he could not have used it.

[not FN: Henley]
It would
not be
consistent
with Omnipotent
Love & Wisdom
to destroy
those means
for improvement

~~M.S. Certainly~~ - Each idiosyncrasy is different from every other. The inventor could not exercise his mind exactly as any other man can, but by the exercise he has had, he has gained power, which, as no other will ever go thro' exactly that exercise, no other will gain - & that power, that capability will be lost, if he ceases to exist.

which, in
accordance
with His Law,
have arisen
from individual
exercise of
power, & could
not, in
accordance
{in another hand: Cuth}
with his
Law, arise by
any other man.

~~J.A./H.M.~~ But often, in inventing or discovering,
the nature seems overpowered - as was Sir Isaac Newton's - Does it not seem well that, after the faculties have blown & borne fruit, they cease their work?

~~M.S.~~ It is only, if they have been un- wisely worked, that a man's power of work is lessened by any past work. If they have been wisely worked, past work makes more fit for future work.

~~J.A And what do you infer f/From this?,~~

~~M.S.~~ I infer a continued existence for man from the existence of an omnipotent Spirit of Love & Wisdom - because it would not be consistent with love & wisdom to destroy those means for improvement & happiness which, in accordance with His Law, have arisen from exercise, & which, in accordance with His Law, never can arise by any other means -

Must
our expectation
of a future life
be solely founded
on the nature
of God?

~~H.M.~~ Then you admit that ~~o~~/Our expectation
of a future existence must be entirely
founded on the character which we are
able to trace in the Divine?

~~M.S.~~ If we convince ourselves that His
Nature is the origin of the Laws whence spring
all existence & if we convince ourselves that
those Laws prove a wise & good & benevolent
nature, is it not consistent, is it not "right
reason" to expect the *future* to be also in
accordance with Wisdom & Benevolence? Do
we not feel certain that a *human* character
will not contradict itself? From the wise
& tender human parent could we expect
to be put to death when we had served
some purpose of his by our lives? If we
grant that *all* existence is in accordance
with Law, the sufferings & privations of the
wicked as well as every other mode of
existence are referable to Him as their
origin.

Do we make
heaven for the
wicked not
for the virtuous?

~~H.M.~~ Then you make heaven for the
wicked, not for the virtuous?

~~M.S.~~ If it is granted
(1) that there is a wise & good God
omnipotent to effect His will;
(2) that *whatever is* is, as it is, in accordance
with His Laws & could not be otherwise;
(3) that vice & wickedness being suffering
or privation such as to make a vicious
existence an evil, not a good, - ~~it is proved~~
it is proved that there is a future existence for the vicious -
for it would be a contradiction to believe it
possible that the Wise, the Good, the Omnipotent
would will any existence not worth having
to the being who exists.

f187

-26-

God cannot
will an existence
which is an evil
to the individual
for the sake
of the general
good.

~~J.A.~~ Not even the good of other beings who
exist?

~~M.S.~~ ~~I suppose t/~~ Does it require an
argument to satisfy man that it would be
inconsistent with a righteous Being to will
an existence which was, on the whole, an evil
to one individual, in order that any number
of other individuals might be the better for
it?

~~J.A.~~ Will Time have nothing to do with
the subject? Would there be any wrong in
an individual existence of misery lasting
only a second, but in consequence of which
millions were happy for ever?

appears

~~M.S.~~ ~~I rather think that I/Individuality~~

to be

sacred in the thought of God. Indeed, if
we suppose man to be a modification of
the attributes of God, limited by the Laws
of physical nature, it would seem as if
individuality must be preserved in every
instance till Perfection is attained -

~~J.A.~~ ~~But what a fanciful theory!~~

~~M.S.~~ It is no fanciful theory, ~~at all~~
~~events,~~ to say that we can discern the same
qualities or attributes manifested in the
Laws which govern the Universe, & existing
in conscious living Man.

imagines

~~J.A./H.M.~~ But Man makes God, it is said,

a

Being like himself, but with each attribute,
which he finds in himself, heightened in
degree, heightened beyond what he can
himself conceive, heightened infinity. ~~That~~
[infinitely?]

~~is all~~

{in another hand: Wilson}

~~M.S.~~ But these attributes are really traceable in the Laws of God. The senses, the reason, the feeling may there appreciate them - & the more Man, by exercise of his nature, discerns & appreciates these Laws, the more of excellence does he find in them.

~~H.M.~~ But how can you/we discern that which is not appreciable by the senses?

Character
of God's Laws
gives us the
character
of His Will.

~~M.S.~~ When we say that the Laws with which all existence is in accordance, manifest a righteous, wise & good Will, we mean that, if there were such a Will, it would manifest itself in such Laws -

It is also obvious that the tendency of the right exercise of man's capabilities is towards perfection. In whatever direction he wisely exercises his faculties he improves - & in no direction has come into view the point at which improvement must stop, except indeed improvement in physical power - A Man may improve in physical strength up to a certain point, but he cannot ~~even~~ keep up permanently even to that point - ~~still~~/much less, go beyond

it -

But it would seem that experience already gives prospect of endless improvement in various intellectual & moral directions - *infinite* prospect of removing ignorance & inability ~~in various directions indefinitely~~

But happiness will be best promoted, not by exercise of skill & ability in a certain direction, irrelative to one general object to which all exercise of human nature should

tend - viz Order, Progress, living for others in accordance with the thought of Righteousness, Goodness, Wisdom - Happiness will be best promoted by each exercising himself according to his own individual nature so as to contribute to the purpose common to all.

~~H.M. But that is beside the mark - Let us hear what you think you have proved.~~

~~M.S.~~ Granted (1) the existence of a wise, benevolent & omnipotent Spirit granted (2) that there are signs of capability of progress towards perfection in Human nature - or, in other words, that, if Mankind learn & keep aright the Laws of God, Mankind will progress -

granted (3) that the affections are the strongest & best interest of human nature

when death comes &, according to the verdict of the senses, Progress & Affection are at an end in the individual, - then

Is progress

best secured

by the succession

or by the continuance

of individuality?

~~H.M. Yes, what then?~~

~~M.S.~~ The heart & the intellect will take up the question, will not progress be greater, more thorough, & more comprehensive, if the individual, keeping what he has gained in one place of existence, goes on to another, than if progress is made by successive individuals alone?

The Law of
God development,
not Succession
Each individual
different
from every
other

The Law of God appears to be, not Succession, but Development. It is not, as in a hereditary monarchy, a successive line of Kings, but it is, as in a school, a ~~rising~~ progressive rising from class to class - such, at least, by analogy, the intention of God would appear to be -

Each individual is different from every other. Some contribute evidently by their lives to the progress of mankind. But can it be said that any one contributes all that is in his present nature & never will be in any other - all of experience, yet immaterial, yet undigested & not utilised even by himself? Each has had experience different from any other - Yet how much of this experience is as yet imperfectly understood, how much that has been understood is imperfectly comm=unicated! What waste of ~~what is~~/that which is most precious! Yet Nature never wastes - Nothing *Material* is destroyed, but goes thro' successive modes of being, useful in each, changing only to be the more useful for the change - Apparently the higher purpose of the material is to be the medium of thought & feeling - Even granting - according to the strictest mate=rialistic doctrine, - that thought & feeling are but elaborations of matter, are we to suppose that this highest elaboration comes to an end, while all that is material merely changes?

f191

~~-29a-~~

Is there improvement within certain limit of the physical, without a limit to the rest of nature?

~~H.M.~~ Of the physical nature experience proves that means may be taken to strengthen it to a certain point, but not beyond -

~~M.S.~~ But can this be said of any other part of nature?

~~H.M.~~ But do we really find persons become more tender, more loving and affectionate as they go on with life?

~~M.S.~~ Have they, I would ask, good opportunity of exercising such affections? If they have, each exercise of sympathy, each work engaged in with one heart, each difficulty borne in the same spirit, each sympathy renders affection stronger than it was before *

* Note

f192

~~-29b-~~

Note P. 29a
~~Comte~~

*~~M.S.~~/Comte says, "*On se lasse de penser & mime d'agir, jamais on ne se lasse d'aimer.*" That present right exercise increases the facility for future right exercise is a Law, applying to every part of our nature. The affections strengthen whenever they are in healthy exercise.

{in another hand: Edmonds}

If, then, Man discovers the existence of a wise, good & omnipotent Being -
 If more happiness would result from progressive than from successive being,
 will result from progressive than from successive being, is not this the same thing as saying that individual being will be progressive?
 If experience & consciousness prove that, next in value to the feeling of Man towards the Perfect, are his feelings towards individuals among those who are progressing towards perfection, is not this proof of a continued existence? For the depths of feeling resulting from the past, in the life of the affections, cannot be transmitted fully from one generation to another, or from one individual to any other - It must be from one to one other - For each idiosyncrasy is varied - That which one human being can be to another, no other can be to that other. I do not mean that every one can be an object of sympathy to the affections of every other, though, as life become better organized, & mankind improve, such bonds of affection will increase in number, but I mean that, wherever two are affected to each other, there is, a peculiarity in their affection which, if it ceased thro' death to exist, no successively existing affections between others could replace, for neither those two
 idiosyncracies
 nor the effect of their union in affection will ever exist again - But such affection would increase in value, if those between whom it
 existed
 should continue to know each other in their progress towards Perfection.

Will a future state be worth having?

~~H.M.~~ But will a future state be worth having is another question?

~~M.S.~~ To a nature, which comprehends thought & feeling, which comprehends the capability of Love & Wisdom, which is, (in degree) the divine nature to such a nature an eternal existence only could be worth having. It would be inconsistent with an omnipotent & perfect Spirit of Love & Wisdom to will to any existence comprehending a degree of Love & Wisdom any but an eternal existence capable of progress, possessing within itself subjectively, without itself objectively means for & inducements to progress. This is human existence *if* it is continuous -

-In proportion as Love & Wisdom in an individual human being exist in an advanced degree, it would appear contrary to the Spirit of Love & Wisdom to extinguish that individual existence - Experience has proved the strict idiosyncrasy - the distinct peculiarity of each individual human being. The constitution of each is different - the circumstances which have modified that constitution are different. If a human being is blotted out from existence, such another human being will never again exist; &, if he be of high attainment in divine nature, that is, in Love & Wisdom, - a mode of existence of the most estimable nature, which never can be repeated, is destroyed.

~~H.M. But I say that the human being is not destroyed, because the body changes, as you/we have said, into other mode of existence.~~

~~M.S. And can you think that is an answer?~~

Individuals
must
communicate
what they
have
gained
by existing,

~~H.M. And I say farther/It is said that one generation pours out its riches to another.~~

~~M.S. But it cannot pour out all its riches, since each individual has his peculiar portion, which he can only communicate by existing -~~

not by ceasing
to exist.

~~J.A. But now, o/On the other hand, let us consider~~

~~the question with regard to those whose natures manifest little or nothing of the divine.~~

~~M.S. How little to them, then, is the value of existence, since does not experience prove that existence is valuable in proportion as it possesses the Spirit of Love & Wisdom?~~

Something
Both the

~~J.A. But you must not blow hot &/To sum up cold. Your/This reasoning is it will be said this -~~

highest &
lowest human
natures tell
the same tale,
viz. of a future
state of
infinite progress
for each & for
all.

~~amounts to~~ The higher
natures, in proportion as they are high,
teach that the Spirit of Perfect, Omnipotent
Love & Wisdom will never destroy that
which is of highest value, which by the
Laws of the Perfect can never be replaced -
The lower natures, in proportion as they are
low, teach that there is a future thro' which
that existence which is not now a boon
will become so - otherwise such existence
would not be consistent with the Will from which
it springs.

~~M.S. You could not have put it better for me. That is just what I think — Only a thousand times shorter & clearer than I could have thought/illeg it.~~

~~H.M. But The question whether human consciousness will be continued after the existence such as he is in the world/In principle would~~
 cease,

~~whence does it arise?~~

~~But have patience with me — And let me try to explain my thought.~~
 {in another hand: Murdock?}

It would be contrary to the Spirit of Righteousness to will that which should cause suffering to an individual for the sake of others, *unless* with the conviction that that individual would, on the whole, gain from it -

Side Note
~~H.M. But what proves this? — And~~
 Would any degree of suffering for however short a time, for the benefit of any number of individuals for any length of time, be contrary to the Spirit of Righteousness?

~~M.S. I would first speak from impressions of what I conceive to be the plan of the Perfect, & then try to make out whether there be proof that it is so~~

To the imperfect & limited, each present differs from every other. The *being*, in all that constitutes it, is different. The physical being, the nature, as to each

capability & as to the whole, is different. It has progressed, directly or indirectly, towards the Perfect.

~~J.A. Cries of "Oh! Oh!"~~

M.S. That is, even if *directly* it has retrograded, it has been going through that which *will* advance it. But to the Perfect, in thought & feeling, there is no change. It is *change* which constitutes a past present & future - To the perfect thought & feeling there is no past & future only present - But activity - the rendering into living action the thought & feeling - *that* in its nature is consecutive. The Eternal Thought & Feeling which is One & changes not, requires successive acts to realize itself in activity.

~~J.A. But~~

Side note

why cannot this activity which proceeds from Perfect Thought & Feeling, be perfect, as being *their* manifestation?

M.S. *It is perfect*, perfect in its imperfection, which is Order in progress to Perfection - If we suppose ~~the Perfect~~ all act to be the immediate manifestation of the Perfect Thought & Feeling ~~the immediate inspiration to all action~~, we preclude any will but His own in activity - But the perfect benevolence which essentially wills the greatest possible happiness to other than Himself, wills other natures to enjoy that which is His own Happiness, viz. a wise

& good & righteous & benevolent will, springing from a right nature. If the All spring from Himself, irrelatively of any other being, there would not be happiness to others, & certainly not be the Spirit of Benevolence - The manifesting Him in act He commits to His creatures, not guiding them as automata, - but, through His Laws, which are simply the permanent, eternal Thought & Feeling of Wisdom & Goodness, ~~He~~ furnishing means & inducements, so that their thought, their feeling, their will, shall, thro' exercise of themselves & each other, become right.

~~J.A.~~ But ~~t~~/The question to which we wish to tend is, is His effecting His purpose by successive natures or by progressive natures?

We trace the same nature in Man and not in Man.

~~M.S.~~ All that we can say is, - we trace the same nature in Man & not in Man. In the latter case, the more we learn, the more does it appear that the attributes are perfect - in the former, that they are capable of improvement so that, grant only time & they might become perfect -

~~J.A.~~ Without entering into any question of whether we may say that these attributes appertain to one & the same Being, our next step to tracing the tendency to Perfection, (if it exists,)

our next step in enquiring into the destination of the Imperfect will be, what ~~of~~(that ~~which~~ is consistent with Perfection) will be the Will of the Perfect? Here are the attributes which constitute His own nature, & in which alone happiness consists - they are capable with time & circumstances of rising to Perfection - Is it accordant with a Perfect Will to destroy these capabilities, to raise up others, to profit by past work & past experience in those so destroyed, - some of whom have only contributed to it

{in another hand: Hesketh?}

The senses tell us that death kills the individual. But the senses also tell us of the Perfect Being who will not kill the individual.

by being a part of a mass of evil or suffering which, being evil & suffering will excite work "to improve it off" the earth in some future generation? ~~Is not that your case?~~

~~M.S. — Yes, exactly.~~ And what is the reason for such a belief? That the senses tell us only that, when what we call death comes, all that constitutes a human being ceases - But, through the senses, we have recognised manifestations of Wisdom, Goodness, Benevolence, Righteousness - And having recognised them, do we not consistently enquire what destination of man will be the Will of the nature which we have recognised?

~~J.A.~~ Let us turn to the question of whether it is consistent with Righteousness to will

suffering to one individual for the sake of another - I believe we must allow this to be a matter of degree. We should not hesitate to cause severe temporary suffering to A, to benefit B for life. In short, it does seem a matter of degree ~~illeg~~/what suffering we should think admissible to inflict on one for the benefit of another.

It cannot be right to will suffering to an individual for the sake of others, without his profiting from that experience himself?

~~M.S.~~ Can it, then, be right to will a life certainly not worth having to A, in order that, some ages hence, his suffering & that of many others may have given experience so that lives really & essentially valuable may arise? Many have lives certainly not worth having in any true sense - But is it reconcilable with the discovery of a perfectly wise & benevolent Being, (omnipotent to effect the will of Wisdom, Goodness & Benevolence), to will that so it should be, in order that *they* may contribute to lives which ~~may~~/shall be valuable to the possessors & which shall lead to

other

valuable lives still increasing in value, & so on? Are we not able to pronounce that this would *not* be righteousness in the Omnipotent? And do we not constantly pronounce concerning what has been & what will be, in reference to the characters of men, as certainly as we pronounce concerning any fact directly evident to the senses?

Did a certain convert to Romanism do what he did from interested motives? - One, totally unacquainted with his nature, says he did - Another, who has had experience of his character, pronounces that he did not, [with as much certainty as that the moon rose yesterday, though he did not see her rise - or, if there is any traceable difference with *more* certainty. Without the senses it is true that Man could not have gained convictions concerning the character of his fellow-man or of his God - but, having gained them, is it not matter of consciousness that his certainty is as great & that he can determine what man's or God's conduct will be as unhesitatingly as in a matter of sense? Why are we not to apply this to the character of God? We call Him wise, & good, & omnipotent, - We address ceaseless words to Him as if He were so. But, if we believe that we have evidence that He is so, why do we attribute to Him that which we should attribute to no other good & wise being? We first discover His nature - & then we attribute to Him that which is consistent with His nature.

J.A. But how can we tell what *will* be righteous & wise & good in one so different from ourselves? ‡/we persist in asking -

{in another hand: Biles}

The question often asked with regard to God amounts to this: How do we know that σ /One so much better than ourselves will

not commit murder?

What real belief have we in the nature of God?

~~M.S.~~ Different how? - As far as we are able to recognise Him, different only in degree. It seems as if we said, "how do I know that for one, much wiser & better than I, it may not be right to commit murder or to steal? to do evil to one that good may come to another? I have only to submit." Whether our conviction come [intuition?]

from intention or experience, we are convinced that to put an end to the child we have brought into existence, after a life of suffering, (when we might prolong its life) for benefits which we may foresee to others would be wrong.

~~J.A.~~ But we cannot be sure of benefit to others?

~~M.S.~~ If we could, would this alter the right to Him?

We do in some degree regulate our lives by our belief σ /concerning the nature of God, or rather we have no belief - we regulate them by the belief of those who once had one - & thus we go to church, because some, who once thought upon the nature of God, believed that this would please Him. Let us now try with our whole being to understand, to feel as much as we can of the nature of God. This will answer our questions as to the destination of Man. In proportion as we gain knowledge & improvement in being, will be our appreciation of God, our

comprehension of his destination for Man -
 Whoever has suffered, that suffering
 shall be well for *him* - that is, his
 suffering is a part of a system of
 things which shall bring to the
 individuality which suffers a happy
 being - not to each suffering a payment -
 but to all suffering this satisfaction
 that it shall bring to the sufferer an
 existence of true happiness, such as
 would, without contradiction, have
 been impossible without that
 suffering.

What is our only real practical reason for believing in a future life?

~~H.M.~~ But what reason have we to give for belief in a continuation of the existence which, by the verdict of the senses, ends here? ~~What foundation for your dependence have you?~~

~~M.S.~~ The same that men believe upon & act upon throughout their practical life, viz. that *Will* will correspond with the nature of the character whence it springs - & that that nature exists in accordance with some Law or principle - Why do I depend on finding my breakfast prepared this morning? on meeting my friend at noon? on finding the Committee collected which I expect this afternoon? Is it not all dependence upon Will, upon the nature

whence all springs? I find it to be essential to Will to pursue its greatest satisfaction - or, in other words, I find that essentially, it does not *dissatisfy* itself. I can give no mathematical proof that, at 9 o'clock, I shall find breakfast on the table, at 3 I shall find collected a Committee for a particular purpose - But I no more doubt it than I doubt the existence of the pen & ink which I see before me.

Once assured that there exists a *will*, whence spring the successive phenomena or modes of existence in the Universe, - once convinced that the nature of that will is the same benevolence & wisdom, of which I am conscious in human nature - and I depend on a continuation of existence. Because the Omnipotent, willing otherwise, would contradict the Benevolence & Wisdom which His Universe reveals.

Who tells us
what the
Spirit of
Benevolence
& Wisdom is-
He Himself.

~~J.A.~~ But how may we be assured that we know what Benevolence & Wisdom are?

~~M.S.~~ Because He Himself, the Spirit of Wisdom & Righteousness, is ever declaring it to you - Seeing you shall see, hearing you shall hear, if you will take the means. Observe His work & way, His path thro' the universe, try to interpret one part by another, - read the present, the past & future in connection with one another.

compare what man can do for man, if he wills him a blessed existence - and you will find that one Will, unlimited by man's material bounds, is pursuing the same purpose by the same means in *kind*, differing only in degree - You will read of a nature & a will common with man's best. If you will strive to observe, study, & comprehensively interpret the Universe in its eternal purport, you will discern more & more one Will, one nature upon which you may depend - You could not bring yourself to conceive that your friends of this house would leave you this morning without your daily meal. Oh! stretch your thought to the revelations of the Universe, and still less will you feel it a possibility that God will quench the spirit than that Man will starve the body -

{in another hand: Mumford}

Have we not
as much
experience of
God & what His
purpose is,
as we have of
any of our friends
& what their
purpose is?

~~H.M.~~ But I have experience that
my friends will provide my daily food.

~~M.S.~~ Have ~~you~~/I not experience of
God's eternal purpose?

~~J.A.~~ Shew it more plainly, Father,
to my dim view, my aching sight - is ~~my~~/our
constant prayer -

~~M.S.~~ "Shew us the Father," said Philip.
He is shewn only in His eternal Universe,
His manifestation - How then shall we
discern Him? The realization of this

manifestation is Eternity's work - But His purpose even now I believe man may discern. Look if experience is not revealing to you that it is to share His nature, to transmute His thought and feeling into life & work, to regulate that life & work by His Law, which shall call into exercise all that it is good to be. If this sounds too vague, we will strive to realize it more & more. Meantime, it is God's nature & character which are our dependence that His nature, as existing in man, shall never cease to be, but shall develop by work & exercise towards His Perfection.

What
experience
have we of
any Thought
& Feeling
existing
without
material
limits.

~~H.M.~~ But, s/Since my experience shews me thought & feeling, as always in connection with material limits, how am I warranted to suppose that they still exist, when I have evidence that those material limits no longer exist?

~~M.S.~~ We have experience of thought & feeling without material limits. The more we improve our being so as to be able to estimate *what is*, & to comprehend its scope, - the more we learn of what is - &/so much the more consciousness and evidence do we gain of Thought & Feeling unconnected with material limits - hence we have evidence that the material accompaniments & limits, with which we find thought & feeling connected in human

nature, are not essential to their existence -

Let us try to understand as far as we may, or, at any rate, not to misunderstand the connections in nature - *Sight* is the consciousness of a present state of being. Whether this consciousness is entirely subjective, or whether it is objective, & connected with an existence we call matter, we know not, nor can any means within our power advance us towards evidence for answering that question. It is entirely unimportant - For this we know, that certain means which are within our power are coexistent with or successive to certain states of consciousness. I wish for the consciousness of the presence of a certain man, a certain tree - I know perfectly the means for obtaining that consciousness, whether the man & the tree be matter existing objectively to me, or not.

Certain coexistences or successions are essential to certain states of consciousness - This is proved to us by experience. This is all that is essential to what appears to

~~to me~~ be the purpose of all existence - viz. the perfecting Thought & Feeling by life & work so as to produce the welfare of a grand existence - the eternal Father - the eternal Son -

[in another hand: illeg]

Some speak with a sort of humble Ignorance, & unconsciously take a sort of credit for that humility, when they say "we know not how light is essential to human vision" & the like. But what, if there ~~is~~/be nothing to know- beyond this, that there exists a will for certain invariable co-existences with each definite consciousness? Supposing the object of human existence to be happiness, welfare through life, exercise, activity of each *for each* & *for all*, - & thus the attainment of divine perfection through successive phases of time, - thus will divine benevolence find its satisfaction - The invariable coexistences & successions, which experience reveals to us, are the means by which we learn to conduct ourselves, to exercise ourselves.

This is not truly to be called an inexorable necessity, but accordance with right in the Will whence spring such laws. By *right* I mean that which is effective for the welfare of *eternal* being - I am not meaning to say what essentially constitutes right.

That may be a question beyond our ken, but whatever, in the most direct course, tends to the welfare of eternal Thought and Feeling, that will be right. And such is the tendency of Law, for these "constant

relations of succession & similitude enable us to foresee them one after the other." And can we not discern that hence the best of education, the only true education, for thus must good depend on Man's ~~life & exercise~~/living

&

exercising

his capabilities for Mankind. These laws "shew us the means of directing our activity" - & thus "the practical effect emanates from an intelligent will."

One /A school of the present day has pronounced all causes radically inaccessible, all research into them consequently absurd. Let us look whether we may not learn, not that they are accessible, but that no cause exists except one omnipotent & righteous Will, manifesting itself in Law - Experience, taking a more & more comprehensive view may show more & more evidence that this would account for all that has been, is, & that we may discern is to be, - while (without a belief in such a will) our consciousness of existence, present, past & future, presents us with contradiction & confusion.

God is good,
& therefore
I believe in
a future
state - But
I am obliged
to take for
granted a
future state,
in order to
prove that
God is good -
Is not this
reasoning
in a circle?

A glimpse of God's thought appears in many of man's struggles to understand existence & its source - But often, he directly contradicts that thought in his interpretation. That each shall work out the weal of the whole is God's thought. That One shall be sacrificed to do away with the sin which arises from ignorance (which ignorance the work of *all* alone can transmute into wisdom) has been Man's frequent thought, or rather this has been passively *received* by many - It has sprung from the *thought* of

comparatively few, from the *feeling* of a greater number, but has been by most who believe, or think they believe it, accepted, not engendered.

~~H.M. But I don't see what all this tends~~
[in another hand: Illeg]

~~to~~ You say that God is good, & therefore you believe in a future state. But you cannot prove that God is good, except by taking a future state for granted.

What is proof?

~~M.S.~~ First, let me enquire what is Proof? Proof is an inference which it is not possible to doubt. I find many evidences in present & past existences that they spring from a Spirit of Love & Wisdom. If they do not, I know not how to explain that the provision for welfare is made, which would be made if they did spring from Love & Wisdom, & this is to my mind proof or inference which I cannot doubt. But, while feeling these proofs of a wise & powerful benevolence, I find other circumstances which indicate either want of power or, if benevolence, unless I can find reason to believe in a plan of eternal development, which would rend what seemed to be indications of the want of benevolence absolute proofs of its presence. Thus, seeking to avoid contradictions in the Ruling Spirit, seeking consistency, a continued existence suggests itself to us -

What can we know of a future state?

And what can we know concerning this state? concerning the change which takes place, when human life ceases in this world?

f211

-48-

I that it is in accordance with Law, since every change which takes place may be traced to a definite Law.

II That it will be a state in which, directly or indirectly, man will progress by the exercise of his own nature & that of his kind, since we find indications of this tendency in all human existence - we find that with this tendency *all* is harmonious with the Spirit detected in some instances

III That man's progress will be - improve=ment of being & lessening of ignorance - more of love, more of wisdom - for such, experience tells us, is the only real progress to welfare - [end of fairly neat section, with FN hand adding side bars at left]

f212 [ff212-17v seems not FN hand] light blue paper, MS prob

-49-

Summary

What can we know of Eternity, we who acknowledge that it is a word to us, that we cannot grasp the idea?

Yet ~~I believe~~ we have means to foretell in Eternity of existence in connection with the present identity of all men - means befitting the Constitution of our nature, means which if they do not gain assurance from us, it is because we are imperfect, even as human beings, in the knowledge & the nature Humanity may attain - But how has it been with men, in their real or supposed belief of a future existence? Some think it wrong & dangerous to admit any feeling of doubt, any desire of confirmation of what is called the doctrine of a future existence.

Side note

Without Eternity for each & for all of us, there could not be a perfect God.

considering that such a state of Mind will offend the Being whom they believe to have informed a portion of Mankind among whom are themselves of a future existence for Man - ~~I believe~~ Many who would shrink from acknowledging doubt to themselves are never far from believing all they think they believe

"Seventeen or eighteen years ago, I was to all appearances dying of fever I firmly believed (if belief at second hand can be firm) that a blessed immortality, guaranteed by the resurrection & word of Christ, was about to open upon me; yet so feeble was the effect of this belief that it gave me not one throb of joy. calm resignation to an inevitable but unwelcome event, & thankfulness to that merciful Love which had revealed itself to my spirit, were my highest emotions" -

But I will refer to

f213

~~-51-~~

another; a pure & passionate
soul; living, breathing &
moving in decisive things;
ever rejoicing in union
with God in Christ - in
theory anticipating eternal
glory; & yet to my most
certain knowledge, most
thoroughly unwilling to
die prematurely.

~~I believe~~ Such a state
of mind ~~to be~~/is common
among those who think
it sinful to enquire
what they believe, & why
they believe - & ~~I think~~ if
the word belief is used
by them to express
assurance, they do not
believe what they
think they believe -

f214

53 1e

Some say that it is a love of life, inherent in our nature that leads to the thought of Eternity, the wish that our present being should

{written in the right margin}
~~Without Eternity for each & all of us there could not be a perfect God~~ {in another hand: Wyman Burley}

not cease. ~~I cannot find~~ Is this why ~~the reason that the desire that of~~ the desire that this world should *not* be the end of all to show is natural, ~~is~~/or befitting to the human mind/ ~~I think t~~/There is a higher reason; one which will strengthen as our nature improves, & our knowledge advances.

The advance of knowledge gives ever increasing evidence of ~~illeg illeg~~/universal accordance with Love of which the results in human nature & human history are such that ~~illeg~~ unless our present existence is connected with a future, it is repugnant to our highest desires, ~~illeg~~/to our moral nature, it contradicts the belief that we are the subjects of a righteous government - while, not only is this Love consistent with a righteous Ruler - it is the *only* course we can conceive consistent with a perfect Being, ~~If~~ that our present existence is in connection with a future, in which the same

process shall be carried forward - namely - that Love shall afford inducement-means through which in course of time, each individual of whom moral progress is the fitting state shall attain that state through his own will, his own work, & that of his fellows - ~~thus I believe &~~ Thus & thus only, ~~in such belief that & in this belief only,~~ can a find the satisfaction of believing believe that Mankind ~~to be/is~~ under righteous government

~~I cannot/The desire that~~ no being should exist that is not perfect is ~~in other words that/a~~ contradiction. Such a conception indeed would exclude *all* conscious being for ~~perfection consists not but with oneness of being,~~ & that would not be perfection which existed alone -

For those we love we/~~for whom I have sympathies, interest, desires, I have two wished — & wish I wish~~ that they should be under the direction of a Perfect being, in such a sense that they shall

f215

-53a-

{in another hand: Mumford}
certainly attain that state
of progress in righteousness
which befits their nature.
‡/We cannot wish to trust
~~my~~/our own ignorance or
the ignorance ‡/we find, even
among the wisest & best
of men, with human desti=
ny, over which indeed
the ~~existence~~/influence of each is
so limited, all see imperfectly/~~are in~~
~~the dark,~~ though all are
capable of opening paths
to ever increasing light, To
none can it be said, "you
might have had the right
will, & known the way
to righteousness if you
would" Of many it is at
once obvious that such
will & such knowledge
has not been ~~in their~~
~~possibility~~ possible to them.
‡/We can endure anything
if ‡/we can believe that
we are all on a road
by which our affections
our sympathies, our
desire to exercise suc=
cessfully the various
faculties we possess
shall in course of time
be satisfied, that is,
shall be in a state of
progressive satisfaction.

Without this belief the contrarities in human existence to what it is good ~~to~~/for those to desire, are ~~such~~ only tolerable ~~to me~~ if I/we shut ~~my~~/our eyes to what is going on in the world, if ~~my~~/our understandings & ~~we~~ hearts are illeg speak not to ~~me~~/us of "what is" & "what ought to be."

The actual history of Man as he is & has been even the portion of it which I/we have some partial knowledge ~~of~~, some faint conception of, would be terrible to ~~me~~/us, if I/we believed his will subject to no Love - if I/we believed that ignorant & helpless as we are, man's will were not the subject of Love, through which in course of time, he shall desire & obtain to will righteousness, & that meantime his erring will shall not irremediably injure himself or others, but shall be a means to correct {connect?} the future by the present.

{in another hand: Mumford?}
Yet feeling as I/we do, that
Human will does accord
with Love, again I/we should
be in despair, if while
believing that it has
not been in human possi-
bility that the terrible
history of human sin &
suffering should not have
been, I/we believed these
sinners & sufferers to
come into existence for
no better purpose than
what is or has been
or to bridge over un-
consciously & without
their own will or pur-
pose, a better existence
for future men.

Yet as little can I/we
desire even to be as ma-
chines, so constructed that
every thought, every
feeling, every wish
every act must be right
as certainly & as much
without exercise of its
own will as in the Chro-
nomery which varies not
from true time.

Such an idea is indeed
as unimaginable to us
as the attempt to imagine
it is unsatisfactory to
our ~~own~~ minds.

~~If there~~ That the ignorance
& imperfect nature of Man
should will irrespectively
of ~~some~~/one higher & wiser
through whom he is
learning to will right
is unsatisfactory to us, -
yet ~~if~~ to be rendered
incapable of willing
otherwise than right
is neither a possible
conception, nor does the at=
tempt to conceive it
represent it as satisfac
tory - Love a love is satisfactory which
ensures that ~~with~~/according to cer-
tain conditions a man
shall will right, with
certain other conditions
he ~~will~~/shall will wrong,
which ensures also that
in course of time,
rather in course of
Eternity, each & all
shall in accordance
with Love deserve &
obtain to Will right
all sin & sorrow being
but one of the processes through
which Mankind is learn-
ing & teaching.
Hence it is that belief
in a future in connection
with human existence is
essential to belief that is under
righteous government.

Mr. Newman condemns the idea that a Future{?} State is necessary to redress the evils of this life, as sometimes maintained - & adds "can I go to the Supreme Judge, & tell him that I deserve more happiness than he has granted me in this life? Whither is the sagacious common sense or self knowledge gone?"

It is on quite different logic & self knowledge, on a quite different understanding of the subject than this, that we deserve & expect a future existence.

We are not thinking of "deserts" as any part of the question. We find ourselves living under a Law; such, that if it fulfils in the future what its character & tendency lead us to expect we live under a righteous rule, a rule consistent with that Law - If not, it is not Omnipotence in our Ruler that would prevent

that his rule would
not be righteous.

The nature of which
he has constituted us,
recognising his Love
could not deem it
righteous, or consist-
tent with its charac-
ter & tendency as
now we see its
operation.

Therefore it is that
we desire, there-
fore it is that we
expect a future
existence

We desire to live under
righteous rule, then
The very constitution
of our natures makes such
desire befitting to us,
admitting a future existence
we live under righteous
rule, admitting it
Law is our revelation
of a righteous ruler
We cannot prove no
future existence, we
can only say we are ignorant
Law, it can be, ~~illeg~~ If we
could prove it we should
prove the existence of Law
inconsistent with itself
that is with the character &
tendency of its results.

f219

-1- [Mary Smith crossed out and another Jacob

Abbott]

[in another hand: Guppy]

Law

~~Railroad Disputations~~

VI

~~Calvin, Jacob Abbott, Mary Smith Jacob Abbott,
M.S.~~

Predestination

~~Jacob Abbott "Predestination", I believe, /infers
one of~~

two things;

~~means/ infers either that, whether we may will &
whatever we may do, certain consequences,
such as our state in the next world,
will take place, in spite of us, whatever
be our conduct, by the desire of God.~~

~~Calvin No, not whatever be your conduct.~~

Or ~~illeg~~/it means that ~~but~~ God, at his appointed time, calls

a

Calvin's

view of

Predestination

certain number into that state of grace which
will have for its consequence hereafter
~~illeg~~ salvation - & leaves the rest
in the state, in which they are by
nature, of sin & death.

In what

~~M.S. Jacob Abbott I quite agree - We /In one
sense~~

sense we

are

predestinate?

indeed we are

predestinate. ~~I~~/We see a ragged creature,
brought up in Rotten Gray's Inn Lane,
at the "Thieves' Kitchen & Seminary for
the teaching of that art to children."

& ~~I~~/we truly say that he is "predestinate"
to sin & death. ~~I~~/We see the child of Lois
& Eunice brought up amid great objects,
"unspotted from the world" - & ~~I~~/we can truly
say he is predestinate to grace & salvation.

Apparent
deviations
from Law.

~~Jacob Abbott Then you leave nothing
for True Will to do~~ All children however brought

up in St. Giles's, don't grow up thieves -
all ~~the/~~who are carefully & piously educated,
as we but too well know, don't grow up
good men - ~~You must grant us/There/~~Is there
something
besides the inevitable action of circum=
stances as it is called? ~~Jacob Abbott~~
These deviations ~~M.S. Your exceptions are also the/These ±~~
~~grant you~~
themselves exceptions; ~~but they~~ are also the
the subjects Subjects of Law; ~~Mr. Abbott~~ the effects
of Law. are also traceable to some circumstances,
unknown to us, but which could have no
other effects.

Does this ~~J.A. Then, you entirely annihilate Free~~
unbroken ~~Will - according to you,~~ there is an un=
~~chain of God's~~ broken chain, held in the hands of God,
Law of God from the first beginning of things, ~~which~~
annihilate upon which is strung every event, act,
Man's ~~/the will of~~ feeling, thought, will of a man's life -
~~Man~~ effect following cause, as link follows
link - immutable - pre-ordinate - None
of the insulated phenomena of Predesti=
nation - none of the recalcitrant exercise
of True Agency -

There is ~~M.S. I don't/won't quarrel with your Theory/~~
no cause ~~Interpretation,~~
but God. ~~only with your words~~ - There is no cause
but God - all the rest is the effect of
His laws or thought. A certain circumstance
brought in to contact with a certain nature

must always have a certain, the same & a definite effect. It can't have sometimes one effect & sometimes another. Nature & circumstances remaining the same, to say that any other effect will occur is absurd.

J.A. ~~Yes, we don't say that, but that nature must/can be altered.~~ t/The nature, however, it is said, remains under the free will of ~~the~~ a responsible Agent.

Does God interfere with some things and not with others?

M.S. ~~I/This is to say, in fact, that God interferences with some things & not with others, that He, by an act of arbitrary will, lays down certain landmarks & leaves man to live as he likes, during the meantime. There can be no/How do you explain "insulated phenomena"?~~ -

Can such be?

Phenomena are only the manifestation of God's thoughts. Insulated phenomena are as much as to say that God thinks at one time & not at another.

There is *Predestination* to universal happiness.

~~Calvin Yours is a far more thorough-going/This, it is said, is a far more dangerous Predestinarianism that mine/that of Calvin.~~

are

M.S. ~~Oh! we are all Predestinatarians now, M. Calvin, in the full force of the word/We~~

are

Predestinarians, each in his own sense - The ~~only~~ difference between ~~my~~/this Predestina= tion & ~~yours~~/that of Calvin is that we believe all predestinate ultimately to the happiness of the Creator Himself - any idea of

punishment, not intended to improve the creation, being inconsistent with a Being of Perfect Goodness - We believe ~~most~~ cordially that the laws of God are so arranged as to flagellate us with our sins & to attract us with their ~~contraries~~/opposites, so as, at an appointed time, (appointed, not by decree, ~~by~~/which is an express

volition of God, but by Law,) to bring us, i.e. all, into a state of grace - as it is called.

{in another hand: Sheneer}

Shall we lie

~~J.A.~~ Well, ~~t~~/Then, it is said we have nothing to do

still & wait till *the Laws* whip us into happiness.

but to lie still & wait till "*the Laws*" knock/whip us ~~about~~ into Goodness - Free Will, adieu! ~~I thought I had had a will of my own, too.~~

What is meant by Free Will?

~~M.S.~~ ~~What do you mean~~/But what is meant by Free Will? ~~a~~

~~J.A.~~ A power to will whatever I please -

~~M.S.~~ Yes, ~~e~~/Certainly, you may will whatever you please - But that is the very question, what you will please - What you will please is decided by your nature - Do you wish to include in the word: a power to will contrary to your nature?

~~J.A.~~ No ~~but~~/it is said, a power to choose whether I will ~~do~~/will a thing or no -

Two wills

~~M.S.~~ That is to say, that you can have two wills ~~two~~

at the same time?

~~things~~ at the same time. Two wills? Rather three - For you must have a third to decide between the two.

f223

-5- -6-

Am I free

~~J.A.~~ Do you mean/Is this to say, that I am not free

to will or
not to will
a thing as
I please?

to will to go into that room or not as I please?

~~M.S.~~ But you won't please- that very "as you please" is the bar. There are strangers in that room - your nature is not to please to go among strangers. In half an hour you have an appointment - & your nature is to be punctual & therefore in half a minute you will get up & set out, in order to keep it. You can certainly do as you please about going into that room - that is, there is no external force to prevent you - but you won't please - You won't will - the force is internal - no mysterious force - but the force of two qualities, Punctuality & Shyness, formed in you without your consent, & prior to any volition on your part. ~~in you~~ -

Supposing

~~J.A.~~ I have a good mind/Supposing that you were to

you will a
thing to prove
that you can
will it, ~~it~~
~~is still~~ you
are still
willing
according to
your nature.

that room at once to shew ~~you~~/me that ~~±~~/you can will it -

go into

~~M.S.~~ But still you will only be willing as your nature prompts you. Your nature is to be piqued - & you may be piqued into going into that room - But what does that prove?

~~J.A.~~ Still,/But, you say, I can bring my will into

such a state as that it will choose to go into that room - *There* will be an exercise of Free Will. I can overcome my shyness & lay my Punctuality aside for once.

If I know you

~~M.S.~~ I/We don't know ~~you~~/each other always enough

well enough,
I can predict
what your will
will be. Yet
this is not
infringing
upon your
free will.

to predict
whether you can or cannot - that is, whether
you will or will not - But if you do, it
will only be because some other motive
is strong enough to overcome your shyness
or punctuality. And that other motive
will have been formed by a concatenation
of circumstances, unintentionally
experienced.

The word
Responsibility
expresses
but a
low
estimate
of our
relation
to God or

of His to
us.

~~J.A.~~ Then where is our responsibility?
is the final counter=argument.

~~M.S.~~ Responsibility? I wish people
~~would use some other word. What a~~
It expresses but a low conception ~~it is~~ of the
connection/relation
between man & his Creator?

~~J.A.~~ Do you think so? You may
~~apply it to God Himself Has He not/may~~ be said to
have
the "responsibility" of ruling the Universe?
~~Is not Heaven~~ to be accountable for us?

~~M.S.~~ But what does responsibility
mean? ~~answering to does it not/~~ What
h/Has God no higher motive in administer=
ing the Universe than that He has to
answer for it - Answer to whom?

What is
Responsibility?

~~J.A.~~ To Himself.

~~M.S.~~ But does a mother take care

f225

-7- -8-

of her child only because she will have to answer for it. Of such a mother may even of a

hired

nurse, ~~your carelessness take~~ we should say that all love for ~~it~~/the child must have ceased.

In what relations is it rightly

~~J.A. But in what relations will you admit the word Responsibility, if not in that between man & his God?~~

M.S. I can understand ~~it~~/the word "Responsibility"

used?

where

you take a housekeeper & say, There are so many towels in that closet - will you take the charge of them? here is the inventory. ~~In this case~~/Where there is an express, or even a tacit agreement, by which one party offers, the other undertakes a charge, there is Responsibility incurred. The housekeeper expressly agrees to *answer for* that linen - In many human transactions, ~~a tacit agree=~~/similar

compact

~~ment~~ may be traced. Where men live together in states & societies, there is a tacit agreement that each shall not live by marauding ~~in a desert, by stealing~~/on the

rest,

~~from the rest~~, in return for which he claims the protection of the rest - & submits to certain penalties, if he infringes this agreement. There is a farther agreement, not that each shall

protect the rest, which would take up too much of his time - but that each shall pay something so that one be appointed to protect all. By becoming a subject, you claim the support of your country & you subscribe to its stipulations. Such ~~si-similar~~ compacts I can understand. You become responsible to your country & your country to you. If you do not like the terms, you can leave the country. {in another hand: Lacy}

But between God & man, there is no such agreement - Man did not ask to be born - God never told me what He had put into me - never asked me whether I would undertake the charge of myself or not - ~~I am very glad He did not~~ Many, ~~I am sure,~~ would say, No, I cannot undertake this anxious existence, even in view of the ultimate happiness secured to me - But he is too good a Father to put it into His children's power to ~~do this. Only t/~~refuse it. Think if He were to do this. ~~The~~ Timid spirits would all resign at once. According to the theory of Responsibility, ~~it seems to me too~~ ~~that~~ Suicide would be justified. For a man may step out of his agreement

if he does not like it - A servant may leave his master, if he is tired of his service -

How can I account for what I do not know is there?

J.A. But you must account for your talents, it is said.

M.S. How can I account for what I don't know is there? The housekeeper might justly say to me, you never told me you put any table cloths in, if there were none upon the List. God never told me what talents He had given me. He furnished me with no List of my powers. A man finds out all at once at forty years of age that he has a talent for something which he had no idea of. ~~that he has a talent for medicine.~~

It is degrading, it is debasing the whole relation between God & man to put it upon the footing of Responsibilities.

What is our relation to God?

J.A. Then what is our relation/ ~~I suppose you don't deny that we are/have some resp... that we have some tie to our Creator?~~

M.S. It is a training by which we are to be gradually ~~led~~/raised to share in all our Father's powers, in all His Happiness, in all His truth.

Even in the relation between master

servant, so often insisted upon, ~~let~~/if the
~~be responsible~~ but if his inter=
rests of the servant become the same as
~~mine/~~the's, if an
affection springs up, such as is seen
between an old nurse & the children she
has reared, & she espouses their cause as if
it were her own, does not a higher
relation take place? And when we come
to have one cause & purpose with God, during the
short moment even now in which we can
feel "I & my Father are one," is that
Responsibility?

The doctrine
of Free Grace,
is
Irresponsibility

~~J.A. Well, if I am to have neither
Responsibility, nor Free Will, if I am to be
trained into all manner of good without
my own agency -~~

~~(Here Calvin, who had been reading the
"Times" Newspaper, & had dropped off into a
daze, suddenly woke up, & argued)~~

tacitly

~~And quite right too./The Calvinists again~~

miserable

~~admit that Free Will implies & sa Irr &
what you call Irresponsibility! if you/we,~~

worms

~~are to be scaling heaven when & how you/we
please where would be the/our sense of
reverence towards God of awe of His judg=
ments & abhorrence of ourselves/& awe when we look~~

up

~~to God, of humiliation &
utter hopelessness when we look down upon ourselves? they ask. God
alone can call us, of his free grace &
election, according to his purpose, before
the foundation of the world -~~

{in another hand: 149}

Partial
Pre=ordination
reduces us

~~J.A. Yes, your/This Predestinarianism reduces
us to the level of animals -I am no better
than a dog to which its master all at once begins
to~~

to the level
of animals.
Universal
Pre=ordination
makes us free.

~~teaches tricks,
& which has neither act nor part in
them -~~

M.S. If this seem so to you in partial Pre=ordination, often called Election, observe that, ~~Alas! But~~ on the contrary, universal, (not partial) Pre=ordination is the only system of things by which any power at all can be given us from above. Without the laws of God, which pre=ordain the minutest connexion (I would not say consequence) of things, how

{in another hand: Boy} could man have any power at all for carrying ~~His~~/his will into effect?

How does ~~J.A.~~ But it is said his will is, according to you/

the fact this doctrine, the that will offspring of his nature, which is the off= is the offspring spring of previous circumstances, therefore of our nature his will itself is not free - make our ~~M.S. It is perfectly true /Logically it is not free~~

will in any Or rather Freedom sense not however means nothing at all in this case. For free? Freedom should we not rather substitute the word Power? And this power to put his will into effect must be wholly dependent upon Law. If circumstances were to have sometimes one consequence & sometimes another, how could we calculate, so as to produce any effect which we desire?

When we are ~~J.A. But how o/~~Often we do calculate & are deceived in are deceived! it is not ~~M.S. It is true But not/~~Not however because the

because the Law has failed, laws have but because some other Laws, unknown to us, not been is-/are concerned - which, when we know it/them, will

constant & endure our calculation, based upon absolute their effects ~~certainty/~~foreknowledge that effects can never vary or/

not to be nor be uncertain. expected, or less definite. When we know all God's laws, but because we shall be omnipotent like Him, for we we did not shall desire nothing but what He wills. know all the Laws.

f230

~~-11a-~~ -13-

J.A. This is a quibble upon the word

Omnipotence,

it will be said. Killing every wish that cannot be satisfied is not

Omnipotence - Supposing you/we know & can employ all

God's laws, it does not follow that ~~you will~~/we

shall

not desire something which those Laws will not give you/us. It is an old story, the child who cried for the moon.

What is

M.S. What is that Omnipotence? To satisfy your

God's Omnipotence?

idea of Omnipotence, must it be able to do everything which tongue can speak - to effect a contradiction - to effect that a thing should be & not be at the same time - that a thing should have been & yet not have been - to make the Past not be - to make injustice justice, cruelty mercy, wrong

right.

Does the

J.A. ~~But is not~~/Is all this necessary to satisfy the

idea of

condition

Omnipotence

that "all things are possible with God."?

include

~~M.S. All that we can say, I believe, is that, if~~

the power

If God repented, &/or wished to make the Past not to be, He would not be God. He would have

of

made a mistake. A Being ~~likewise~~, who

effecting

could wish to effect a contradiction or an

a

absurdity, would not be God - And that

contradiction?

Being who could wish to make wrong right,

we are quite sure would not be God, but

Devil. Is it necessary to make God able to

do that which He does not wish, to satisfy

your idea of Omnipotence? If not, the

same definition, which will ~~not~~/agree with your

con=

ception of God's omnipotence, will also satisfy it in man's case.

Can we share

When man knows all God's laws, he will

the Omni=

perceive the full beauty of them - it will be

potence

impossible for him to wish one to be altered.

of God?

for he will see that if one were other than it is, mankind could not attain the full happiness prepared for him - it will be impossible for Him to wish other than what God wishes - because he will see the perfection of it - Is not this the meaning of what St. John says, "we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." Then shall we no longer say, "Father, not my will, but thine be done." but "Father, thy will is mine" - & therefore all that we desire *will* be done - ¶ Do we wish for a greater extension of omnipotence than this? Faith truly makes men omnipotent.

f231

~~-12-~~ -14-

Rationalism
takes the
Creator away
from his Creation
& leaves
only Law.
What is the
difference
between God
& His Law?

~~J.A. But what a miserable universe you
make of it. This/This dreary Rationalism, it is
said,
stripped of the universe of the presence of God,
& causes it to be inhabited only by His Laws!
What a
dreary religion this Rationalism is!~~

M.S. But what is the difference between
God & His laws? His Laws are, after all,
only the expression of His thoughts. If
thought is invariable in Him, so must
His laws be also invariable - But we
have got into our heads that Law is
some mysterious chain, which God
creates & then leaves - a machine like
the watch, which the Maker manufactures
& then sends to a distance out of his
own hands - If however it is correct to
define Law as but the unvarying thought
of God, God & Law are the same thing.

~~J.A. I cannot admit your definition -
We can break & are always breaking
the laws of God & again according to what
you say, a prayer would be the breaking
of His law, since an answered prayer
alters a thought of God.~~

~~M.S. Let us discuss the subject of
prayer another time. But with
regard to breaking a law of God, I
deny that we can - The/Great confusion
arises from our using the same word
Law in two totally distinct senses -
in a physical & a legislative sense -
viz. as the cause & the effect.~~

f232

~~-13-~~ -15-

Law is no

J.A. ~~When you have/~~It is said that to
"explained

explanation
of anything

away" every

thing by Law, ~~we shall be/~~is to enable us to do
without
a God.

Law does
not dispense
with God.
It brings
us back
to God

M.S. But, ~~my dear Sir,~~ Law is no explana=
tion of anything - Law is simply a generalization,
a categorization of facts. Law is neither
a cause, nor a reason, nor a power, nor
a coercive force - it is nothing but a general
formula,

{in another hand: Clift}

a Statistical table - ~~Why,~~ Law brings us
continually back to God, instead of carrying
us away from Him. ~~What a confusion~~
~~arises from this undefined idea of Law -~~

To say that a stone must fall *because of*
the Law of Attraction is but a name to say that

one

stone

must fall *because* another does, or because
the Earth tends to fall towards the Sun
The Law of Gravitation is merely a general
formula, embracing all these facts.

So Quetelet makes his computations that
so many people will steal that so many
widowers will marry 3 times - & we call
it & justly (supposing the computation
correct) a Law- & then, with our vague
ideas that a Law is a coercive force, we cry
Oh! how horrid - then there has been a Law
made, which compels so many people to
steal in a twelvemonth. But the Law, [which
is merely a *Statistical Table*, has no *power*
to make people steal - So, You might as
well say that Newton's Law has the

power to make the stone fall, as Quetelet's table to make the people steal. Newton's Law is nothing but the Statistics of Gravitation - it has no Power whatever -

Law neither explains nor compels.

Let us get rid of the idea of Power from Law altogether - call Law tabulation of facts, or what you will - anything rather than suppose that it either explains or compels -

~~J.A.~~ But ~~surely~~ there is another meaning to Law, besides this - The Divine Legislator makes a Law - "Thou shalt do no murder". the human, Jews shall not sit in the House of Commons -

But there is another sense to Law.

~~M.S.~~ Yes, Law indeed in the first meaning which we have been discussing, carries us back to another kind of Law, a first Cause, a conscious intelligent Will. If Law is in itself no Cause, it must bring us back to the Cause of Law. If Law has no power in itself, it must be the expression of a Will or Power, mental not physical. And thus Laws are only the expression of the thoughts of God.

the

~~J.A.~~ But these are quite different things. ~~There are thoughts & thoughts.~~ The thought, "Thou shalt do no murder" is quite a different kind of thought from "Attraction is proportionate to or diminishes as the square of distance" -

For murders are done - but stones do not not fall to the ground -

~~M.S.~~ "Thou shalt do no murder" means If

thou doest murder, such & such consequences shall follow. ~~If t/~~The Law of Attraction means If the stone is not lodged in the fork of a tree, it will fall to the ground - Where is the difference? ~~I deny that~~ we can not break a law of God. We see, ~~on the contrary~~ that we do not. Such education & such temp= tations acting upon such natures, we see, by Quetelet's tables, that such a number of murders takes place - Is there any breaking of a Law here? Such a body being brought within such a distance of such another body, such an Attraction takes place. ~~I do not see, after all, much difference in the Legislative & in the Physical Sense - this law is the expression of the thoughts of God in either case.~~

~~J.A. Then why are o/Our thoughts not/would also be Laws! if law is nothing but the expression of thought.~~

~~M.S. This would be -if 1st our thoughts were invariable, as in Him in whom there can be no variableness neither/who "is not a man, that he should shadow of turning" - & 2nd if thought & action in us were one, as they are in Him - that is, if we had power - "His word was law" is an expression which is even used of men- word being the manifestation of thought -~~

~~J.A. Well then when you have reduced every thing to a formula, & Moral Responsi- bility to a table of facts, what have you left at al of Conscious Agency?~~

repent"

~~M.S. Why, there are two meanings to the word law & we are constantly confusing them - constantly mistaking the cause for the effect.~~

Law is 1. an order of things
2. a will in an intelligent Being

Law is 1st a general formula, expressing - not explaining - facts - 2nd an intention, will or Power in a conscious intelligent Being, divine or human -
All calculation, all foresight becomes nonsense,

{in another hand: Brooks}

if we admit no Law or pre=ordination, no inevitable & unalterable connexion of facts- If "the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness nor shadow of turning" governs the world, how can phenomena, which are but the manifestation of His thoughts, be variable & indefinite?

Doctrine of Reward & Punishment

~~J.A. Then you do away entirely with the The whole doctrine of Reward & Punishment is by this theory, swept away/sweep it off recklessly at a~~

~~blow.~~ for how can the human being, whose will is formed for him, be, in any way, with justice, a subject of reward or punishment? he only does what he is made to do. The Creator has made His creations what they are - How can He punish or reward them for it?

How erroneous?

~~M.S. How can He indeed? And how could any one ever think He did? Why then, l/Let us give up altogether the ideas & the words, implying reward & punishment - Take all the Sermons, all the little good/pious books you written or preached ever - & what, if you/we come~~

to

analysis, is the fundamental idea expressed in every one.

of them? Sin is very nice, if God by an arbitrary will did not burn us for it. They lose sight altogether of the eternal, imitable (I will not say connexion, but) identity of right & happiness, of wrong & misery.

Erroneous
theory
that God
makes

~~J.A.~~ How can there be any right & wrong if there is no "Free Will"? it is asked.

allowances.

~~M.S.~~ It is a law of God that a certain wind acting upon a ~~certain~~ tooth in a certain state, tooth ache

shall be the consequence - Because you could not help it, does that tooth ache cease to be pain? Do you say, It was not my fault - I will ~~lie down~~ & not care about it. On the contrary, the very pain is the motive which compels you to try to get rid of it & to avoid it in future - Right & Wrong are as inimitable as Pain & Ease - the one to produce happiness, the other misery - And ~~they~~/we talk of "God making allowances for the frailty of His creatures" "not being prone to mark what they do amiss" "having mercy on His erring children" ~~Why~~ This mercy would be the height of cruelty. As long as His laws have not knocked us about till they have knocked out every vestige of sin left in us, mercy means to leave us in sin & consequently in misery.

Why?

~~J.A.~~ Oh no! it does not mean that it means Mercy for *past* sin would mean a

~~M.S.~~ But what does that mean? A

{in another hand: 153 s s}
 change of mind [in God. What does it
 change in us? in that which is passed?

J.A. It is said to mean that God, knowing our
 weakness, makes allowance for it & does
 not require from us more than we are
 able to do -

M.S. Allowances for what? Allowance
 to do wrong - e/allowance to be miserable.
~~we don't wish for such allowance.~~

J.A. ~~No, I/It is said to mean a remittance/remitting of the~~
 punishment- for what we *have* done
 that is wrong.

M.S. Punishment, in the sense of the
 immediate suffering consequent on the deed,
 & designed by the Eternal Laws to drive
 the criminal to another course, I/we can
 understand - & such punishment I-am/we are
 not such a fools as to wish to have
 remitted. But punishment, when there
 is no further power of amendment, - there
 is hardly a human being, who would
 wish to inflict. ~~it.~~

J.A. ~~Then burn for all license! With~~
~~your unaccountability/unaccountable creatures, your passive obedience,~~
~~& exemption from all punishment, let every~~
~~one give a free course to every passion &~~
~~say, I am not to blame - I hail the~~
~~Dawn of a new Era, a Millennium of~~
~~Science.~~

M.S. Why your s ~~Don't be frightened~~

as a free gift, it seems to me there can exist than this no more immoral doctrine.

God *gives* us nothing. We are to work out a happiness, like His, in ourselves, in accordance with His laws.

In what way
What does
the story
of the
Penitent
Thief support
the doctrine
of death bed
repentance?

~~J.A. — Then what do you do with the~~
The Story of the Penitent Thief? so often quoted, is not relevant.

~~M.S.~~ It is very evident that the man was very far from being all evil - The very high state of spiritual perception necessary to believe in Christ's kingdom at a moment when his nearest friends ~~believed it/~~considered their hopes blasted, & his kingdom destroyed - to pray not for life, not for being saved from the Cross, but only for salvation - shews that he was already very far on the road to happiness - As far then as he was right, he will enjoy happiness, identical with the right - *In* his wrong, not *for* his wrong he will suffer till his evil becomes all good. But to obtain happiness complete, eternal, while there are any of God's laws unknown, or unobserved by us, is an impossibility.

Is the selfish
man happy?

~~J.A. — But your/~~This conclusion is it is said contradicted
by our every day experience. You see the selfish man enjoying, the good man suffering - the criminal infinitely happier than the Philanthropist.

~~M.S.~~ Happier do ~~you~~/we call him? Insensibility to privation is not happiness.

As a medical man thinks any pain better than paralysis, inflammation more hopeful than mortification - so the murderer, who is conscious of no suffering, is in a worse state than the man who knowing & observing some laws, suffers for his ignorance of others. Therefore I say, not that misery is the inevitable consequence of evil, but that evil is misery - identical with it.

In the ordinary sense of the Free Will, God Himself has no "Free Will"

~~J.A. Well, it matters little. If we have no free will, no power to avert this misery, it does not much signify what your laws & your identities are. Man is "predestined to misery".~~

~~M.S.~~ Only on his way to something else, & in order to give him something else.

X *What* is the Creator's own character? ~~(I am obliged to use our irreverent human words)~~ This I do not like to say cannot, because that seems as if He would if He could. But we cannot suppose the Creator willing evil. In this sense, God Himself has no Free Will. The nature of the Spirit of Goodness is turned unvaryingly to good. What may we suppose is His object with His creatures? Not ~~to give~~ that they should attain a free will to choose between good & evil, but such a nature as that nothing but good will attract - no evil will tempt it. Surely, if you were bringing

up a child, you would not wish to educate it to make a free choice whether it will be a murderer or not - but to be one to whom murder is impossible. When therefore our natures, by the Creator's laws have been brought into that state, that we not only know that right is happiness, but feel it, know how "to incline our hearts to keep this law," we shall not will to commit evil - that is, - not that we shall have acquired free will to make a choice between good & evil - but we shall no longer be capable of willing evil - and without this, what boots all the Free Will in the world - if we have nothing, no immutable ~~pre=~~Laws ~~ordination~~ & dispositions of things, to incline our wills to the side of good? If there were no ~~pre=~~ordination - no inevitable consequences, ~~justice~~/right would produce sometimes happiness & sometimes misery, & there would be nothing to calculate ~~by~~/upon, no reason for preferring right to wrong ~~virtue to vice~~, nothing to influence the will & if even there were Free Will, nothing to incline that will more to good than to evil, unless it be this ~~pre=~~ordained connection between good & happiness, evil & misery.

~~Shelley, Jacob Abbott, Mary/illeg M.S.~~

[in another hand: Canny?]

Necessity ~~J.A. You Necessitarianism, you/it is said does~~
away

VII

with

all spontaneous action & liberty - all love
& sympathy between the Creator & the
creature - ~~you~~ substitutes for the Father of
mercies the stern blind lifeless Fate of
heathendom - "Necessity, thou mother of the world!"

~~Shelley It is true a/Admitting the~~
existence of God, He is also subjected to
the dominion of an immutable Necessity.

What is
Necessity? ~~M.S. But I do not admit the word~~ Necessity
~~it~~ appears to me a word without meaning
in this case. Necessity means a *yielding*
to need & represents the Almighty as
doing that which He would not desire,
if he were not yielding to need. But is
this the case? shall we not rather say
the Almighty is acting in accordance with
the Spirit of Right, *which He is*.

~~Shelley~~ But, admitting His existence,
it is said, he could not act otherwise than He does.
In the immense chain of antecedent &
consequent no one could occupy any other
place than it does occupy.

Is God
subject to
Necessity? ~~M.S. The word "could" is what I/It is in the word~~
"could" ~~I think~~ that resides
the fallacy. ~~object to.~~ It implies that the Eternal
Spirit would do otherwise if He could.
For the word Necessity I should like to
substitute Right - the Spirit of Right.

~~J.A. Well, but/Did the Creator made/make Right~~

~~M.S. B/by an arbitrary will? do you~~

f242

Can God
make
wrong
right?

~~think? Can? do you think/could the Creator could make
Wrong Right? Perhaps we can only answer
that/this by saying the Creator God is the Spirit
of Right - if he were not, & if we could fancy Him
willing what was wrong, he would not
be God -~~

~~J.A. Then that I/Is this making Right the
Master of God - It I/Is it making Him undergo
the Necessity of Right?~~

~~M.S. It does not appear to me to be so -
But I believe it is one of the questions
which we might be contented to leave
unsolved Some say perhaps we may be
able to see how God is Right & Right is
God - & that it is in fact not, how God~~

~~decreed/decrees~~

what

~~was/is to be Right. At present I believe
we can only make a "reductio ad absurdum"
& say if we could fancy a Being willing
what was not right, that Being would
not be God - Would you rather believe
that that/Right is right because a God wills it -
or that God wills it because it is right?
Does God's Omnipotence extend to
making what is wrong right?~~

Does God
make
Right or is
He Right?

~~J.A. That is only a mere quibble.~~

~~M.S. No, it is not. It is not meant to be so -~~

only

a question

The conception of a God among the ancients
is not, we see, generally that of a perfect
God. They did not require perfection in
their Gods - Power was the great charac=
teristic, which they worshipped & they
deified this quality, combining it with
other imperfect, merely human, qualities.

The moderns, on the contrary, require perfection as the attribute of Deity. They call their God perfect - & having endowed Him with certain qualities, such as anger, revenge, changeableness &c, believe, either by authority or indifference that such qualities do not interfere with Perfection. But whence do we obtain the conception of a perfect God? ~~And why do we believe God to be perfect? The first question we may answer by saying - from the extension of those~~ qualities which, by the Spirit of Right in us, we recognise as good in man, we conceive of as infinite.

How can there be any antagonism between Justice & Goodness?

~~J.A. Well, but you will admit/~~But it is said the quality of *just* in a man is ~~to be~~ good - Now, Justice raised to Perfection in God ~~(which you call anger)~~ must induce him to punish sin, would induce him, if not tempered with mercy, to exterminate the sinner.

~~M.S.~~ I cannot understand the antagonism of Justice & Goodness - as usually represented in God. "Justice, tempered with Mercy" is a mother who ~~gives~~/rewards her child a little ~~sweetmeat~~, too much & then repents & says, I forgive you - ~~&~~ give me a kiss.

~~J.A. No, I deny it -~~ The phrase means it is said that God is inflexible in carrying out His laws - & in awarding punishment to those who break them - but that repentance & faith will satisfy His justice, as well as the destruction of the sinner.

f244

~~-4-~~ -27-

[in another hand: illeg Steuerer?]

But what does ~~that~~/this mean? Either

the

consequences which God has attached to Sin, for the purpose of weaning us from it are too great or they are not - If they are too great, it was Injustice, not Justice tempered with Mercy. If they are not we are not such fools as to wish the consequences remitted. For Mercy would then be Cruelty, even to our understandings.

But what is the true state of the case?

What is really God's goodness? ~~He~~/It is

that

which has

organized the world so as to bring all to happiness by bringing all to His own truth & goodness. What is His justice? ~~He~~
It is that which has organized the world so

as to

bring all to truth & goodness, which is Happiness, & to expel all sin & error, not by confining it in a place by itself, but by transmuting it into light & good. The

propositions are identical. Therefore

Justice & Goodness are one & the same thing - & cannot be divided. Though that Goodness which would overlook sin & that Justice which would discover &

To satisfy ~~w~~/whose punish it, are certainly at variance.

sense of justice must ~~J.A.~~ But sin deserves to be punished -

sin be punished? it is said its punishment is necessary to satisfy

man's own sense of justice - & to prevent

the consequences which sin left unpu-

nished would produce in the community.

What does
the word
"deserve"
mean?

~~M.S.~~ What does the word "deserve" mean in this case? The circumstances which have made you what you are are often anterior to your very existence.

~~J.A.~~ Yes, but I had not been what I am, they would not have had the same working for me, it is said.

How gladly
would we
not have
been other
than we are!

~~M.S.~~ I had not bene what I am! But how gladly would I not have been what I am! How gladly would I have received a different disposition when I set out! Did I make myself? ~~No, I/~~If I had, how different would I have been!

~~J.A.~~ Yes, that is the way you fine philosophers always reason away the blame from yourselves upon your Creator Pray, why don't you make yourself now what you so gladly would have been?

What is "I"?

~~M.S.~~ Who is myself? An aggregate made up of hereditary constitution, geographical & topographical influences (who knows the effect of the various kinds of food or of climate?) the impressions produced by education & circumstances, & ~~all/~~many of these at a time when no one pretends that the human being has what is called Responsibility, or Free Agency. I have my natural character - our family character, the character of my age - the character of my climate

~~J.A.~~ But who gave you a will to control

~~your own actions & modify your own character.~~

Of course, it is admitted that a man ~~only~~ begins only

to be

a free agent, when his will has the dominion over his own actions.

M.S. And what is his will?

J.A. The "effluence" of his nature - the spontaneous action of his character.

Free Will, in

Shelley Suppose I were to say, I was born by chance

in its ordinary sense, means

of London/Sussex - it happened to be the year 1852/1792 & I ~~chanced~~/fell upon parents of the ~~city~~/county

the will acting by chance

J.A. You would say, There is no chance -

If there is no

Shelley Indeed? Do you admit no chance?

chance, there is

Then you can admit/if there is no chance, there is no Free Will. For Free

no Free Will, in

Will is only the will acting by chance - i.e. not determined by any motive.

this sense.

J.A. ~~Well, between you, you may rejoice~~

~~in having made man as passive a tool~~

~~in the hands of Fate as the plant or~~

~~the animal. He/Then, it is said, man is obeying God's decrees,~~

alike when doing wrong and when acting

right - is & breaking a law of God as much

when ~~resisting temptation as when yielding~~/he resists

temptation as he keeps one when he

yields to good feeling -

Shelley ~~certainly~~ If God is the author/has

decreed

~~of good, he is/has also the author of decreed evil.~~

M.S. ~~Excuse me I think you are~~

~~both of you~~/But this is confusing decree & law. Were

it

a decree of God that Calvin should

burn Servetus, ~~he would have no right to~~/there would

be

no Right or Wrong

f247

~~-7-~~ -30-

Difference
between
Law &
Decree.

~~alter it, if he could.~~ It is true that it
was by the laws of God that Calvin
was in such a state of mind as to
burn Servetus & therefore he was not
to be blamed for it- he could not
help it.

{in another hand: Thomas}

~~J.A. you are/~~This, it is said, is only putting the
difficulty

a step further back. According to ~~you/~~this,
God is as much accountable for moral
as for physical evil, for Buonaparte's
universal earthquake as for that of
Lisbon.

~~Shelley Certainly he is, that is, the
Spirit of the Universe is.~~

~~M.S. Well, take it as you put it.
Link for today the difference between
"law & decree" - accept even the word
"accountable" as you have /here applied it.~~

The answer is, Do not Buonaparte's sins teach us the laws
of God? With the animals, ~~to whom~~
~~you have compared us,~~ it is different
They do act, as Heaven has ~~decreed/willed~~ they
should.

~~J.A. So do we, you say/~~it is said. But only,

~~M.S. Yes,~~ on our way to something else -
We do it that, by our mistakes, we may
find truth, by our errors knowledge,
by our suffering happiness, by our evil
good.

~~J.A. Yes/And so, your cruel God tempts~~

Does God
tempt
man?

Then, it is said God tempts
the man & ~~then~~/afterwards punishes him for sins to
which he could not help yielding.

~~Shelley Yes, I must say, Jacob Abbott,~~
~~your~~ God ~~made~~/makes man such as he is & then
damned/s him for being so.

~~M.S.~~ Not punishes nor condemns -
How could man have learnt the essential
difference between good & evil if ~~they~~/he
had not suffered the consequences of
evil? Brutes never do ~~know~~/learn it. & they
never suffer - they never make mistakes.
they act by the ~~desire~~/will of God - instigated
immediately by Him.

If beasts
without
reason
always do
right. And
if we, with
our Reason,
are always
doing wrong
-would it
not have
been better

~~J.A. How much better then for us, if~~
~~we had all been beasts. They always do~~
~~right. Because they have no reason -~~
~~And we, with our Reason, as it is~~
~~called, are always doing wrong.~~

~~M.S. Yes, because we made a~~
~~mistake.~~

if God had
created
man
without
reason?

~~J.A.~~ Then how much better it will be said to put
us beyond the possibility of mistake!
The human race has done more mischief,
~~you will allow,~~ than all the brute races
put together. And all ~~along of its~~/in consequence of
this
terrible curse of Reason!

~~M.S. Well, leaving you to your brute~~
~~bliss, if you like it. You/But we must grant~~
that, if mankind is to attain at last
to the happiness of God, this cannot be done
by instigating them every moment by instinct -
for the beast is perfect from the beginning.

Does God
create
sinners
without
{in another hand: Byson?}

J.A. ~~Then you/~~This is not instituting life merely as
a
foil for heaven to teach man by what
he has suffered to appreciate what he has
has gained.

their
consent
as

M.S. ~~No,~~ but as a means of teaching
him what is suffering & what is happiness.
& how to avoid the former & gain the latter.

warnings
to the rest?

J.A. ~~And Buonaparte & the other poor
wretches you create, without their consent,
as warnings to the rest - to suffer in - for
the character of scarecrows. At least
they ought to have double pay hereafter
for having taken such a part here.~~

wretches,

M.S. Mankind is to create mankind.
And the best argument for a future state
is undoubtedly the condition of the wicked
here. That they are the greatest sufferers
every body will agree. Some might say,
the existence of a good man, ever so much
tried, is worth having, even should it end
here. It is even possible that a good man
might consent to sacrifice himself for
his race & say, I will spend 70 years of
suffering here, for the sake of benefitting
mankind, tho' there be no other life.
But is it possible that there should be
created without their consent millions of unhappy

of whom none can say ~~that~~ *their* existence
is worth having, if there be no eternity,
in which that existence will become so?
Is this consistent with any idea of Justice?
The good might do without another life, the
bad cannot.

Then heaven

ought to be
for the bad
good - The
not for the
bad are the
greatest
sufferers
have the
Will they

have the
greatest
reward?

The

common
universal
intuition
of Mankind
is against
all this.

~~J.A.~~ then it is God will be said, not the Devil,
who

makes us sin - & to refuse would be to
disobey. He makes us play all manner
of pranks for the public benefit.
But why should it be ~~me~~/I? And ~~again~~
~~I say,~~ is it not unfair that I should
not have more than the others of glory
& happiness in a future state, if I have
been chosen to play the necessary ~~part~~
but unpleasant part of rogue in this? The
predestinated
villain ought to be rewarded for perform=
ing ~~well~~/well his part - & punished, if he
were to refuse it.

~~Shelley - There is no Reward or
Punishment at all in the case - Desert
is equally absurd. In the Necessarians'
creed these words have no meaning.~~

~~J.A. It won't do. It won't do. The~~
The common universal intuition of all
mankind it is said is against this ~~very illeg~~ It
cries

out I ~~know~~/feel I could have done
otherwise, if I would. No need to
tell me or to prove it. I feel it.
You can no more persuade me of the
contrary than that I don't feel pain.

~~M.S.~~ What is called *Law* in the
world of Matter, of which no one denies
the existence, is, ~~I believe,~~ what ~~Mr.~~
~~Shelley~~ is called *Necessity* in the world of
Mind. As there could be no calculation,
no foresight, no Physical Science, if the former
did not exist, so there could be no
metaphysical Science, if it were not for the latter.

Shelley

If there
were no
Laws of
the Human
mind,
could there
be any
legislation,
Political
economy,
history.

~~Certainly,~~ a/All legislation, diplomacy, history,
Political economy would cease, if there
were no laws of the Human Mind. An
inducement would act upon the same
mind one way to day, another tomorrow.
Mrs. Fry would be killing or robbing
her female prisoners - & Cain would
be preaching fraternity to Abel. But
these catastrophes do not happen - Given
the character & circumstances of a man,
& you can prove what he will do like
a Mathematical ~~Problem~~/Proposition.

{in another hand: Brooks}

~~J.A. That is to say~~ You can it is admitted in

some

cases &/but not in others. Some persons are
proverbially vague & uncertain - & you often say,
for this action I can find no cause at all.

~~M.S.~~ But even ~~the sayer~~/he who says this does not
suppose it is done *without* a motive.

Such expressions are generally made
use of in moments of unphilosophical
impatience. But supposing they are
not, all ~~you can say~~/that is true is that you are
unacquainted with all the Motives.

~~Mr. Abbott says truly~~ "I could have
done otherwise if I would" If I would -
does not that mean If I had had
another ~~motive~~ will - another motive?

~~J.A. No, it means if I had exerted
my will to resist the motive, the tempta=
tion.~~

~~M.S. That is to say if you had had a stronger motive.~~

~~Shelley Are we not constantly proving these principles in daily life -- presenting motives to influence the will of those about us?~~

If I am the passive instrument of my own motives, what is the use of my making any struggle?

~~J.A. Then am I a passive instrument in the hands of your motives? If so, I may as well give up the struggle at once. There is no reason why I should follow right rather than wrong, esteem the one rather than the other/ or dislike.~~

~~M.S. If you mean that because a mad dog cannot help biting you, you are therefore to caress & not to avoid him, - you are to esteem Hydrophobia equally advantageous to your health & spirits as a state of vigorous enjoyment, I may differ, from you. but, *il ne faut pas se disputer de goûts* But if you mean that you cannot consider man is the object of praise or blame, that to say a man shall suffer because he deserves it is absurd, we are agreed.~~

If I can't prevent evil, what is the use of any recognising it?

~~J.A. We are not at all agreed. If I can't prevent however the mad=dog from biting me, what is the use it will be said of my acknowledging the inconvenience of being bitten? It would be better for me if I did not.~~

~~M.S. But if there were no pre=ordi=nated, no inevitable connexion of motives & actions, if a motive sometimes produced one line of action & sometimes another, we could not calculate upon ourselves. After~~

f252v

a long life spent in protecting & cherishing
my child, I could not be sure that to=
morrow I might not put its eyes out -
~~And only think h/~~How unfair, if, after years
spent in gambling & drinking, ~~that~~ I
should wake up some fine morning &
find myself as innocent as the Virgin
Mary. We know, ~~th~~ & do not contend with the Law -
~~with the Law of what would be the~~
consequences, with regard ~~to my~~ health, of such a course
~~Oh w/~~Why cannot we learn & acknowledge the
moral as well as the Physical Laws?

Add Mss 45838, JS and FN parts distinct. Adam Matthew microfilm reel 52, diskette, f92-140; 141-319, 319 ff total, photocopy of f1-162; ff1-92 is Man's Will and God's Law, in Sugg 1: ff93-147 is A Short History, JA, etc., in Sugg ff148-319 is novel, Portia etc., in Sugg 2:38-180 more illeges to check start JS exchange at f21

Note: This first section of the volume was largely in two columns, one of FN's comments, the other of Dr Sutherland's, but with the comments so interspersed as to be extremely difficult to follow. Instead of imitating placement in the original folios the transcription has been broken up and grouped for comprehension; one section has the novel again, Fulgentia and Portia ff151-57, and again later;

[11:698-781]

f1 left

FN: I MAN'S WILL & GOD'S LAW.

Free will

&

necessity:

words which have
perplexed the
human race,
because they are
mere "words".

JS: On the contrary, "free will" has a very definite meaning.

1. The absolute freedom of *willing* is matter of experience. 2. The freedom of *doing*, which is quite another matter, is bounded by external conditions or by internal considerations. 1 & 2 are often confounded, & have a mark of the obscurity which surrounds the controversy.

Without the freedom of willing there could be no responsibility: no choice: no obedience. Of course, the absolute freedom adverted to exists within the limit of one's sphere of being only, and cannot extend beyond it.

f1r

FN: It is constantly said
that, "Necessity" &
Freedom of the Will"
are subjects beyond
human comprehension.
Milton once clinched
the nail. And now it has
been repeated "usque
ad nauseam" by
the idle, the cowardly
& the silly, who are
miscalled "the world."

I believe the words
"Free Will" and "Necessity"
to be words without
meaning - and therefore
I do not intend to use
them - especially as
some are frightened
when you touch these
words, & feel they
have lost their God,
and others are
hardened, and say
they don't want
your God.

I would wish to
consider the following

f1v

question concerning
human will without
touching these dangerous
words.

Question

Does human will
accord with definite
& invariable laws?
Do human volitions,
in other words,
manifest such laws?
Or can human
will be called a self-
determining power,
irrespective of *any*
traceable law?

is human will
in accordance
with law, as
other things are?

JS: The use of the word "law" here requires careful definition. The idea of law was drawn first from social relations, and then when science arose the social idea was carried naturally into the material world. We talk of "the common law" & of "the law of gravitation". Now in neither of these senses is volition under law at all. The very faculty is the opposite of law in that sense.

Volition acts within bounds or limits, and there is a certain similarity in its manifestations in all men as beings of the same order. In this sense alone is there a law. Except in this sense human volition is a self determining power. It is above all law that can be conceived, and of its own free choice alone can it subject its own action to law. One of its grandest powers is the power of submission to law, but that very power shows its superiority to law.

FN: This is a question which bears directly on the moral government of mankind.

And, in considering it, I must allude to this, ~~fact~~, viz. that it has frequently been admitted that the human will *does* bear traces of being in accordance with

f2r

FN: definite and invariable laws - but that ~~all~~ most writers, among others, Kant and Fichte, have recoiled from the admission & said that it ~~appeared~~ was so contrary to *right* that, although it *appeared* in accordance with *fact*, it could not really be so.

f2l:

JS: The only traces of action according to law prevented by volition is in the similarity of its manifestations in different individuals of the race already referred to, and whatever the idealist school may say it is simply a mistake to say that "similarity" is law or anything like law.

FN: I would therefore begin the enquiry with the two following questions:

1. what can we learn (with regard to this) from actual observation & experience?

2. what would be most satisfactory (with regard to this) to what we feel to be morally right?

in other words,

1. what is?

2. what ought to be?

[If it is said, "we can learn nothing with

1. What is? with regard to human will.

2. what ought to be?

f2v

regard to these things from human observation or ~~from~~ with human powers of mind;

JS: I never heard this said. I don't know who would say it.

FN: we *must*
have recourse to super-
human ~~observati~~
communications," I
have nothing more
to say.

I think that by
human observation
& enquiry, we arrive
at the *hypothesis*
of an omnipotent &
righteous Being - that,
by what are called
"superhuman" commu-
nications we arrive
at what is called
a "certainty" of a
capricious and ~~not~~ un-
righteous Being.

JS: You assume this; - although it
may be granted at the outset that inasmuch
as there is an evident adaptation, amidst
disharmonies, between man & the world,
and inasmuch as in all ages the idea of
God in some sense has arisen in the human
mind that the induction is a simple
one - namely that the Universe & man
came from the same being. As to the
character of that being however so conceived if
it is simply matter of experience that early
nations & men have differed more than
they have ever differed about any other
subject. There is perhaps no one moral
attribute of the Supreme Being that is found
in all religious systems or notions of
merely human origin. The *idea of*
God is universal as far as we know. The
idea of the character of God varies with
every changing notion of humanity.

FN: But, if ~~there~~ it is desired
to pursue the enquiry
upon human observation
& experience,]

JS: This is simply an error. It is
surely possible for God to reveal himself
to the creature he has made. If he
has so revealed himself the revelation
must be a correct one. "He cannot deny
himself." The only question is how he revealed himself.

FN: I ask:

f3r

FN: 1. does Human Will 1. What is?
accord with definite
laws,

JS: only in the sense already stated

FN: or may it be
called self determining,
without dependence
on law?

JS: yes

Third hand: # The question does not seem to me to
"grant" anything. If men have differed
about what ought to be, it does not follow
that no satisfactory answer will ever be
found for the question,
still less that we shd not
try to find one.

FN: 2. how would the 2. What ought
government of the to be?
superhuman Power,
on which man
depends, appear to
be a *right* one to
human comprehension?

JS: This is the question of all ages and times. What ought to be? would never have been asked if the fundamental conception of God's character & of moral government had not varied in every individual man by light of nature. The very question grants the whole case, namely that there is a striking discrepance between what various men think there "*ought to be*" & what the same men think "*there is.*"

FN: [And here I must make another diversion. Human will is not, as it often appears to be thought, a separate force.

JS: It is a separate independent faculty. Third hand or JS: I should like to know what are the respondent's views about the "faculty" of electricity, divested of its manifestations & the apparatus in which it is produced.

FN: It is the result of ~~the~~ a man's thoughts, feelings, wishes. The man's thoughts, feelings, wishes are the result of organization and circumstances.

JS: No it is not! Its *manifestations* are bounded in the way you mention. Its results are governed but *not always* by "thoughts feelings wishes & the result of organization". The faculty itself *never*. By training you may give it a direction as you can every thing else including even the law of gravitation. But the faculty like the law remain the same.

FN: Given the hypothesis of an omnipotent and

f3v

FN: righteous Being ~~he~~ such
could not create
other perfect beings
~~he~~ neither could ~~not~~ he create
imperfect beings,
without a *certainty*
of their arriving at
perfection. How
can they arrive at
perfection except
through His laws?

JS: I simply reply that
a perfectly righteous and
omnipotent Being *has*
created other beings with
certain faculties. That these
beings in all ages have re-
-cognized their responsibility in
some sense. That one of
these faculties is freedom of
will, and that if there be a
such a *certainty* the WILL
must *will* perfection, otherwise
it is unattainable. This is
in *Human experience*, God's law
in the matter of perfection.

FN: [When I say, "*could*
not," I mean, *it*
would not be in
accordance with the
nature of an omnipotent
& righteous Being]

JS: "Who can by searching find out God? Who can discover the Almighty to perfection"? The problem is a mightier one than you contemplate. You contemplate animated stones. God contemplates something infinitely higher. Up to this point you desiderate a human being with certain faculties sub-ordinated to certain laws which you consider the best, and having so conceived of your "man" you charge the almighty with the duty of finishing a work he has left unfinished. There may be a world where such a process is to go on, but it is certainly not this world, except in the case of the lower animals, who are perfect in their kind. You forget Man's absolute responsibility which is his.

FN: To return.

1. when we say that	Answers to
we trace laws in the	1. what is?
phenomena of nature,	
we mean either that	
we trace uniformities	
so invariable that	
they may be considered	

f4r

FN: as the laws of a Power which wills this invariableness; or that such uniformities are as invariable as they would be, if attributable to a Will & a Power which render them so.

JS: In abjuring the Pope, here we as a matter of mental necessity had to take refuge in another pope with a wig instead of a tiara. I sometimes think that we have either done so or are rapidly doing so. Witness "Combes Constitution." The so called "*philosophie positive*," "Miss Martineau" & "Mr Atkinson" save the mark!

FN: With respect to human volitions, it can only be said that, the more widely & the

more closely we observe,
the more we shall find
them to be examples
of such uniformities
as we call law.

JS: This is the same proposition
restated it confounds the
manifestations of will with the
faculty.

FN: The phenomena of the
Will are so complicated
that, *without* such wide &
close observation, it
is *impossible*, - *with*

JS: It is not so difficult to arrive
at the psychology of the matter.

FN: it, it is *difficult* - to
trace in them those
relations of simultaneity
& succession (or, in
other words, those uniformities)

f4v

FN: which we call laws.

JS: {f4r} There are, or, rather, alas! there
were spiritual laws or, better and truer,
a spiritual economy (for the term
law is cold, frigid and irrational). This
economy is the reminiscence of humanity,
of the time when the Father dwelt in
his house. But we WOULD NOT.
glory.

FN: Volitions originate in
(and exist in uniform
relations with) sensations
& thoughts. Sensations,
thoughts & volitions
originate in (and
exist in uniform
relations with)
organization &
circumstances.

For the truth of this,
we can only refer to
observations & experience.

Third hand: ~~Simple observation.~~ Repetition.

What does it signify whose
argument it is?

JS: This is Combes argument
stated in another form, but
it arises solely from want of
analysis, & confounds
manifestations with faculty.

Experience teaches us that the will is absolutely free. Experience teaches us that its external manifestations are conditioned and that not even so constantly as to give the idea of "law".

FN:

2. What ought to be?

2. If we consider *phenomena* only, they tell sometimes one way, sometimes another. But if we consider the *character & tendency of law*, we arrive at some hypothesis regarding a perfect Being.

Given as an Hypothesis a Being omnipotent & **{f5r}** perfectly righteous, the existence of other beings would follow.

JS: {f4v} Whence comes conscience? from God. Is it or is it not a fact that the entire human race as a race has sent up its prayers & groans & bloody sacrifices for "mercy" & its petitions for favour "Grace". to Heaven ever since the world began? Why so? Conscience.

Your perfectly righteous being who could not be "merciful" or "gracious" has laid on all his creatures an instinct requiring both mercy and grace.

f5r

JS: This is simply a hypothesis founded on a hypothesis. Creation did not so originate, otherwise the Creator has no free will & was subject to "destiny."

FN:

A Perfect God must create.

For a Being would not be omnipotent & righteous, unless His existence became the source 1. of other being -
2. of other righteous beings (on the same reasoning)
3. but NOT of other beings

other Beings!
~~Yes, Creation having originated~~
other righteous Beings
other beings

righteous through the direct will of the Omnipotent, because the Being would not be perfect in righteousness who thus operated on other beings.

righteous not through His direct will

JS: God in creating, must have created other beings in one of two antitheses. 1. Righteous - that is cognizant of & obeying every condition in which the welfare of the universal creation depends, & for this the gift of free will is absolutely necessary.

Or 2. Unrighteous, that is disobedient to the conditions, which is absurd. The most absurd of all hypothesis is that a being unrighteous was created capable by some absolutely unknown & inconceivable process of arriving at the perfection of the Creator or that by a perfect creation. Suppose the following "God created Abel a righteous man and Cain a righteous man not in the sense of absolute Righteousness, but that both might arrive at perfection, and Cain was displeased with Abel & murdered him."

FN: [And here I must remark that there can be no "grace", there cannot be no such a word as *mercy* with a perfectly righteous being].

JS: This is simply a hypothesis "philosophically" without any basis in philosophy. While it is contradicted by the entire feelings of humanity.

FN: 4. of beings, therefore, other beings

f5v

righteous, through advance from limited & imperfect natures towards perfection, by exercise of the faculties of those natures individually & collectively:-

righteous by, advance, thro' their own exercise of their own faculties, from imperfection to perfection.

JS: the fallacy of the word "Law" runs through the whole argument. The sooner we get our philosophy out of the "Courts" the better.

JS: This again is simply a hypothesis founded on a hypothesis. There is another hypothesis which runs through all the ancient mythologies, namely that of a "Golden age" which has the authority of infinitely greater adaptation & acceptance than this one. And there is another, that is not a hypothesis:- the Cross, and what led to it, is the only key which opens the mystery of obedience & free will.

FN: The object to be obtained by such laws with regard to the human Will is - that the will shall be *right*, - or rather that the nature & the knowledge shall be such that the will must be right. Object of God's Laws with regard to human will.

JS: This again is all wrong. It supposes in the *will* a *necessary righteousness* which would be opposed to the very respondent's idea of will at all - acting righteously or unrighteously being simply manifestations of free will, and not free will, while it further gives to "knowledge" a mastery over the will thereby depriving it of its freedom.

It is simply the fact that "*will*" presupposes freedom or it is not "*will*" but something else.

FN: - not, as is often supposed, not, as is often expressed, that a man *shall be free to choose* between right & wrong, but that such *choice* shall be *impossible* to, i.e.

{f6v} inconsistent with his nature, as it is with God's.

JS: {f6r} Again I repeat your Creation would consist of a very low type. Certainly not of men. Man is a nobler creature than you appear to consider him. "Choice" & the power of "choice" was the Creator's final finishing touch to man. Third hand: How does he know this?

f6v

FN: Volition being in
accordance with Law,
(a manifestation of
Law,)

Man's power
over *his own*
will defined.

JS: Always the same fallacy
of late years "Law" has
been gradually rising into
"God." *We will not surrender our
freedom!*

Whenever it is impossible to do wrong
there is no longer "man" but some
other being. Man rises to be partaker
of the divine nature when he of his
own free will surrenders his will to
God's will, & in doing so he remains
man, but becomes a son of God without
losing his free will.

Third hand: in order to learn, not in order
to be childish.

FN: all the
power which can
be *rightly* used or
desired by a man
over human will, whether
his own or another's,)
is given to him -
viz. the power to take
means to render
human will right -
means *certain* when
known - & the knowledge
of which is attainable
to human nature.

JS: Ah! There's the rub! "Ye shall
be as Gods knowing good & evil"
said the tempter. How to have such
knowledge and to choose the good
required quite *another* teacher, &
he has told us that unless we
become as "little children" we
cannot do it. It is when
we voluntarily surrender the will,
not when we acquire *knowledge*,
that we again enter the Father's
economy. But as all definite
acts of the will depend on *motives*,
what is our motive? What can
make us give up our freedom with
the certainty, of a higher freedom.
Third hand: Do we give it up?

JS: There

is but one thing and that is Love, which is above all philosophy for it is of the Soul while philosophy is only of the reason. It is when we love Him, because he first loved us that we learn once and forever how to wed our free will to *God's will* so that they become *one*, and from that moment all contradictions are solved for evermore. It required Gethsemane & Calvary to do this.

The tenor of the principles in this paper is pantheism. Making men a mere fragment of a whole, and depriving him of his individualism and responsibility; and it has all arisen from that supreme fallacy of modern times, substituting "Law" for "necessity" which used to be the fallacy formerly.

JS: I simply reply that a perfectly righteous and omnipotent Being has created other beings with certain faculties. That these beings in all ages have so recognized their responsibility in some sense. That one of these faculties is freedom of will, and that if there be a such a *certainty* the *will* must *will* perfection; otherwise it is unattainable. This is in *human experience*, God's law in the matter of perfection. "Who can by searching find out God? Who can discover the Almighty to perfection"? The problem is a mightier one than you contemplate. You contemplate animated stones. God contemplates something infinitely higher.

FN: From this point you desiderate a human being with certain faculties subordinated to certain laws which you consider the best, and having so conceived of your "man" you charge the almighty with the duty of finishing a work he has left unfinished. There may be a world where such a process is to go on, but it is certainly not this world, except in the case of the lower animals, who are perfect in their kind. You forget Man's absolute responsibility which is his. When I say "*could not*" I mean *it would not be in accordance to the nature of an omnipotent therefore righteous being*.

When we say that we trace laws in the phenomena of nature, we mean either that we trace uniformities so invariable that they may be considered as the laws of a Power which wills this invariableness or that such uniformities are as invariable as they would be if attributable to a will and a Power which renders them so.

f7r

FN: II ~~Dr Sutherlands~~

OBJECTIONS

"Freedom of willing is matter of experience."

ANSWERS.

It is so, in this sense.
It never happens that
what we should will,

To Printer.

if not prevented by
a superior power,
we are prevented by
such power from
willing.

When we say we
are free to act as we
please, we mean, no
power above our own
prevents our acting
as we should act,
if we were not
subjected to such
superior power.

JS: I would still keep in view the
distinction between simple
"volition" & "acting."

The former is the result of a power
implanted in man: necessary to
complete the man: without which
he would not be man, but something
else. Descartes says
"Cogito, ergo sum." Descartes should have
gone a step further & said "volo
ergo sum." The highest manifestation
of "volition" is in thought. The proper
definition of man is "a being who
wills."

FN: In this sense, we
may say that we
have "freedom" to
will as we please
i.e. no power above
our own operates to

f7v

prevent us from
willing as we please;
or in other words,
willing according to
the state of our nature
(when we will).

JS: I agree to this except to the
last clause. "Acting" on "Will"
is founded (among other things) by our
state when would will, but "volition" is [see]
not so bounded.

FN: But where is there
any contradiction in
this to the proposition
that a volition is a
phenomenon which
accords with definite

laws or, in other words that,
given a certain
state of being and
certain circumstances,
the same volition
will invariably co-
exist or succeed?

JS: No! Because the proposition as thus
stated subordinates volition to circumstances
& introduces the idea of "necessity."
"I was in such circumstances & therefore
it was "necessary" for me to will so
& so." I have heard this very
frankly stated to excuse crime, & if
it were true it would afford sufficient
excuse.

FN: [If the word "Law"
gives offence, I would
gladly change it -
shall I say *plan*?

JS: I only object to the word law in such
discussion because it really means
nothing. It is a stilt to help on
the lame intellect & is of no further
use. The evil of it is that we are
so apt to make it a "leg," and worse to
make it a God, or worse still to subject
God to *our* law, or what we *think* a law.

FN: But it is impossible

f8r

FN: to me even to conceive
of the perfect
Being, "in whom is
no invariableness
neither shadow of
turning," without conceiving of
law, in His moral government, in the sense in
which that word
differs from *decree*, -
~~that~~ No other term
will express my
sense of the invariable-
ness & perfection,
~~with regard to~~
~~His place.~~]
of His moral government,
His plan, His
Theodikè, call it
what you will.]

JS: I entirely concur in this but it
is a separate proposition, and "Law"
is used in another sense here.

If there be one idea more than other which we attach to Perfect Divine nature it is *absolute "unchangeableness"*. But the moral government of God is not therefore "necessitarian". It is the result of supreme intelligence acting in accordance with its own Perfect Nature, & yet Perfectly free. In our weakness we say God acts (appears to act) (or can only act) on fixed laws. God is above all Law. He is *Perfect* & therefore above all Law. We may certainly use the word Law in a human sense to express this as a formula, but for no other purpose whatever. It is worth nothing else in such a discussion. The instant we admit the idea as a fact, then away goes *freedom* from the universe & there is left *fate* in its stead, we ought never to forget this.

f8v ~~Dr Sutherland~~

FN: Without the freedom of willing, there could be no responsibility, no choice, no obedience."

Answer.

1. "Responsibility".

I have never been able to see how the word "responsibility" applies at all to the relation between man & the source of his being, the ruler of his destiny. *Responsibility*", "choice", "obedience", are all secondary conditions.

JS: It would be a sufficient answer to this that the Human race in all ages and states of advancement has acknowledged its "responsibility" to its Creator: its power of "choice" and its power of "obedience."

FN: *Responsibility* does exist between two beings, of whom one accepts from the other certain conditions.

JS: Responsibility can occur in other

ways. Suppose the case of a child & parent. Neither one nor other offers or accepts responsibility. It nevertheless exists between them, & is acknowledged by both. This is matter of experience. The child can sever itself from its parent & in so doing renders up "responsibility". This is what is called "majority."

FN: Something being committed by one

f9r

FN: to another on the mutual understanding that the latter accepts conditions, upon the breaking of which follows some penalty or blame.

JS: This is only one phase of it.

FN: E.g.

I give to my linen-store-keeper the charge of certain articles of linen.

JS: And this.

FN: She accepts the "responsibility," receiving an exact list of what is in store.

But no such engagement exists between man & his Creator. Man does not know what talents he has in store, what he is in charge of. God has not told him - on the contrary, by God's plan he has to find this very thing out.

JS: Man has two things to do, not one. He has to discover God's will and to do it. His responsibility lies in these two things. His responsibility lies in doing his utmost in both.

f9v

FN: If it be said that the Bible offers certain conditions with the

assurance that
reward or punishment
will follow, as they
are kept or neglected
- to such a decree
the term "responsibility"
does not apply. The
human being comes
into existence without
choice of his own,
without that acceptance
of conditions which
constitutes "*responsibility*."

JS: The Bible merely enunciates
in this matter what God has
already done in the organization.
He has been pleased to bestow on
man. Man acknowledges the
"responsibility" as already said.

FN: Or if, as *I* interpret
the thought of the Ruler
of the Universe, man
is to attain the welfare
of himself & his kind,
i.e. man is to create
mankind, *dependently*
on his keeping aright
laws manifested to
{f10v} him through phenomena,
still the word
"responsibility" does
not apply, for there
has been no acceptance
of conditions.

JS: Responsibility exists throughout
God's universe where so far
as we know there has been
no acceptance of terms.

JS: {f9v} This is really nothing to the point.
Because, 1st, we are here. 2nd,
the infinite majority of us are
convinced, against all reasoning
to the contrary, that we are responsible
to God. The inference is obvious
that there is by an infinite probability
an error in the reasoning.

It is not for us, or the infinite
minority of us to say what we
think God should have done, according
to our manner of viewing things.

I do not quite understand this.
What is welfare? Is it simply

earthly good. Then it is not
worth supposed trouble. Is it
everlasting Good. Then it is in the
highest degree doubtful what
man can do in the matter.

f10r

FN: [Hence I infer
that no righteous Being
would, by His power,
without choice or
conditions offered,
call beings into existence,
except on the certainty
that their true welfare
~~would~~ is to be to ALL such
beings ~~be~~ the result
of such existence.]

JS: Quite true so far as God
is concerned.

But man can never
be made happy by fate,
necessity, nature, organization,
call it what you will.

It is possible to conceive of a
being with passive happiness
who could be happy in this
way, But not man whose
happiness must be *active*.

Be certain of this that
not an atom of misery
shall exist in the spiritual
world without man has
willed it so. The real
Question is why a being with
"will" was created at all.
What can we know?
"We see through a glass darkly".
Let us be humble.

f10v

FN: "Choice", "obedience".

"No choice, no

Men *do* choose, *do*

obedience".

obey. This is fact, whether the will be a self-determining power or a manifestation of law. The question is whether a man's "choice" or "obedience" proceed from a nature in which *all* the operations, are manifestations of Law, or, in which one of these operations, viz. volition, is *not* a manifestation of law but the result of what is *called* a self-determining power.

JS: This puts me in mind of an argument to show that morals were subject to "law" because a certain percentage of crime & murder & suicide are pretty clearly yielded every year by a given population. People used to argue they are [illeg illeg] formerly but they don't do so now. We now know that our "will" has to do with it.

FN: Will it be said that a "choice" which originates in a mind, the operations of which manifest law, has the

f11r

FN: character of a piece
of machinery?

I deny it -

A machine operates
without consciousness,
while Law stimulates
man through his
consciousness.

In accordance with
Law, conscious natures
are called into existence,
educated to exercise ~~their~~
appropriate to them, ~~exercise~~
which is carried on by
& within themselves.
They are not machines
acted upon unconsciously
by external power.

Suppose a child
educated by his parent,
& that, in a decision
he makes, may be
distinctly traced the
effect of the education
of that parent. Can
it be said that, in
as far as the parent
was the cause, the child
was but as a machine
in that choice?

JS: According to this a man's acts are the result of his organization, or in other words of God's will. God is never the author of virtue & murder, of self-sacrifice & tyranny.

It only removes the causation a step further off to introduce the idea of Law. The Law comes from God. The law leads to crime. Therefore &c. -

Where there is nothing but irresistible progress in one direction we may infer law, or in other words that it is God's will. But where there is a paucity of progress in more directions than one there must be a determining power other than God's will. What is it, Law? No because God cannot be the author of two opposites (love and murder). *Choice*, then:- It is the only alternative. in other words free will.

Education as is well known acts not on the will at all, but it directs the will in using particular faculties or opportunities, & renders the use of these "*by the will*" easier in each successive occasion. It also gives data for the will to use. It may be safely stated that whenever the will has been attempted to be bent, the educator has failed & this is a common cause of failure.

f11v

FN: Law which, in educating human beings to a future destiny, is the origin of the decision a man makes, can no more be characterized as levelling man to a machine, than can a parent who in giving an education to his child is traced as the cause of any decision made by that child.

JS: The law here supposed decides one man to love his fellows, & another to destroy them.

The law supposed makes man a machine. But the fact is there is no such law. The fact of one man hating & another loving, rests on totally different grounds. The cases supposed do not admit of comparison. The parent cannot educate the "volition" of the child. The attempt is a common cause of rebellion in youth.

FN: "Choice" (often a state of *indecision*) and "obedience" are indicative of IMPERFECTION,

JS: On the contrary. The only conceivable perfection except *passive* perfection consists in *freedom absolute* used in consistence with the highest interests. And this act in perfection is the highest of which men can conceive. The earthly form of it is given by St Paul "The spirit of power, and of love, & of a sound mind."

FN: *beyond* which even imperfect man should strive to advance. "Choice" (where there has been doubt) & "obedience" are inferior, secondary states of mind-

f12r

FN: inferior, that is, to a state of *accordance with* the perfect Will, to be *one with* which is the highest state.

JS: This is *passivity* & is morally a lower state than activity. Animals in their paradise would be so.

FN: In fact, I cannot conceive of "obedience" at all, except as obedience to an imperfect Being. If the Being towards whom we are exercising obedience is *perfect*, & we are convinced He is perfect, it ceases to be obedience, it must become accordance.

JS: This to me is quite unintelligible except I admit an *industratum* [?] of thought based on "necessity" which I deny to be the foundation of the universe. In this passage which is quite logical from your premises I recognize the modern "idea of" law appearing in the older one of "necessity."

They are in fact the same idea as so used.

FN: Even in the midst
of the most severe
paroxysms of pain,
I have felt this!

JS: Quite so. But this
does not follow from
"necessity" of suffering
pain, but from the idea
that it is "best" & this very
thing involves the exercise of
free will which we always exercise. Let us call it what we may.

FN: If the law is perfect,
which subjects me
to this, let me
not *obey*, let me

f12v FN: *second* the perfect
Will, accord, agree
with it. This is
the perfect "love"
of the "Scriptures."
And towards the Perfect
there can be no
obedience, but love,
accordance.

JS: To say I submit because it
is a law of my being is one
thing.

To say "thy will be done" is
quite another thing.

The former proceeds on the
theory of an inexorable
law Creator & Law Created
world.

The latter, on the certainty
(It is no theory as our own
hearts tell us), of a loving
intelligent Creator, always
doing the very best for us
although we cannot always
see it. The "accordance [end quote?]
you desiderate is the highest
conquest of free will. So
high is it that it is one
of the few things our Lord taught
his disciples to pray for.

To *endure* because it is inevitable
and to *accord* because it is God's
will are the result of two
entirely opposite philosophies.
At the root of the one lies law,
at the root of the other, free will.

f13r ~~Dr Sutherland~~

FN: "The use of the word *law* here requires careful definition. The idea of Law was drawn first from social relations. And then, when science arose, the social idea was carried naturally into the material world. We talk of the common law & of the law of gravitation. Now, in neither of these senses, is volition under law at all. The very faculty is the opposite of law in that sense."

Answer.

I understand the word "*law*" to signify either a ~~decree~~ will that a definitive state of

f13v

FN: things shall be always *simultaneous with* or *successive to* some other definitive state of things, whenever the latter occurs. or to signify such uniformity of co-existence or succession as, if not considered as attributable to will, yet is invariable as if it were the result of will, united with power to effect its realization.

JS: This does not apply to "volition" at all.

A good musician has the "volition" to play on a bad instrument & does his best, but the result is very different on a good instrument, although the volition is the same in either case.

FN: On this understanding of the meaning of the word "law," I maintain that volitions accord with law, are manifestations of law, inasmuch as they are phenomena, existing in uniform relations of simultaneity or succession to other phenomena.

JS: This has never been shown at all & yet it is the whole question. It cannot be shown that volition as such follows any succession, *acting* however generally does.

f14r

FN: Every volition is successive to or simultaneous with some phenomenon or assemblage of phenomena, ~~which~~ if this again exist, the same volition ~~would~~ will be co-existent or successive. In other words, each volition exists in such relation of simultaneity or succession to some other phenomenon or assemblage of phenomena that, had this not existed, the volition would not have existed.

JS: It has not, & cannot be proved!

"Will" is free & above all matter & phenomena. It is lord & master in its office, & will subjugate matter and phenomena yet to the full bent of its original power which is its only "law." Otherwise progress would be absolutely impossible. & would be under the dominion of matter which would be absurd. "Choose ye what ye will serve" matter or will.

FN: "Volition acts within bounds or limits, & there is a certain similarity in its manifestations in all men as beings of the same order. In this sense alone is there a law. Except in this sense, human volition is a self-determining power."

FN: I refer to observation & experience to decide

f14v

FN: whether Volition does not manifest that uniformity which entitles us to designate it as according with law (defined as above) - or whether volition only manifests law in a limited sense,- exhibits only "a certain similarity in its manifestations in all men as beings of the same order, but is at the same time a self-determining power."

JS: So do I refer to experience. If the will ever follows in the same tract it is not because it is subject to law, but because it chooses to follow. & it chooses to follow because there is a motive which motive in the ordinary affairs of life is experience, but the volition acts, for all that, with entire freedom.

f15r FN:

III ~~Dr Sutherland~~

"The only question" Humanity has to ask, in reference to dependence on a Higher Power, "is, - Has "he revealed himself?"

To me the question appropriate to Humanity seems to be, - Is the Law - on which we find that Human existence, Human destiny depend, - unsatisfactory or not to the wants appropriate to the Human mind, consequently on that Law? viz. the wants of a spirit of love, of sympathy, of justice, benevolence, conscientiousness, of a *desire* to learn the truths within our ken,

JS: In other words to try to solve the insoluble problem of *necessity* by our experience.

FN: & whatever else may be understood as the desire of a righteous mind, i.e. the desire appropriate, through its laws, to healthy Human nature.

JS: What is a *healthy* human mind? Why should we even have to distinguish a human mind as healthy?

Here again comes in the idea of necessity.

There is no such law discernible by us. If it is meant to ask, "is our experience of life in conformity with what one believes God's moral government ought to be?" Then the reply must be that almost every human being will give a different answer. Unless we vary the question and ask "ought we to submit to things as they are because God knows best, & then the great majority would answer yes.

f15v

FN: In the desire to "submit"
without question to any
Higher Power
(be that power
God or man)

JS: The simple reply to all this
that God is omnipotent, we must
admit this while we admit that he
is free.

FN: I see nothing which the *highest* Power (the Power of Right) should
wish to constitute us
for - constitute us, that is,
to believe such "submission" to
be the highest rectitude.
This is "obedience," not right.
I believe that He
has fitted our minds
to learn His laws &
understand their object.
Note: [Job's expression, "Tho'
he slay me, yet will I
trust in him,"

JS: Only those can use such an
expression who have been tried.
Those who have not been tried
cannot.

FN: - "Isaiah's
question as to the right
of the "clay" to ask of
the "potter" anything about its
creation,

JS: Certainly, absolutely God has the
power.

FN: the Jesuit's
aspiration to be able
to love God tho' he be
thrown by Him into
hell,

JS: Such a question is not asked of us.
The Jesuit asks it of himself.

FN: - appear to me

f16r

FN: all utter confusions
as to the character
of God, echoes
of the reverence for
mere Power embodied in
Eastern despotism,
the very reverse of
what I think
the purpose of God in our creation.

JS: Because you have made a
deity submit to necessity. It
is the same idea which lies
at the root of all philosophic
theism from the earliest
dawn of philosophy, & leads
to results you do not contemplate.

FN: Power without right
is NOT an object of
Reverence. And it
would be probably
impossible to find
in any savage
superstition one
more ~~savage~~ cruel than
that contained in
Calvin's own words.
But indeed it would
be difficult to call
Calvin's a religion
at all, if religion
is the tie to a *good*
Being.

JS: The whole of this is incorrect as
regards Calvin. It is a partial
statement. And even if it
were correct it does not touch
Christianity & the Christian
ideas of God.

FN: "God in predestinating from all
eternity one part of mankind to
everlasting happiness & another
to endless misery was led to
make this distinction by no other
motive than his own good pleasure* &
free will."

* Note:

"Good pleasure"!
Of what devil could be
said worse than this?

f16v

FN: The abominable doctrine involved in that of Baptismal regeneration,

JS: The truth should not be condemned on account of error.

Besides you draw conclusions, logically enough I admit, from the error which its supporters would deny.

FN: (viz. that God damns little babies, come into the world without any choice of their own & which certainly could not get themselves baptized),

JS: It is right to show that for it is no part of Christianity.

FN: is another superstition about the nature of God unparalleled for its atrocity in any savage tribe. What human murderer could be compared to him in crime, if this were so? The wretched Ch. of England, one day some years ago, brought to look this thing fairly in the face, & to say whether God did *damn* little babies or not answered,

1. It was an open question.

2. It did not signify.

3. People might believe one thing or the other [or both] as they liked.

"Did not signify"! whether God was the worst of tyrants & murderers or not.

f17r ~~Dr Sutherland~~

FN: "This is the question
of all ages & times -
What ought to be?"

It has been so. And this
is most important
- as shewing, in all
religious & moral
questions, that to *know*
& to *bring to pass*
what appears the RIGHT
to the human mind
is one of its essential
wants.

~~Dr Sutherland~~

"What ought to be?
would never have been
asked, if the fundamental
conception of God's
character & moral
government had not
varied in every
individual man by
light of nature. The
very question grants the
whole case, viz. that there is
a striking discrepance

f17v

FN: between what various
men think there
"ought to be," & what
the same men think
"there is."

JS: In the whole of your reply to me, there is a mixture of what I admit to be true & what is not as it appears to me tenable.

There is no doubt in the first place that there is a religion of nature, a religion that man works out for himself, at all events he considers that he has done so & is more or less satisfied with the result.

Conscience lies at the root of the best form of it; but the form is infinitely varied according to the constitution of individual minds. Every century three ~~hundred~~ thousand millions of people die & there is every probability that the religious ideas of this mighty host have varied more or less in every individual. Natural religion therefore, in the sense of being a *religio*, is no *religio* at all, but apparently the wreck or remains of a *religio* which the human race once had. Just as the fossil collection in the British Museum is not a whole but only parts of a whole which once existed as a whole. This is to me the only conceivable explanation of the phenomenon. To suppose that God is in any sense the author of ideas of himself and of his character so varied, so contradictory, so cruel, so

{f18r} immoral as these various *ideas* of a religion would indicate is to revive the old difficulty, whether there were not after all a number of contradictory gods, which led to paganism, of which learning by the way there is a curious illustration in the last number of the *Westminster*.

One thing is quite certain & that is the only point we have to deal with that up to the present moment the Human mind by its own power has discerned no God's government under which the entire human race is disposed to fit.

As to Mohammed, everyone knows where he got his Koran. It is one of the works (& there are many others in the world) of revelation, in the same sense as the ethnic idea of God is the wreck of a primal but lost religion.

It is this same reminiscence which leads to all merely human attempts to disparage revelation & to discover a God & a God's government.

Theism has up to this present moment been as powerless for good as Mohammedanism, or any other merely human religion.

The only question therefore, I repeat, is has God revealed himself? It is merely a question of fact, & like every question of fact it must be settled by evidence, & not by any preconception of what God ought to do or to say.

FN: {f17v} Now, if we look at phenomena, if we judge of single facts as known to us from human experience, we shall indeed feel the discrepancy between what "is" and what "ought to be." Man is forever contrary to (or below) the best possibilities of his nature. We seek then a Revelation to assist us to solve this difficulty. Some will answer we find it in the Bible, others in the Koran, others in other books supposed to be from superhuman sources.

My disbelief in these as direct revelations,

f18r

FN: i.e. as ~~more~~ being other than man's noblest attempts (up to the present time) in the course of his development to understand God, (in which attempts he has formed "God in his own image,") is bounded on the contradictions in these to universal law. This once admitted, what have been supposed to be revelations cease to appear so, because, on this admission, they fundamentally contradict both what "is" & what "ought to be."

f18v

FN: ~~Dr Sutherland:~~

Human Will "is a separate independent faculty"

FN: What is a faculty? Is it synonymous with *Power*?

JS: Not necessarily.

FN: E.g. we say, man has the *faculty* of speech; does this not mean that the *power* of speech exists in mankind? This faculty or power exists accordantly with or dependently on Laws. i.e., it does or does not exist, & it exists in one mode or another, according as certain definite pre-existences or co-existences have been & are, or have not been and are not.

JS: With regard to will, the faculty is *willing*, not *doing*. The power if you will have the word is that of *willing* fully & independently within the sphere of its being, but not necessarily of producing *action*, which is another thing. The power of *willing* is under no law in the sense in which you use the word.

So I say, and I don't believe a human being ever arrived at the conclusion that the *will* was found except by mixing up the ideas of *willing* & *acting*

FN: With respect to the faculty or power of will, & how it is exercised, we can only refer as before to observation & experience as to whether this faculty or power of willing

f19r

FN: differs from every other by *not* existing in, & being modified by, relations of simultaneity & succession with & to other phenomena -

or whether, the more closely we observe, the more ground we ~~shall~~ find for believing that volitions do arise & vary connectedly, uniformly with sensations, thoughts, emotions - and that sensations, thoughts, emotions - and that sensations, thoughts, emotions do arise & vary with organization & circumstances.

JS: No! This idea which leads logically to pantheism & is in fact the ground of that idea, has resulted as it appears to me from 1st want of courage in dealing with the freedom which God has given man. 2nd & mainly from want of analysis in confounding *willing* & *acting*.

Willing has nothing to do whatever with sensations, thoughts, emotions. Acting has a great deal to do with them, and it has a great deal to do with organization.

FN: Men fear to look this experience in the face & to acknowledge it - because they imagine that it is to acknowledge themselves powerless machines, or ~~{illeg illeg illeg}~~ "animated stones".

JS: No on the contrary necessitarianism with its law bound creator & law bound will is afraid to look at God's freedom & mens freedom & to take the consequence of both & it shelters itself behind an "eternal order of things" & so saves itself all further trouble.

f19v

FN: The very reverse is the fact.

Law is the *means*
always at hand to
afford us power.

Law is the inducement,
if our minds are
enlightened, our hearts
true, to use the power
aright.

JS: This is a perfectly logical result, but it should be carried further; what say you to this "Law compels me to diminish human suffering which is great upon the earth in the only way I can relieve it namely by taking away human life" That is part of a Creed.

FN: If I believe that a certain state of will is right, - if I wish for that state of will which is right -

JS: This subverts by a strike of the pen the distinction of between "free will" & "necessity" and would do very well for the commencement of a Chapter on the Ethics of Free will.

FN: - if

I also believe that,
in certain circumstances,
upon which is consequent
a certain state (as to
sensations, thoughts,
emotions) Human will
becomes right - ~~does~~
is not the course ~~become~~
obvious to endeavour to
bring about these
circumstances for
mankind?

JS: And this is simply applying
in practice the Ethics of
free will. But it utterly
subverts the logical sequence
from the position that *will* is
under law.

FN: What is all that we

f20r

FN: are doing for Sanitary
Reform but this? We
know that Crime,
Disease & Death always
go together. We know
that to preach to a
man to do right, &
to send him back
into a pig-sty where
he cannot but do
wrong, is nonsense.
We set about improving
his pig-sty. What are
all our attempts at
Education, Poor Law
Reform, Municipal
institutions, ~~when they~~
~~are right-minded,~~
but one assertion of
this belief? What
has Louis Napoleon's
whole course been,
in his attempts to
destroy these things,
but ~~one~~ another assertion of
this belief, in the
converse sense?

JS: Most certainly, but mortality tables, & Sanitary reform, & Physical morals, & the reformation of business all proceed on the basis of the philosophy of free will which is the glorious liberty we got at the Reformation & which has made England what she is & a light on these subjects to all lands.

Were your philosophical principles as laid down in the earlier part of this discussion true, every one of these reforms would have been impossible.

For instance, I have found the real logical necessitarians, every where opposed to these reforms, as they always must be.

f20v

FN: The mode in which the will acts is subject for observation & experience, from which we may collect evidence. Will it be said that observation & experience teach us that we can "will as we please"?

JS: One case is enough. If the will in any case can act independently of law, it can act independently of law.

FN: Granted, in some cases. Truly & justly a certain previous exercise of our nature secures us the power to "will as we please", while error or neglect deprives us of this power. If we desire to will right habitually or to help others to do so, we must study so to live that we shall bring about such volitions, -

JS: True, but how? that is the whole question.

FN: i.e., we must so keep God's Laws that this will follow.

JS: How do we know Gods Laws unless he has revealed them. We have certainly not discovered to guide us.

FN: In proportion as Humanity desires the right, pursues the right,

JS: This again is begging the whole question.

FN: in accordance with law, Human organization & circumstances will, by the Power which Law offers to man,

JS: Law can never give power. It presupposes power.

FN: be rendered such that human nature will progressively advance in what is right & true. Can the Imperfect have a greater scope to attain & exercise all power which can be truly, rightly desired?

f21r

FN: "A perfectly righteous & omnipotent Being *has* created other beings with certain faculties".

On what ground is this asserted, unless on the admission of Law of such character & *tendency* as manifests a perfectly righteous & omnipotent Being? Do phenomena, on the separate facts of human life, enable us to assert it?

JS: On the ground of every day observation we know that our idea of what is right, and our ~~idea~~ knowledge of what we are by nature are at direct antagonism. The Bible does solve the enigma in the only way our faculties tell us it can be solved. No other philosophy, no other so called revelation does so, for they all rest on the basis of *necessity* which contradicts our experience.

Depend on it that there is no stronger proof of the decay of mental health among us than that afforded by our popular so called philosophical writing which in order to escape the clear utterances of Scripture, dethrones a free creator & sets up an inexorable fate in his stead.

FN: Does the Bible or any other (so-called) revelation really present to us a perfectly righteous & omnipresent Being? What "the Lord" is there said to have said & done, - if we now heard it for the first time - could the true human heart, the mind enlightened even to our present **{f21v}** possibility, hear it for the first time - *could* it accept ~~it~~ such as any conception of the character of a *perfectly righteous* & omnipotent Being? - Impossible.

JS: {f21r} Christians accept the Character of Christ in the New Testament as the personal manifestation of Gods Character.

If you or any one else can give us the absolute freedom we then have & at the same time

f21v

JS: ~~and~~ give us a more perfect personal manifestation, pray give it to us. But until this is done excuse us from declining the Trinity of the Fates as God.

When I meet with a *true human heart* I will reply to the later [latter?] part of your question. It admits of a very satisfactory reply otherwise.

FN: Men "have, in all ages, recognised responsibility in some sense."

Does this prove that responsibility is the true term for the connection existing between humanity & a superhuman Power? Responsibility, in the received understanding of the word, implies conditions offered & accepted, implies "answering". How can there be an answer when no question has been asked? How can there be responsibility "recognised", (in any *true* "sense", at least), between man called into existence without a choice of his own, & the source of that existence?

JS: You cannot reason men out of his sense of what is commonly called responsibility, namely that some how or other, some time or other he must meet his Creator more nearly than at present and answer for the use of all his faculties & opportunities. It is utterly useless to argue that this cannot be, because God has made it part of mans nature.

Of which he is as certain as he is of any thing.

22r

FN: "If there be certainty of Perfection, the will must will perfection, otherwise it is unattainable."

Nem. Con.

Perfection must be the will of the Imperfect, before it can be attained.

"It is surely possible for God to reveal himself to the creature he has made."

The word "God" has been used to express such various conceptions that there is a degree of vagueness in this proposition, which however I admit to be undeniable, since all these conceptions include the idea of superhuman Power.

[Note. It would be the greatest gain Religion has ever made, if, for a time, the word *God*,

f22v

FN

which suggests such various & irreverent associations, (irreverent, that is, to a spirit seeking right,) could be dropped. And the conception substituted of a Perfect Being, called the Spirit of Right].

JS

Even so! In such a philosophy as we have now ~~possibly~~ arrived at it is highly necessary to get quit of the word & ideas attached to it. One step further & your pitiless logic will have run itself out. If you have a "perfect Being" without free will, governed by law, and creatures without will, & under law, why not exchange the idea of your "Perfect Being". Of what use is it. Martineau, Comte & Holyoak have arrived at this - by the sheer force of logic!

FN

"If he has so revealed himself, the revelation must be a correct one. "He cannot deny himself".

FN

This depends in order not to be either a truism or a *non-sense*, upon ~~every thing that~~ what has been said before. If ~~upon whether~~ God has revealed Himself to our understandings as a Spirit of Truth, to such a nature it ~~would be contrary~~ is undeniably impossible to contradict Himself.

~~I conceive He has so revealed Himself~~ find such a revelation in His Laws. But I do not find any other harmonious or consistent revelation.

JS

There can be no revelation of this kind except what is common to the human race, & what the result of it is, history or philosophy have pretty much told us. You assume individual "imperatives" so to speak. I assert that if you receive the teachings of revelation just as you would receive any of the teachings, there could be no contradiction.

I assert simply that neither from your own experience, nor from the Universe can you know God's Laws. Before you assert this you ought to show what are laws sufficient to enable you to know God & God's will, & then you must show that no other laws are necessary to be known & that you knew the "necessary".

f23r

IV

FN

"The only question is, Has he revealed himself?"

In what sense the only question?

Another question, it appears to me, Man will be impelled to ask; ~~with~~ and the force of desire with which he seeks for an answer will be exactly in proportion to the healthy development of his nature, exactly in proportion to the advance ~~of~~ in his knowledge of human nature, of human history - & exactly in proportion as he realizes in his conception the actual history, (with the intensity of its horrors & the sublimity of its beauty) of human nature

{f23v} [To be a historian,
even a Macaulay,
does not necessarily
imply this. A mere
hold on the memory
of facts which have occurred by no means
implies a realization
in our consciousness
of the consciousness
of those *to whom*
they occurred.

Somebody has justly
said that, if we
could realize the misery,
the crime, the lunacy,
the pain, the suffering
going on at this one
moment of our existence,
we should go mad].

The question then
that we shall ask
unceasingly, eagerly,
earnestly, in
proportion as we do
realize human history
will be:

f24r

does there exist such a
Power as ~~shall make~~ causes
Man's existence to be ~~made~~ a road
by which ~~he shall~~
Humanity shall attain
to an existence of progressive
righteousness, without
limit short of perfection?

The answers to all
questions concerning
Human nature, Human
destiny,- concerning
the Superhuman Power
believed to be the
Source & Ruler of
Human existence, -
will be modified,
according as we believe
or disbelieve that all
the phenomena of ~~human~~ nature
are manifestations of
Law.

[I include in the
word "Nature" all
modes of existence,
which have a beginning
& are subject to changes.
Each of these modes is
generally called a
phenomenon].

{f24v} I consider the beginning
of & every change in
each phenomenon
to be a manifestation
of Law, in the sense
above defined of the
word "Law".

In other words, the
relations are such, in
which phenomena
exist to one another,
that no one would
have existed unless
some other, existing
previously or simulta-
neously, had so existed.
And, as often as these
definite phenomena
again exist, again
will arise the same
co-existing or successive
phenomena.

Whether there is any
exception to this rule
experience must decide.
Being convinced of its
universality, I can only
consider questions in
accordance with its admission.

JS:

Done into plain words this
means that the present state
of things was the best possible
when it was framed, that we
may rest assured it was the
wisest because *it is*, and that
we shall some time or other be
convinced that it was the most
benevolent and just.
And that all this is the result
of certain laws which it is
hypothetically supposed regulate
the concerns of the universe.
Now I am a great friend to examining
with these laws or plans, provided
we go no further than observe facts
and classify these facts for the sake
of convenience as we go on.

The more we do this, the more will
we know of God's works, and the more

{f23v} will we learn of our relation to the external universe and our power over it.

But in the physical universe it would be simply absurd to predicate the unknown from the known, or to antedate as it were our discoveries. A man would be mad who would try to propel a steam engine through the air, although the time *may* arrive when we shall be able to do so. If this be true of the physical world, how much more is it true of the Spiritual world.

What do we really know of the Spiritual world by our natural faculties. We suppose in philosophy that such and such things are the best. How do we know? We suppose humanity to be *by nature* progressive. Is it so? What experience have we of it?

We are *certain* that sin, & crime & sorrow sweep over the world uneasily like a flood. It is horrible. It is abominable to contemplate. And yet more terrible still is the apparent contradiction that our own hearts tell us that our Creator is a merciful holy, loving, perfect being. Is it possible that he can be the author of

{f24r} such obvious contradiction.

It is not impossible says
Philosophy, because in my
opinion all must be for the
best.

It is impossible says humanity
for *I feel* it cannot be.

Come let us reason together
says Philosophy & I will
convince you that your
feelings are all wrong & that
my reason can show you so.

It is true I am not like your
mechanical Philosopher, I cannot
show you faith & discoveries, but
I can give you reasons.

"Reasons" says humanity "What
have I to do with your reasons
have not I facts to deal with"

"Oh" says Philosophy "your facts
must be some part of the laws
of the universe".

"How do you *know*" says Humanity
"I do not profess *to know*" says
philosophy "But I can explain the
whole matter in a satisfactory way".

"Can you" says humanity "give me
back my lost child, my lost property,
my lost wife, my lost eye sight, my
lost health, my lost reason. Above
all can you relieve me from the terror
of my last account with God".

{f24v} "No" replies philosophy" I cannot do any one of these things. I can perhaps show you but all are for the best and that you are wrong in supposing that God will account with you at last. It is in fact all part of a great plan which you & I will know more about afterwards."

This is really the state of the Question. You try to discover something about God, either out of your own reason & understanding, or by analogy with nature not one of which can tell you any thing certain on the subject. And you mix up with these ideas so acquired certain other ideas derived from the Bible & so a God, & a universe are created, and placed under law and from the creation so framed which can never be the creation of any one else. You argue against the revealed character of God in the Scripture, & adjourn all the questions that humanity must have an answer to *now* into an indefinite futurity.

f25r

FN

This view of Humanity
then follows:
by the laws of ~~his~~ man's nature,
righteousness of nature
& of life is his appropriate
desire for himself & his
kind. Yet, through
the laws of which all
phenomena are the
manifestation, such
an existence has been
to many impossible.
A nature & life of sin
has been inevitable.

JS: The whole plan of observation & induction is hollow. I should consider it simply madness to trust either life or soul to it, & so would every one else, if they really were required to do so. But the fact is people don't trust to what they profess.

Reason cannot discern religious truth for it deals solely with relations of facts.

Understanding cannot discern religious truth for it deals solely with facts.

In what ~~then~~ way are religious truths known.

The answer is by the soul, but the soul lives only through God it has no independent existence in the individual in the way that reason & understanding have.

Yet the soul does not discover truth, it only receives, & religious truth comes direct from God or from no where. I mean by *truth* what man *knows* he may trust in. It is the highest kind of knowledge.

(It is necessary to state that the idea I attach to religious truth here is not the philosophical idea but the Xtian idea. The philosophical religion, if there be such a thing has nothing to do with the soul)

FN: Had it been thus to *one only*, the problem would have been the same. And this is what I mean when I say that, in proportion as we realise the horrors of human history, the righteous mind will feel utter repugnance at such conditions of existence, unless

{f25v} there is ground for
belief that

1. the Law by which
righteousness of nature
& of life is made the
appropriate desire of
human nature.

& 2. the Law by which
it is to some impossible

JS: There is no such law
It is simply an
assumption

FN: are *both* the mani-
festations of a Righteous
Power -

affording thus the
assurance

1. that sin is an
evil remediable in
time to come

JS: Sin is an evil remediable
now or never. We know
nothing by philosophy of the
life to come.

FN: that righteousness
is to be attained
through, if not during
human existence.

JS: Righteousness is to be obtained
now or never, so far as
our knowledge goes.

JS: In a matter of such inconceivable importance you
require others to trust to inductions drawn from a philosophy
which cannot deal with the questions at all. Why hold out
delusive hopes. Why not say at once Here are such & such
contradictory phenomena. Who can solve them? And leave the
question, or else take up the child nature, the first step in the
solution of the problem, and go to Him who blessed the children & say
here
are the contradictions, can you solve them? All the little children
know that he has
solved them.

f26r

FN: "Who can by searching
find out God? Who
can discern the
Almighty to Perfection?
"The problem is a
mightier one than
you contemplate."

Let us be equally
careful neither to be
fools who rush in to
subjects in which
evidence is unattainable,
nor cowards throwing
dust in our own eyes.

If we "by searching"
try to "find out" the
nature of "God", the
beginning, the end &c,
we are fools.

If we take for granted
that we cannot learn
or must not enquire,
where evidence is
within our reach,
we are cowards.

JS: Yes, wherever there is evidence
go reverently. But put off the
Philosophers cloke

FN: ~~Man~~ The finite is
utterly incapable of
understanding the
{f26v} *mode of being* of the
Infinite who reveals
Himself by His Laws,
as the Source & Ruler
of our being.

JS: It would be well to
say where the Laws are.
I do not say there are no
laws as mediatory expression of Gods
will, but this is not the
point. Of late years there
has been an unusual
talk about *Gods Laws*, & this
talk has got into both Philosophy
& religion. But it is nothing but
talk.

FN: But these Laws,
for ever operating
within & around us,
seem to be expressly
~~there~~ constituted *in order to*
reveal to us the
character, the thought,
the plan, the will
of Man's Creator &
Ruler, as far as Man
is concerned.

JS: This is simply an assumption

FN: It is consequent
upon these Laws that
we have a consciousness
of Right and wrong:
- in other words, that
we have a consciousness
concerning some thoughts,
feelings, objects, pursuits
~~which we~~ expressed by
calling them right -
concerning others, by
calling them wrong.

JS: And this. The idea of
right & wrong in man is
subject to as much variation
as any other idea. I mean of
course naturally. Man has the
faculty of knowing right & wrong
but nothing more.
The right of one generation is the wrong
of another. Like other faculties it
may err & does continually err.

f27r

FN: It is consequent upon
His Laws that Love,
Benevolence, Justice,
the pursuit of Truth &
Knowledge have to our
minds the character
of *Right-*

JS: To your mind,
not to Torquenadas'. He would
have thought the highest Love,
Benevolence, Justice & truth counted
in burning you for writing this
paper. Only a week or two
ago Gods justice was interpreted as
meaning that the Revolt in India
was Gods revenge against Protectionism
in England. Not a doubt that the
men & the people whose sentiments
he represents believe it.

FN: that we include in
Right the attempt to
realize, to the extent
of our power, these
qualities in ourselves,
& in others.

Is not this practically
admitted in our attempts
to educate the ignorant
to reform the erring?

JS: Don't forget that these attempts
came not of Philosophy but of
the Christian faith. Let
Philosophy shew its works & don't
let it boast itself in the works of
others. Your basic principles
if rigidly followed out would prevent
action

FN: Are we presumptuous
then, (our minds being
thus constituted by the
Will of the Almighty,)
in our conviction that,
to that Almighty -
through whose teaching
in His Laws we reckon
Love & Benevolence
as essential to Right
eousness of character -
it would be impossible

f27v: to exist alone, while
powerful to bring
about goodness &
happiness?

JS: There is no presumption in any
part of this except in the fundamental
principle, that we know enough
naturally to be able to predicate
what Gods character & moral
administration is. Which is
certainly not the case.

f27v

FN: Are we presumptuous
in the conviction that,
(since He has so
constituted our natures
that we feel, unless
thro' defect or ignorance,
that righteous existence
is alone of real value)
the Omnipotent will
secure to our natures
the realization of this
righteous existence?

It does not shock
our sense of right, with
regard to the rule, in
conformity with which
we find Human nature
exists, that sin &
suffering are incident
to it.

JS: It ceases to shock our
sense only when we
admit "necessity" is the
law of the universe
which I deny absolutely.
But the fact is most
people don't think on the
subject at all.

FN: For we find that
to learn, to acquire truth
& knowledge, to *attain*

f28f

FN: righteousness - (the means,
through which we shall
certainly arrive at it,
being bestowed on our
imperfection by the
Perfect in Righteousness,
the Almighty in Power)
is the *best which is*
possible for imperfect
being.

JS: This is all hypothesis
without a shadow of
proof.

It is not in us naturally at
all. If man has any
tendency in himself it is in
declension. If he advances
it is not of himself but of
God acting against mans
proclivity.

FN: [When I say "which
is possible", I do not
imply necessity; I
mean, that ~~which~~ it
must be without some
contradiction, or
inconsistency, itself
inconsistent with
the Spirit of Truth.]

JS: Yes but you must accept
one or other of the forms of
the dilemma. Either necessity
or free will. As it stands
this proposition when worked
backwards subverts all you
have said on the subject.

FN: If God's ~~thought~~ plan
for Man is - truth
to be *learnt*, right
to be *attained* by
man for mankind
through the teaching
of God's Law, (as means
& inducement) - to
such a plan sin &

28v

sorrow are *essential*,
but remediable.

JS: Your proposition is not
"*truth to be learnt*". I agree
with that. Yours is truth to be
discovered by mans natural
powers, such, that it shall teach
him every thing about God that
it is necessary for him to know
& to ensure his salvation & everlasting
life. That is your proposition.
Men cannot do that.

f28v

FN: The character &
tendency of these Laws
are educational. As such,
they shew, as their source,
Righteous Power. Such
a source *assures* us
that the Imperfect
will *attain* to remedying
each & all of our sins
& our sorrows in the
course of an existence,
of which human life
is but a part.

JS: By all means discuss
them & use them. Such
discovery & use are the
talents committed to us.
Only don't argue from this
that man can by pursuing
such a course discover all
he requires to know & obtain.

FN: Such a plan does
not admit "*responsibility*".

JS: While at the same time it lands
on the head of the Creator all the
sin & sorrow & suffering that
ever has been or ever will be
to the end of time. It is so
shaking to my sense of right
& justice, that if I could really
think you entertained it, it
would be the greatest miracle
I ever heard of.

FN: These Laws are not
offered on *conditions*
which we may accept
or refuse. We cannot
refuse to be the subjects
of His Laws - Well for
us we cannot! I for
one should have refused,
had I known what
Life was.

JS: Your idea of good & evil has
landed you in Pyronhism.

f29r

FN: But Perfect Love &
Wisdom decide for the
imperfect. It is well.
Since our refusal
could be but the
refusal of ignorance.

As we attain to
the understanding of
His plan, we shall
accept it with all
our hearts,- though
sin & sorrow may
seem almost at
times to overwhelm
the fainting pilgrim
walking in darkness
& desolation.

JS: Alas! Alas! for all those
countless myriads who have
never known Gods plan, & for
the myriads who will never
know it.
Better infinitely to accept
Stoicism here & endless death
hereafter. It is a shorter &
less confusing need, than
to try to reconcile all these
contradictions by Philosophy.

FN: But
the Father never
forsakes him ("My
God, my God, why
hast thou forsaken
me?" is a mistaken
cry)

JS: Little did I ever think
that I should have met with a
human hand who could have
penned this.

Pray God that in his Mercy you
may yet be compelled to utter
the same cry. You will
see more clearly than on some
points than I fear you do now.

FN: the Father
conducts him *surely*
to light,- stirring up
within him the will
to use his own powers to
gain all for his kind
(including himself) which
makes life of value.

f29v

FN: Though we be com
paratively in darkness,
it is in us to see, that,
Law alone, without
making us machines,
("animated stones,") can
secure our attaining,
by & through the exercise
of our own natures, to
become *one with* God.

JS: Law mark! not God
God is dethroned, Law is
in his stead.
Re write this & put God
where you have put law
& see how it will read.

FN: [When I say "can"
I again explain that
I mean no necessity.
I mean, "can" without
contradiction, absurdity,
inconsistency.

JS: You cannot get off the
horn

FN: "To God all things
are possible," viz. which
are possible to God.
To Him, the Spirit of
Truth, contradiction or
inconsistency is
impossible. For He
would thereby cease to be
the Spirit of Truth -
to be God.

I should reverse
it & say, *Because*

f30r

FN:

I know thou canst not,
(will not) slay me,
therefore I trust Thee.]

"You desiderate a
human being with
certain faculties,
subordinated to
certain Laws, which
you consider the best,
& having so conceived
of your man, you
charge the Almighty
with the duty of
finishing a work
He has left unfinished".

No *desideratum* of my
own invention can
affect the question.
nor indeed has entered
my mind, excepting this.
I "desiderate" to learn
what is. I believe
what is *is right*, - not
because I submit
without question to
superior Power,- but
because the healthiest
promptings of the
nature *bestowed upon*
me yearn for right

f30v

FN: (to be realized in the existence of all my kind)- ~~because~~ I therefore search for a true interpretation of what is, determined to accept nothing as truth, unless it comes home as the accordance of what *is* & what is *right*. Where I can see no such accordance, I remain respectfully in doubt, trusting to learn here & hereafter what shall remove all doubt.

JS: I repeat that you have not found a man subservient to certain laws. You suppose you have found him that is all. I have found a man with free will.

FN: I FIND a man "with certain faculties subordinated to certain laws". I do not invent him. The effects of these Laws are such that, (constituted as I am), I *might* admit their author to be *Almighty* even if he did not "finish His work". I could not admit Him to be *righteous*, (constituted as He has made me) if He did not "finish His work."

f31r

"You charge the Almighty ~~to~~ with the duty of finishing a work He has left unfinished."

~~But~~ This is a forced construction. ~~to say that however.~~

 Taught by His Law,
I interpret that it is his Will *eternally* to carry on this work.

 "Left unfinished".

I believe that He *never* leaves it, but is carrying on in perfect wisdom, truth & love, the work of right which will never "finish".

JS: This again is a mere hypothesis on which you rest your own salvation & that of the human race.

 It is part of religion, true you say to your nature, utterly untrue & hollow to mine. Our natures there are radically opposed on the most important of all questions. So far as I have studied the laws to which you have alluded they bear no such interpretation as you have put upon them.

FN: "There may be a world where such a process is to go on, but it is certainly not this world, except in the case of the lower animals, who are perfect in their kind".

 This world's work is merely a part of the realization of God's plan, (viz. the education of imperfection towards perfection), as shewn by His Laws.

JS: This is true but it follows from quite other premises than yours. It does not follow from your premises.

f31v

FN: How indeed ~~could~~
can the thoughts of
the *Infinite* & Eternal
be carried out (or
perfected) in the
finite world?

JS: A proper question
but not german to your
position

FN: In
Infinity & Eternity alone
are we to advance
towards Perfection.

"Comte, Miss Martineau
& Mr. Atkinson - save
the mark!"

Let not my friend
give into the common
injustice of frivolously
supposing that one
who believes with
another on one point
believes with that other
on all points. With
Comte I believe in
the universality of Law,
but I entirely differ
here, viz that he thinks
right to stop short
when he has recognised
Law.

[Miss Martineau & Mr.
Atkinson's book ~~was~~ is
so weak, excepting in
what they borrowed
from Comte, that I
am really unable to
say in what their
propositions can be
agreed with or in what
differed from.]

JS: Yes, but these people by
narrow observation & by indulging
in the *idolum specus*, have some of
them denied God & others have placed
Law, of which they know nothing, as God.

f32r

FN: Now, if I could get
rid of the word Law,
I would - & substitute
for it "a thought of
God". For this is all
that it means to my
mind.

Comte sees Law
manifested throughout
the phenomena of the
Universe & nothing more.

I see ground for
believing, as above said,
that a Law is nothing
else than a thought
of God.

Without this staff,
I cannot conceive how
man dares bravely
to walk through Life's
difficult & dangerous
paths. With it, I
can conceive him
thanking God even
for his mistakes, from
which he learns
"*right*" for his kind.

JS: You and I agree never
now in the definition.

God is perfectly free.
Freedom is the essential condition
of spirit. God is infinitely
perfect and you can
depend on his perfectness.
Observe very carefully what
takes place under certain
specific circumstances, and to
the extent to which you can
defend from experience, you
may safely continue to defend.
This is really all we ought to
include under our idea of sequence.

Law is a thing imposed. It
saves us trouble if we can
refer to the statute book, but
in reality we cannot, we can
only observe, and if we do so
we shall find very little evidence
of what we understand as law
beyond the action of particles of
matter on each other. God acts
on a plan, we think we know his
plan but we don't.

FN: Except to the child
or the animal, Life

f32v

FN: can have no real
peace without the
belief, viz. that the
Law of which the
phenomena of the
Universe are a
manifestation, is
itself a manifestation
of the existence of
Omnipotent Right.

JS: You can have no peace
in it from the instant
the Soul is awakened out
of its slumber.

FN: All other peace can
be only insensibility
towards the sin &
suffering of our kind.

"There are or rather
alas! there were spiritual
Laws or, better & truer,
a spiritual economy
(for the term Law is
cold, frigid & irrational)
This economy is the
reminiscence of humanity
of the time when the
Father dwelt in his house.
But we *would not*."

Let each speak for
himself. *I would* that
the Father should dwell in His house,
or, rather, I do not wish, I *believe* that He *does* dwell
in every part of His house of the universe.

f33r

FN: And let me say that
I deprecate the use of
the Evangelical jargon.
It consists in saying
that we are *very bad*,
feeling all the while
that we are *very good*
for *saying so*.

JS: This is a misunderstanding
of the Xn Religion
altogether

FN: "The term Law is
irrational".

I should be glad
to change it. I want
a word to express -
- the uniformity of
the relations in which
phenomena exist to
one another; ~~to which~~
~~we owe what power~~
~~we have to~~ in proportion to
our knowledge
of which relations
we can foretell &
influence the future.

JS: Apply it to material phenomena
& welcome, because we have
made it out by observation,
with the statement it
is different, we have
observed very little.

f34r

V. V III OBJECTIONS

FN: "Whence comes Conscience?

From God."

Certainly -

- Like every ~~thing~~ other
faculty.

But what does
Conscience mean?

Is it not a consciousness
with regard to *some*
thoughts, feelings, actions,
expressed by calling
them wrong - with
regard to *others* by
calling them right -
consequently upon which
consciousness we desire
the latter, avoid the
former? But what
is right or what is
wrong - does Conscience
tell us this? In this matter, Conscience
has given entirely
different ~~dictates~~ verdicts to
different ages & nations.
Conscience told Calvin
to allow that poor fool
Servetus to be burnt.
Conscience told the

{f34v}

Egyptian Ptolemies
to marry their sisters.
Conscience told the
old Romans to kill
themselves. Conscience told the
Jews to marry a
~~great~~ many wives
& a ~~grea~~ & more
concubines. Conscience
told Abraham to
marry his wife's
maid & then to
murder his own child. Many things,
~~which now are~~
considered crimes which
we must not even
mention, were at
other periods or by other
races considered duties
or virtues.

{f34r} JS: There is no need of answering
this paper in detail because
the arguments are the same as in
the others. Your views which
rank you among the so called
Positive religionists, and their
views are based on principles
which I deny because the
principles are hypothetical, & rest
on no observed facts.

1 Necessity is *not* a law of the
Universe.

2 Man's volition is absolutely free
or he would not be man. There
is no qualification of the term
admissible. I hold free will in
the sense of absolute independent
volition. A power given by God
to man to constitute him man.

3. I have no doubt that Gods
moral government is just & perfect.
but we have never yet discerned
how that government is conducted.
and most likely never will.

{f34v} 4. I hold that the most obvious object of Gods dealings with man is that man while retaining his will perfectly free should in his very independence yield his will to God's will, & not absorb it in God's will. Holding these principles, the first three of which I hold to be proved and the last to be an obvious induction, I cannot for an instant admit your principles: the errors in which are obvious [of?] & easily traceable to your doctrine of necessity & your ideas of Law.

{f34v}

FN: Conscience tells many
"to send up prayers
& groans & bloody
sacrifices for mercy
& petitions for Grace"

Conscience
tells me ~~that, while~~ the reverse - as long as
I believe myself
under the rule of a
Being whose Love,
Truth, Justice, Wisdom
are inconsistent with

f35r

the idea of "Mercy", &
to whom "bloody sacrifices
& petitions" would be
but as the ignorance
of His poor child,
waiting for a better
understanding of Him.

I do not "petition
for Grace". I ask for
nothing. I rejoice
always that His Will
is Law through Infinity
& Eternity. Believing
thus, I can thank God
even for suffering &
sorrow - even while
struggling with the
hardest suffering, my
own ignorance & mistakes,
past or present.

JS: These ideas have been working in many minds for the last half century, and are to be traced in their present form to the revival or rather creation of physical Science during the first French revolution. Since that time *matter* has been in the ascendant & Metaphysical Science has been greatly neglected among us. And the result of all on Colleges & Mechanics institutes has been that mens thoughts & methods of reasoning have been directed into the Channel of material induction, which is all very well & necessary with matter but which leads only to error when transferred into the spiritual world. It is from this that first arose the modern necessitarian philosophy. Judging in fact **{f35v}** of spiritual things by the scale of atomic equivalents. And hence the idea of constructing a religion by subjecting Gods government & mens relations to God, to laws similar in their operation to the physical laws, and to perfect a man as you would perfect beer by "fermentation."

{f35r}

FN: "God has laid on all his creatures an instinct requiring both Mercy & Grace."

I have no such instinct. Nor more have many others, ~~who~~ ~~are~~ sincerely conscientious.

f35v

FN: Hence the desire for "Mercy & Grace" cannot be called an "instinct", but the consequence of certain views, with regard to which it is desirable to consider whether there is, or is not, ground to believe them true.

"This is simply Hypothesis."

Law, *if it exist at all*,
(and whether it does, or does not, must stand on evidence) is not "Hypothesis" but fact. Its *character & tendency* are developing, & will be understood more & more, as we improve in being & advance in knowledge. We can trace no beginning & no end to the thought of the Being who manifests Himself in Law. Our glimpse at this eternal manifestation must be imperfect. But it is a revelation ever ready to unfold itself to our efforts to understand it. In this world, doubtless, it *has* the character of "Hypothesis" to be verified hereafter. [So have many other things, upon which nevertheless we act].

JS: If new religions are to be [illeg] by miracles surely this "positive Religion" has more miracles than any other ever had. Its miracles are miracles of reasoning. Matter is subject to laws deduced from observation. ergo Spirit is subject to laws of which we have *no* observation. God appears to govern the material

f36r

JS: universe by defined laws which we can in some sense arrive at. ergo God governs the spiritual universe by laws we put hypothetically. And it is literally on this that Christianity is rejected. A stranger Mutation of the perversity of that free will which is denied could hardly be adduced.

You differ from others of these opinions in that you push your logic further, but you do not push it to its legitimate result, which, incredible, as it may appear, is hero worship & polytheism, but of a different aspect from the elder polytheism.

FN: "God in creating must have created other beings in one of two Antitheses, 1. righteous, i.e. cognizant of & obeying every condition on which the welfare of the universal Creation depends, & for this the gift of Free Will is absolutely essential. or 2. unrighteous, i.e. disobedient to the conditions, which is absurd."

I see no *evidence* that Man is created righteous or unrighteous - nor any reason why he *should be* created in one state or the other. The baby enters the world, neither in one state nor the other, unless ~~you~~ the diabolical doctrine be adopted of "baptismal regeneration".

f36v

FN: †† The baby *becomes* the one or the other, according as its thoughts -, feelings -, character, in short, - are developed by its circumstances acting on its organization. If we will, we can, to a certain degree, affect organization, & when we cannot affect it, & adapt circumstances ~~to it favourably, when we cannot affect it.~~ to it. And, if Mankind at large, attain to desiring the right, they will learn more & more to bring about this - viz. that both organization & circumstances shall ensure continual progress, in righteousness, of being & of life.

Can any evil be shewn in human life ~~which is~~ not *more or less* remediable by power, wisdom, & goodness *attainable* by man. Who shall say *how far*, then, ~~it~~ all evil is not remediable.

JS: In taking what may be called the active side your reasoning passes through pantheism & stops, push it further & you get hero worship. The human mind moves in all this in a circle.

When man left to himself looked in the day & night orbs he said they were Gods. When he settled in cities & his passions were lighted up he adored them. When he got an unexpected deliverance he adored his deliverer. And now after all these ages man while admitting the supreme God has come round to the deification of the laws by which he considers the universe is governed, and he aspires to conform himself to God not on any positive knowledge of facts but on an assumption that certain supposed laws which he supposes he has discovered are the will of God.

f37r

FN: "It is necessary that the soul should receive *what* it requires from the Father - otherwise it would be independent of its source, which is impossible. Why should the soul be the only exception in the Universe to dependence on its Creator & upholder?"

Am I conceiving of human nature as "independent of its source", when I conceive of man's entire being as a manifestation of the Divine Thought & Will?

[This is not a forced construction, but a misconstruction of what I say.]

It is the *right* wish of our nature, *not* to be machines, "clay" in the hands of the "potter" - yet to attain (*by his help*

{f37v}

-given to our feebleness & ignorance-) to be *one* with the Spirit of Love & Wisdom.

For this end we are *entirely* "dependent" on his help. He gives it in the teaching of his Law. We are (and we rejoice to be) *entirely* "dependent" on Him.

JS: {f37r} Hindooism was the "positivism" of 2000 years ago. Buddhism comes very near in some of its aspects to the present positivism.

The present "positivism" ought to end in worship of man by man.

The views in this paper are certain to gain a certain amount of circulation, as in fact they have already done. They will lead to enquiry, on some unexamined points in philosophy & in theology, & then they will have served their time.

f37v

JS: Man will reassert his free will. And as soon as he recovers that he will be at no loss to discover what is true & what is untrue in the system. Like every other similarly constructed system it is not all false. Much in it is true, not inherent, but desired from habits of thought engendered by Christianity, which you may rest assured will hold its own till the consummation of all things.

Up to the present time we know nothing which harmonizes with the facts of our nature except Christianity. These views certainly do not.

FN: "The Golden Age has the authority of infinitely greater adaptation & acceptance than this Hypothesis".

I have yet to ~~learn the~~ find any evidence that the "Golden Age" ever existed, ~~and the~~ still more, any reason why ~~or that~~ it ever ought to have existed - or how the "Cross" is "the only key which opens the mystery of obedience & free will". [~~vide Dr. S.~~]

f38r

FN: "Knowledge" "a mastery over the will depriving it of its freedom".

Does it deprive us of free-will, (in the sense above given to it), that we certainly *shall* decide in some cases, according to our "knowledge"?

On the contrary. We are even indignant, sometimes, with others, for supposing that we can decide otherwise than we do, having such or such a "knowledge" - "Could I decide", we hear it said, "otherwise, when I 'knew' so & so"? "Could *I*, when I *knew* the soldiers were being murdered wholesale, decide otherwise than to give all I had to prevent it?

f38v

FN: "Will presupposes freedom, or it is not will, but something else."

We must define *Will*.

Is it not inclination realizing itself, i.e inclination of such a kind & degree & existing in such circumstances as that consequent upon the

~~will be the realization of the inclination or attempt to realise in the present or determination to realize or to attempt to realize it~~

it will realize or attempt to realize itself in the present, or determine to realize, or to attempt to realize itself in the future?

In other words, Will includes wish intention & the belief that it can realize that ~~wish~~ intention. Such inclination or Will is free in this sense:

No power can prevent any inclination which a man would have, (in the state in which he is at any particular time), if not prevented by any superior power.

f39r

FN: "Choice & the power of choice was the Creator's final finishing touch to man".

If "choice" means the unhesitating decision for right, as opposed to wrong, the righteous man will choose. [I have said nothing ~~to~~ at variance with this]. Will does not mean merely choice after doubt. Inclination realizing itself *without* doubt is still ~~will as well as much so~~ as much as (or more so than) where doubt has preceded or accompanied.

"Law has been represented as God." Not by me. But the reverse.

I have in no sense represented Law as God, but as the thought of God. I think *the error is* where Law is recognised, as manifested in

f39v

phenomena, but where
a Mind is *not*
recognised as the Source,
of which Law is the
manifestation only.

All I know of Law, ~~is~~
from its character &
tendency, is that it is
the manifestation of an
Omnipotent Righteous-
ness, expressed by the
word GOD.

"The supreme fallacy
of modern times,
substituting Law for
Necessity".

I set out by avoiding
the words "*Necessity*" and
"*Free Will*", because as now used they
convey misconceptions.

~~For Human Nature~~
~~exists the possibility~~
~~to attain for human nature~~
Do not recur to them, without
definition, therefore.
The possibility exists for mankind to
attain for mankind
the power & the
will to will right.
Can we desire any
thing else?

f40r

FN: "Whenever it is impossible to do wrong, there is no longer "Man" but some other being."

Yet we know it to be impossible to *some* men to do wrong in *some* ways. We know that A. could not tell a lie, whatever the temptation - nor B. take his neighbour's property - nor C neglect a sick person committed to her charge, nor drink his wine, nor take away his pillow.

Where, then, are we to place the limit of how far it may become impossible to man to commit any wrong? I do not assert that it will be ever impossible to ~~mankind~~ Human Nature to do wrong in any possible human circumstances. I cannot see so far into the possibility of Human progress as to assert or deny it.

f40v

FN:

"Always the same fallacy.
Of late years Law has
been gradually rising
into God. We will not
surrender our freedom!"

I have attempted to
define the sense in which
we "will as we please" -
no higher power pre-
venting, if it is in our
nature to please.

I have attempted to
define how it is in human
nature to attain to will
as we please, if we
attain to please to will
right. The question
remains - is law a
"fallacy"? - or does it
exist?

"We will not
surrender our freedom!"
is an exclamation
which seems to arise
from a misconception
of the question, from
a misunderstanding of
the nature of the "freedom"

f41r

FN:

possessed by Man.
& of the power which man
may attain, - consistently
with the existence of
Law, as manifested
in all phenomena, -
(in volitions as in
other phenomena)
Hence our power
over our volitions,
because hence our
means to bring about
certain volitions in
our own minds or
those of others.

Whether Law exists
or not must be matter
of evidence, & whether,
if it exists, we may
derive from it the
power which will
assist us to be & to
live righteously.

f42r

FN:

"The tenor of the principles in this paper is Pantheism"

Pantheism attempts an explanation of the mode of being of God. I express the belief that the mode of being of Him, who is manifested by Law, as the Source of Law, is inconceivable by human nature.

I maintain that Phenomena (& laws manifested by Phenomena) are open to human observation & are the subjects of human experience.

These Laws, in their effects as known through this experience of Phenomena, are unsatisfactory to the healthy appropriate

f42v

FN:

desires of Man for
Mankind - (healthy,
that is, in accordance
with Law).

Hence we are urged
to enquire whether the
character & tendency
of these Laws is such
as to reveal a future,
- whether, considered
in connection with a
future, their rule
becomes satisfactory
to man's best desires
for mankind.

The more we study
them, the more we find
them adapted to educate
the imperfect towards
perfection - to afford
that education which
had WE the power, we
should give as the
best boon to imperfection.

Such character &
tendency reveal them

f43r

FN:

to be the manifestation
of a Righteous power -
(i.e. reveal them ~~as~~ to be
consistent with
righteous power) - and,
as far as we can see,
reveal them as the only thought, the
realization of which
would be consistent
with Omnipotent
Righteousness -

Consistent~~ly~~ with
the nature of Omnipotent
Righteousness is a sequel
to Human Life, which
shall be the continuation
of ~~the~~ an education of the
Imperfect towards the
Perfect, - an education
for each and for *all*, - an education
in which *this* world
has been for some a
beginning, for others
a preparation only.

f43v

JS:

In reading over what I have
I am afraid some
expressions may appear harsh.

I am apt to write rather too
energetically.

There is I fear not the slightest
chance of our agreeing.
Your point of sight of these
matters and my point of
sight are totally different.

For many years I have read
& otherwise come in contact with
almost all the new ideas
on these subjects, but I have
never been able to comprehend
the state of mind out of which
such ideas can have arisen. And
the instant I get hold of these
ideas they break up into a
kind of mist & float away.

The impression produced
on me by them is that they
are mental exhalations.

Knowing, if ever I do know,
how infinitesimally small is our
knowledge when I fear people
raise systems of thought or
belief on history on the barest
suppositions (as it appears to me)

I am sorry to say my Charity
fails miserably, especially
when I am required to surrender
what I know to be true in order
to receive the new faith.

I could never be a necessitarian.

It is not in me. We have
our necessitarians in Science
also & their doctrines I equally
refuse. I love only that
clear bright intelligence which
recognising freedom & loyalty
in all things strives to combine
them in all things. But to
escape the contest by taking
refuge in law or necessity
or plan or any other
such idea would be to me
neither free nor loyal

It is just this in which
Christianity is so immeasurably
superior (merely as a philosophy)
to all these systems, and
which makes a descent from
the New Testament into your/John
Chapman's [illeg watership?] like [see]
going from freedom into slavery.

f44r FN:

VI.

LAW,
NECESSITY
FREE WILL.

Direction the present
theology is taking.

Nature & tendency
of *Law*.

Definition of Freedom,
Free Will.

Distinction - or rather
opposition - between
Law & Necessity.

Law the exposition
of God - & the only
exposition.

Mankind must
create mankind,
by means of God's
Law.

God's *Law* our means
& inducement, in our
progress from
imperfection towards
perfection.

VI [right column]

The character of religious literature in these days is truly alarming.

For the last 300 years, it has been purely destructive. And no one has thought of reconstruction.

Before that time, the Roman Catholic loved God & Christ & the Holy Ghost, the Virgin Mary & the Saints. Then came the Protestant & he destroyed the Virgin Mary & the Saints. But he did not make God, Christ or the Holy Ghost more loved or loveable. Then came the Unitarian, & destroyed Christ & the Holy Ghost. But he did not make God more loved or loveable.

Now the conflict

f44v

FN: between R. Catholic
& Protestant is well
nigh over. And no
one reads "controversial"
literature. The roarings
of Cumming are
listened to by an
infinitesimally small
sect. And the
Cardinal Archbishop
has taken to lecturing
on art in Hanover
Square Rooms!!

JS: Allow me to make a
passing remark on this
decline of religion.
I do not call it religion
at all that has declined.
The church has always
contained all kinds of people
& it is not surprising if
certain formulas have ceased
to carry weight.

The *real people* are in
no way influenced by such
phenomena.

FN: But what has
taken its place?

The alarming
literature above
referred to -
consisting either in
a superficial defence
of the doctrine of
Free Will, urged by
those as, e.g.
Kant
Cousin
Revd. James Martineau
who are
terrified at an
equally superficial
glance at Necessity.
~~or by the literature~~
~~which is~~ in a doctrine now rapidly

f45r

FN: becoming the only
one ~~which~~ thinking
men will entertain,
~~& which~~ viz. that represented
by Comte, Buckle, Mill,
Quetelet. This consists in (directly
or indirectly) establishing *Law*,
~~(which is being now~~
(recognised as it is now becoming with
unexampled ~~rapidity~~ completeness
as obtaining in every department,
physical, moral,
intellectual of the
Universe).

JS: This statement is very
doubtful. Necessity is one
of the oldest of theories & its
prevalence marks decline
of intellectual vigor
& a surrender of free will
rather than incur its con-
-sequences. The human mind
revolts from it, in time, &
reasserts its rights. It has
done so hitherto & will do so
again.

To Buckles & Comtes supposed
discoveries I simply reply -
"dubito"

FN: But *not* in ~~recognising~~ establishing Law
as the thought of God,
~~but~~ rather in *substituting*
it for Him. in
looking upon all farther research
as being after a "barren theory".

These authors seem to
consider Law, which is
only a formula, as an
explanation, a First
Cause, for phenomena.
R = n. This is a formula.
It explains nothing. No
one would say that writing
down R = n "explains away"
God in any department of
His Universe - Now no law which
can be stated is anything more
than this.

f44v **JS:** ~~Yes! They consider it something different.~~
The objection to their whole procedure
is that they employ most defective methods
of observation & enquiry. That they classify
supposed facts, and apply to their classifications
the term *law* which invests them with an
apparent value of which they are destitute.

f45r

FN: ~~This~~ But what makes
the superficial
recognition of
Quetelet's truths
so dangerous is that
they convey to the
half-taught mind

f45v

FN: the delusion of *necessity*;
~~instead of shewing~~
~~is us~~ Whereas, so far from
really ~~doing~~ supporting necessitarianism, they
in fact, shew
how these very
Laws place into our
~~its~~ hands the ~~very~~ power
~~& the only power~~
which God deigns to give
to man. For all that is His He designs to make ours -
even his Omnipotence.

JS: Every thing of course depends
on these Laws having been
DISCOVERED WHICH THEY HAVE NOT.

The religion of [FN?]
Comte, of Buckle
&c, and even, (&
this is most extra-
ordinary), of the puny
Reviewers who have
dealt after their
puny fashion with
these great minds - [see]

JS: Great only in the *petitio principii*.
In other things quite other than
great.

FN: is mere asperation, "ima-
gination", - nothing more -
beyond. "in other words,
it religion is a mere transitional
form of thought."

JS: No one knows what religion
is but its possessor.
It is the "white storm" of the
Apocalypse.

FN: Surely, it cannot be intended to say that absolute Truth
~~cannot~~ depends on
what state man is
in at any given moment. And, if not,
what Comte calls the
"Theological, & Metaphysical
& Positive" stages of religion are only three forms of the
"imagination".

f46r

FN:

"Free Will *in Philosophy*

I define to be an
inherent faculty of
spirit whereby it
is capable of willing
any order of sequences,
whether such order
is to begin to be, to
cease to be or to have
its direction altered.

"Free Will *in Morals*

I define to be an
inherent faculty of the
human mind, whereby
it is capable of willing
any order of moral
sequences, or (so far as
the physical capacities
of men will permit)
any order of physical
sequences which it
chooses to will.

"Generally that Free

Will or Liberty, as
opposed to *necessity*,
is under no condition
external to itself, to
will or not to will,

f46v

FN: according as such external condition may require. That there is absolute freedom in short in the function or faculty of volition, while the "introduction of the idea of necessary sequences in the functions of the will raises necessity into the rank of governing power in the spiritual kingdom, to which all freedom of activity in the Highest as well as the lowest realm of spiritual existence must be subordinated.

~~Dr-S~~

Before "I define"

"Free Will" let me define "Freedom", "Liberty". Am I to understand these words to signify absence of impediment to *any* wish which might, by possibility, enter into the human mind?

JS: Free will is just what the words express. It does not involve freedom of activity.

Human freedom aims at pure external activity. Free will relates to the inner world alone, and through the inner to the outer world.

f47r

FN: E.g. if a child were to wish to go to the moon, is it correct to say that the impossibility of going to the moon is an absence of "*freedom*", of "*Liberty*"? Or does the word "*freedom*" not apply in this case - it being correct to say that human beings have not *power* to go to the moon, - or, in other words that, to beings constituted as we are it is impossible - while it is not correct to say that human beings have not the freedom to go to the moon.

But take another instance. If Lord Derby were to have wished, fifty years ago, to cross the Atlantic by means of steam, the inability to do so, arising as it did from ignorance or uncultivated capability, it would not be correct to call want

{**f47v**} of "*liberty*" but want of *power*. Power which an individual or a race does not possess at one period of existence may yet be attainable at another.

JS: {f47r} The illustrations here given as opposed to freedom do not touch the question at all. They belong to quite another question, namely the variance between *volition* and *action*, and its causes.

These cases may all be true and a thousand million other similar cases may be true, but they leave the question of free will just where it was.

The limitations & their causes & consequences would form quite a separate enquiry.

At the same time, it appears to me that all the modern discussions on the subject of *Law* resolve themselves not into determining the law of the universe into the *law*, if there be any, which regulates these limitations. They evade free will.

The subject is highly important. It is partly philosophical partly practical, partly physiological, but it is incapable of being applied in the manner in which the term *law* is applied.

f47v

JS: I formerly illustrated the whole subject by citing the case of a musician playing on a good or a bad instrument, as it refers to psychology

FN: But take another instance still. Suppose I had wished to plan the dome of S. Peter's. Such impossibility, whether from incapability in the nature, or ~~want~~ absence of development and cultivation, it is not correct to call want of "*freedom*" but want of power. Yet Michael Angelo did it. To one individual is possible what is impossible to another.

JS: Instead of discussing the causes of the difference or want of adaption between *will* & *power*, in regard to which we have a large amount of knowledge. It is better to state the result as it affects our discussion.

Suppose the universal human will were rightly directed. That is suppose all mankind always willed to love & serve God & Man but yet did not do it on account of the same kind of limitations you instance, then it is quite clear that what we ought to do is to develop *power*. But it is a simple fact that the *will* itself is at fault in most of the observed cases, - not the *power* simply.

{f48r} To bring the observed cases in morals parallel with those in physics which you have cited, the *will* must be *right* & free, and the *power* defate. [?] But this is contrary to fact observation & experience.

{f47v}

FN: Again, take a fourth instance. If I am ill & in consequence unable to go to see my

f48r

FN: mother whom
otherwise I should
go to, this impossibility
it is not correct to
call want of "*freedom*",
but loss of power to
go - tho, in common
parlance, it may be
called "*being a prisoner*".

An injury to the brain
from a fall is said
to have deprived a
man of the knowledge
of three languages.
As means were taken
to promote his recovery,
one after the other
returned to his memory.
This was not the
recovery of his "*liberty*"
but of his *power*.

Take a fifth instance.
The fall of a burning
house prevents all
egress to a man in
the basement. Such
prevention is commonly
called loss of liberty.
But, if so called, what

f48v

FN: definite meaning can be attached to the word liberty? If a man is prevented by a storm from joining his ship at sea, we do not call this want of liberty. Yet, if we use the word in the former cases, & not in the latter, what is the distinction?

If I am prevented
by the will of another from the possibility of realizing an inclination, this is distinctly want of liberty. And I do not see any definite meaning which can be attached to the word, unless by thus limiting its application.

JS: This illustration is of a somewhat different character. If you mean that simply the *expressed will* of another so influences you as to prevent the realization of an inclination, then such a result can only ensue from the action of your own will. I have the power of willing or of not willing, but *volition* so to speak precedes both acts, *for both are acts*. In my will I am sovereign or subject, just as I please. I must perform an act of abdication before I can obey another will. The more perfectly human nature is

{f49r} developed the more sensible will such acts of abdication become, and the reasons for them will be always higher & nobler, at present they are chiefly the result of moral deficiency or cowardice.

If I felt as I ought, I should never follow any other will than my own even in the most minute point without feeling that it was right to surrender my will in the case. Almost all the cases of the kind you mention are simply indifference or acquiescence of the will mostly unconsciously.

{f48v} FN: Such distinctions may be unimportant in common conversation - but are so important

f49r

FN: in such an enquiry as this that, if we would advance one step beyond the mere everlasting *persiflage*, for I can call it nothing better, which prevails about "Free Will" & "Necessity", we must begin by such careful definition.

Otherwise we shall learn nothing concerning the government of Human nature by superhuman power.

In the sense above ~~given by~~ defined of the word *Liberty*, *Freedom*, Man has absolute Free Will i.e. no other Will prevents his willing what is accordant with his nature.

JS: This I consent to.

FN: In other words, his Will is not prevented by any other Will from being what it would be but for another Will.

JS: This I do not quite understand. It appears to me not to agree with the above.

f50r

FN: "The more modern
"development of the
"idea of *Law in the*
"*spiritual universe,*
"so far as I can
understand it, I
"take to be, either
"that co-existent with
"the eternity of the
"divine or spiritual
"nature (as contra-
distinguished from
"matter) there have
"existed certain
necessary sequences
"by which the Divine
"nature *found itself*
"*found*", (Qy, who has
said this? not I
certainly.) Editor's note.

JS: You do not say this in so many words, but your exposition in more than one instance was based on the theory.

"and that in creating
"spiritual intelligences,
"it became *necessary*"

FN: (again, who has said this? - quote.)

JS: I cannot quote because I judged from the obvious consequences of the principles themselves.

JS: Mark! neither the first nor second definition of *Law* is mine. Both are to me equally unintelligible. I have introduced two definitions of what I understand you to mean by Law as applied to the government of the universe. The first involves Philosophical necessity involving both God & man in its menses [?]. The second involves moral necessity leaving God free, but binding mans will in a certain pre determined chain of sequences.

The latter is just as much opposed to what I believe to be the truth as established by experience as the former is to all our ideas of the Divine nature.

I understand you to reject the first & to hold to the second. At least some of the following passages would lead me to infer so, although there are others at variance with it.

FN: "to create them in

f50v

FN:

"accordance with

"these necessary

"sequences."

[This *is* the definition
of necessity - certainly
not of Law - which
pre-supposes some
thing *laid down*
by the *will* of the
Law-giver.]

"Or that the Divine
"nature by an act of
"its own will established
"a certain order of
"sequences, and left
"these to follow all
"their evolutions for
"ever, the divine nature
"by the condition of the
"problem having with-
"drawn itself from all
"connection with those
"sequences, & so to speak,
"beholding their evolution
"apart and from a
"distance".

f51r

FN: ~~Volitions are a
manifestation of Law.~~

Law is that which
is *laid down*.

JS: I object to this definition of
Law. In the present case the
only possible definition is "a succession
of sequences so numerous & invariable
as to enable us to trust in their future
invariableness". Can we do this.

This is as great a
petitio principii as anything
that Comte or Buckle
ever wrote.

My reply is simply "nego."

FN: There is ground to believe that there exist relations of simultaneity & succession between phenomena (including among phenomena the volitions of the Human Mind) which have the uniformity which would exist, if such relations were *laid down* by ~~Power~~, (or in other words were the regulations of) a Power able to effect such uniformity.

[The "established order of sequences," which is complained of as shewing that the Power has "with-drawn" to a "distance" is ~~to me~~ the proof that *He* is always there, "in whom is no variableness neither shadow of turning."]

JS: Here there is a mixture of ideas. I agree at once that God governs all things on a fixed plan or economy, but I deny, for that very reason, *evolution* by what is called *law*.

f51v

FN: Volitions are a manifestation of Law, because, preceding (or co-existing with) every volition, there exist (or have existed) phenomena, without the existence of which such volition would not have existed - but which, having existed in the same relation as to precedence or co-existence any number of times, those volitions would exist such number of times.

JS: In other words volitions stand in the relation of *effects* to antecedent *causes*.

Now there is only one definition of a cause. A cause is that, which if increased, diminished or suspended, increases, diminishes or suspends the presumed effect.

This is not at all the case with volitions & motives. It is simply an observed fact that the very same antecedents to volition affect different wills opportunity & the same will opportunity at different times. It is true that there is a general *tenor* so to speak in the manifestation of volition in every individual but this arises from other causes besides your supposed law of sequences.

FN: [Every body knows & acknowledges this in ~~his~~ ~~their~~ own practice. Every body who has had at all to put himself practically into moral training in order to manage his own will, has tacitly acknowledged it. A "Sister of Charity" who had to go to South America to nurse the Yellow Fever, told

f52r

FN: me that she took care to receive the invitation, not after she had been at "recreation" or in her Laboratory, but after she had been at "meditation", when she was sure to accept it.

She did not attribute this to any supernatural "grace", but to her having thus brought her will (by observing the ~~usual~~ ~~constant~~ relations of succession which are constant) into that conformity with the will of God which was essential to her performing such an act of "self sacrifice"].

JS: {f51v} This is quite true, but it in no sense bears out your supposition it is no proof of anything other than that the will can be trained, which is a fact. That is to say that any class of motives, benevolent malevolent, pure, impure, lofty mean, can be used *by this will* to give it greater facility of action in a **{f52r}** specific direction. I put this in the ordinary language, but there are physiological reasons of the highest importance why the action of the will can be modified by men in this way. *But will does it all, not God, nor Law of sequence.* The sequence follows on the action of the will. It does not precede the action.

The nuns practice is consistent with sound physiology & sound reason as well as religion, but it is no proof that the will is governed by Law. Physiologically the *nuns act* rendered the *wills act* very much easier.

But nature is teeming with similar illustrations. Only the Will is always Lord Paramount.

FN: These relations of simultaneity & succession (~~or regulations~~) are such as to justify us in actually considering them the regulations of a Power & Will of a ~~certain~~ nature which can be inferred from their character & tendency.

JS: They would were they constant, for they would partake of the nature of law, but they are not constant except so far as they are *willed* to be so by the *will*, and if in the process the acts followed always in due sequence, then the will would be, as it ought to be, on its throne as law giver.

FN: If it is "laid down", or determined by Will, Divine or Human, that, to a

f52v

FN: certain state of things, a certain state of things shall be successive - that with a certain state of things shall co-exist, - such determination we call *Law*, and the word expresses *will* exercised in a different manner from that which is exercised by decree.

JS: Here you have again changed your ground. *I* agree if you give the power to the Will. It then becomes independent, & free & we can then discuss the laws it enacts. But it escapes both from Comte & Buckle. But in any case the will as Lawgiver would be above Law.

FN: The chief of a savage tribe wills the death of a man for a theft, altho' thefts are habitually committed without punishment.

A mother has a child's ears boxed for accidentally breaking a tea-cup by crawling over the tea-table, altho' the child habitually crawls over the tea-table without punishment.

In either case this is a *decree* or order, but not a regulation or *law*.

JS: The whole of these cases touch of easy decision.

f53r

JS: another question which admits of easy decision so soon as we have settled that man will be free. But the decision would be very different if we decided man will not be free. All depends on whether man *can* absolutely or *cannot* absolutely. If the former, human laws are justifiable, if the latter, they are unjustifiable. Anarchy in morals is the legitimate result of abdication of the will.

FN: A determination that every man detected in the commission of a theft ~~should~~ shall be put to death - that ~~the~~ a child, every time it crawls about the tea-table ~~should~~ shall be put to bed would be a Law. We do not therefore say that either of these individuals has been deprived of *liberty* or that the governing power has "with drawn to a distance".

On the contrary, Law enforced is the means by which the Governing Power induces those who live under it to govern themselves. If a man or a child knows that, by keeping a Law in ~~some~~ a particular manner, he or it is certain to obtain some object of his or its desire, the Law furnishes an inducement to him

f53v

FN: or it so to keep it.

JS: All human law
presupposes freedom
in mens will.

FN: ~~In fact, the vacillation
in parents, (which is
what we want to see
in God, what if at least, we
the holders of 'the Beggar's
doctrine of asking
God, want to see in Him)~~
God towards him is exactly what
most children arrived at maturity, complain of having suffered from
of in their parents,
viz. that their decrees
can were not to be *depended*
upon.

It by no means follows
that *Law* is necessarily
an appeal to *selfish*
feeling.

Man, well
born, well developed,
well bred, well cir-
cumstanced, will not
be a selfish being.

JS: We are dealing not with the
few very few exceptional cases, but
with the 1000 millions of human
wills.

FN: Such a man, discovering
that there is a way
of keeping *Law* by
which he may promote
the health & virtue

f54r

FN: of his fellow=creatures is
furnished by existing
Laws with inducement
to keep them ~~in~~ after that
~~way~~ manner.

[And here I must
refer to a common
confusion about the
word *Law*.

"Thou shalt not kill"
is said to be God's *Law*.

JS: But this is not God's *Law*.
For men *do* kill. But
God's *Law* is never broken.

FN: ~~But~~ Men do kill &
if they *could* not kill,
there would indeed
be no "liberty". This is
Moses' Law, not God's
Law.

JS: The exercise of liberty is either
in obeying or disobeying. There
is no liberty otherwise.

It is God's will that men shall neither
kill, steal, nor commit adultery,
but men do all these ergo they are
not God's laws at all!!!
Practical Communism realizes
this beautifully. Propriété! C'est le vol
marriage! C'est une crime,
jalousie. C'est une folie!!
And yet the Communists on such
premises as you have here laid down
are perfectly right. Abolish
property, marriage & jealousy &
you need no law at all of any
kind!! Man can even break God's physical
laws.

FN: Again, Quetelet says
there is a Law by
which not only such
a percentage of men
shall kill in a year,
but such a percentage
out of this percentage
shall use such a
weapon, such a
percentage shall use
poison etc.

JS: Again, there is no such
law. This is an entire misunderstanding
of the whole statistical argument,
and arises from omitting the conditions.
Statistics are not intended for such purposes.

FN: Either Moses or Quetelet
must be wrong, or both.
For one says, Thou shalt not
kill, in God's Law. And the
other says, Thou shalt kill,
in God's law.

JS: If Quetelet's statistics
proved what you say they would simply
shew that wicked society necessitates remedy:
nothing more.

f54v

FN: ~~But this~~ The fact is, this last is Quetelet's law, not God's law.

Again, it is said that there is a law that, ~~altho'~~ boys, between the age of 15 & 20, altho' they constitute only one tenth of the population, afford an amount of ~~their~~ crime which constitutes no less than one fourth of the total crime committed in that population.

But this is the Statistician's Law, not God's Law.

God's Law is that, given such organizations & such circumstances, given such a state of society, ~~in short,~~ - such a number of murderers will ~~take~~ ~~place~~ there be. And, further, such an amount of ~~suffering will be entailed on and by the murderers.~~ evil will be entailed on Society, teaching it the truth about crime.

JS: Again, there is no such law. It is an entire mistake & misuse of words. Society makes laws which very often it has usually no right to make & boys break laws they do not understand. The statistical proportion of possible law breakers is determined more by the number of laws and the activity of the Police than by the numbers of the population or its moral state. Gods law is that all men should do justly, love mercy & walk humbly with him. When society & the legislature do this there will be no juvenile delinquency. That is God's law. The statisticians law is the bitterest satire and condemnation not of the boys but of society. It proves Gods law in as far as it shows the evil results of disobedience. See + pag 62 ½

f55r

FN: God's Law is that,
given such a state of
society & such of
education, such an
amount of boy=crime
~~shall~~ will take place.

But what is this
but to say that we
must bring about
another state of
society & of education?

If indeed we were
to see a spotless &
virtuous generation of
youth growing out of our
education & society,
then indeed we
should be at ~~sea~~ a loss
~~to say anything but,~~
~~& we should be~~
~~justified in saying,~~
to conclude any thing else but that
This God has "withdrawn
Himself to a distance,"
& has ~~made~~ laid down no *Laws*
at all]

JS: This is all quite true, but Society consists of individuals. It has no corporate moral existence. Every man must act for himself. God has given certain laws in morals which have never been improved on, as has been acknowledged by every writer on morals. What he requires is that every man shall obey them INDIVIDUALLY, & he leaves the State as he well may to take care of itself. To treat society in such an argument as if it were a big boy is simply to blink the whole question of individual responsibility, and to expect society to do what the individuals composing it are not expected to do.

God deals with men individually, not with society, in these matters, except that he has as a necessary consequence entailed social misery on individual sin.

f55v

All natures, (possessing certain conditions of being, which, if not realized, their appropriate well-being will not be realized) if not omnipotent, not possessed of all knowledge, not perfect in wisdom & goodness, want assistance or guidance.

JS: SOCIETY MUST BE IMPROVED THROUGH THE INDIVIDUALS WHICH COMPOSE IT.

INDIVIDUALS CAN NEVER OTHERWISE BE IMPROVED THROUGH SOCIETY.

Hence Gods supreme wisdom in dealing with individuals.

FN: The history of mankind shews that the want of such assistance & guidance **JS:** I acknowledge the want individually.

FN: has led to the belief that is has been received by audible voices from an unseen world, by miraculously inspired teaching, by a cloud by day, a pillar of fire by night.

JS: + Page 11 1/2.

Apropos of these famous statistical laws. There are a definite number of fires in London year by year, & a definite loss of property & life. Are you prepared to use the statistical evidence in proof of Gods moral government of London or does it not rather prove that there is an annual average of wilful negligence? & no more.

FN: But, as the mind has progressed, some find there teachings do not contain intrinsic evidence of truth - they are but the teachings of

f56r

FN: men of like nature to ourselves - though in some way superior to those they taught.

JS: {f55v} I do think before you say the like of this you ought to state what teachers are better than Christ and his Apostles. I should like very much {f56r} to know them. Will you give me their names.

FN: Observation, extending throughout the phenomena of nature present & past, is presenting to us teachings of another kind, a governing power of another kind.

JS: This is a mere chimera.
It is however a very common
petito principii.

FN: A government is
good, in proportion as
it offers means and
inducement to a man
to realize for himself
or his kind a state
of being appropriate,
or befitting to human
nature - that is to say,
a state of being in
harmony with (or
adapted to) its present
type but ever progressing
towards a higher type. ~~of being~~
~~which we~~. What this higher type is we do not yet
know ~~not~~ definitely ~~what it is~~.

JS: - But even if it
were proved.
We have nothing to do with
Government in the argument of
free will at all. A man
is his own king & government.
And the true teachers of
mankind are those who teach
him so. The human race
exists. Societies & governments
are all evanescent, surface
phenomena. They are here today
& away tomorrow. We who live
under them are bound to do all
we can to alleviate their inequalities
& miseries, but let us never forget
that we have to do with immortal [?] [immoral?]
beings as *individuals*.
Civilisation alas! exists
for the very very few. For the many it
exists not, & perhaps never will.

f56v

FN: But we do know by
experience the capability
of human nature for
indefinite improvement.

JS: Non mille fois non!!
We hope, but we do not
know. Experience is most
adverse to this except in
individuals. *Society* as such
has improved little in 4000 histues [?]
years.

FN: The character &
tendency of *Law*, - (as
above defined), - as
manifested throughout
the phenomena of nature,
~~are that is is~~ shew it to be a process
~~of~~ for *thus* governing
human nature.

JS: All unproved, at least in
the sense I understand you
to believe in Law.

FN: This Law, not
written for the eye,
nor spoken ~~for~~ to the ear,
is observable in the
history of human exis=
tence, as it passes
before us.

JS: I believe firmly in Gods
moral government of his creature
Man, but to be morally
Governed at all men must
have free will. There are
two independent parties
God & man, and God
Deals with man solely through
his freedom. The law
which God has given is the
external law of moral freedom.
Take it or leave it. There
it is. Exercise your free
will on it. Obey it and
welcome. Disobey it and
welcome.

FN: Human existence
~~is~~ becomes, - within certain definite
limits, - one way or
another way of being,
one way or another
of organization, one or another
constitution - according
to, ~~or~~ i.e according *with*
certain co=existences

f57r

[14]

FN: or prae=existences.

What else do all
Crime Tables, Sanitary
Tables, Statistical
Tables shew us but
this?

JS: All these tables shew
simply the punishments which
men in this life ever have
reaped, & ever will reap
because they chose to exercise
their free will in being
ignorant, selfish, unjust,
covetous, haters, unclean,
If the human race were, each
individual of it to exercise its
will appositely, there would be
no crime tables or statistics
of preventable disease, or
Comptes &c.

FN: What else do all the
various organizations
of the earth, at
different periods,
the Greek, the Roman,
the Hindoo, the
Esquimaus, shew
us but this?

JS: They prove a moral Government
leaving mens wills free. I believe
more than half the evil in all
societies is the result of direct
crime in the Governors. That
is breaking the moral laws of
which they themselves are
cognizant, & expecting the rest to
obey them.

FN: Viz - that, if we possessed the knowledge of all facts & their connections, certain facts would be recognised as having, in every instance, existed in such connection with these organisations as that, without those facts preceding or co-existing, those organizations would

f57v

FN: not have been - and were those facts precisely again to co-exist or prae-exist, those organizations precisely again would exist.

The soil upon which a man has lived may be told by his appearance. The water the Guardsmen drank who dies by the Guadiana may be told by the record of their diseases.

JS: There are those relations here referred to, but they affect simply *matter*. They affect not *WILL*. I have already said that this is a separate enquiry involving *actions* not *will*. But it has nothing whatever to do with law. It is merely accidental. We cannot reason from it to moral freedom.

FN: ~~And, though we cannot
yet prove the whole
of the case, prove above that is that the proposition
obtains everywhere & throughout -
by actual experience,
yet it is experience
& reasoning upon
experience, which
lead all thinking
minds to believe it - to believe that it is
to be true universally
as we know it to be true
partially.~~

And, though we cannot
yet prove, by actual
experience, the *whole*
of the case; prove, that is
that the above proposition
obtains everywhere and
throughout - yet it is
experience, & reasoning upon
experience, which lead
all thinking minds - to
believe that it is so - that it is true
universally
as we know
it to be true
partially.

f58r

[15]

FN: Inclinations, of such
kind & degree as
induce the human
being in whom they
exist to realize or
to attempt to realize
them, exist in every
conscious human being.
Such inclinations we
designate ~~huma~~ as volitions.

JS: No not volitions.
They belong to a class of
phenomena which have never
been sufficiently examined,
but they are certainly not
volitions.

(++ Perhaps the best way would be:-
If you will admit *volitions*
to be perfectly *free & in-*
=dependent, I will enter
on the subject here mooted
namely the conditions which
limit the *action* of will.
But it is necessary that the admission
of freedom be absolute & unreserved.
before hand.)

FN: What the volitions of
each human being
are is a manifestation
of Law - i.e. given
a certain constitution
or organization, which
is in itself a manifes-
tation of LAW,

JS: Not necessarily.
in most cases it is
simply an embodiment
of contingencies & never
comes not under law,
the conditions & phenomena of
which must always be invisible.

FN: and given
circumstances which
affect that constitution
or organization in a
definite manner, there
will exist *definite*
volitions varying with,
(in *uniform relation* to)
the *organization* & the
circumstances.

JS: This is not necessarily
the case by any
means.

FN: Neither observation
nor experience lead us
to suppose that the

f58v

FN: Power manifested in
Law "found itself
"bound by certain
"sequences". Vide Dr. Sutherland's
definition of *Law*. To be so
"bound" would be a
state of things which
we should call *necessity*.
We see none of the
characteristics of *Law*
in it.

JS: You cannot escape *necessity*
in the application of the term
law you have here made.

FN: Law is not *neecessitated*
on the Ruler of the
Universe,

JS: Then this is not *law* but
moral government. It is the
just & infinitely wise
procedure of a perfectly
free creator to his free
creatures.

FN: but is the
eternal process of
realizing the thought
~~which is~~ accordant with,
~~with~~ harmonious ~~with~~ to
His nature, viz. the
progressive advance
of imperfection
towards perfection
by means & inducement
afforded by His Law.
in it.

[Note. These means & inducements do not always act
upon individuals, but upon the *whole human*
race, which is, as the French term it *solidaire*.
E.g. The murderer is not always induced by ~~his suffering~~ the evils of
murder
to devote himself to improving murderers & to banishing murder from
among
mankind. But mankind is induced, sooner or later,
to improve the state of society which produces murderers.]

JS:

Query with regard to the last sentence.

Please define the state of society & the amount of population which composed it when Cain killed Abel?

You can abolish murder theft & adultery, the three cardinal human sins only by one of two processes Abolish property & marriage & separate the human race.

In other words destroy society, or if ~~you~~ this ab extra experiment should be impracticable (although the Communists would have it tried) then you must proceed ab intra through the soul & conscience of man, & teach him to obey these laws.

FN: When our limited nature

attempts to conceive of a nature superior to our own, we conceive of a nature, like our own in kind, ~~by means of~~ having those attributes which we trace in His Laws.

"Only in so far as man "is the image of God & "can think like God, can "he give the reason of "anything that God has "made". This is true, yet, in attempting to interpret the thought of the Ruler of the Universe through our own, we are not open to the sarcasm that "Man makes God" - we are to *interpret, not invent.*

JS: *Certainly!* But this is the whole *onus* against Buckle Comte, Martineau & in that they start with a preconception & range round it all manner of surmises & form a system.

FN: And, if we find existing phenomena referable to Laws, manifesting thought,

f59v

FN: purpose, feeling, such as we are ourselves conscious of, though on a scale infinitely greater than our own as ~~the Universe~~ Infinity exceeds our sphere & as Eternity exceeds our span of time on earth, we are justified in attributing such thought, purpose, feeling to a nature in kind resembling our own.

JS: If it be unwise for men to measure themselves by themselves it is surely not wise to measure God, by themselves.

FN: We learn from our own attempts at
Government & at
Education

the advantage of Law over Decree.

JS: Government Is too often founded on what is quite a different principle from that on which education is founded.

FN: An Education which furnishes means and inducement to its pupils to find their proper way along existence by the appropriate exercise and

f60r

FN: improvement of their
faculties is the best
boon an imperfect
nature is capable
of receiving.

JS: {f59v} I hardly know how to deal
with you. There are passages
such as this that are
inconsistent altogether with
certain other principles you
lay down.

I agree with this. Nay more
{f60r} I believe it contains the
whole truth as to the moral
government of men for it
includes both faculty, matter
& will. And it is thus
the Creator appears to deal
in his moral government.

FN: A good
education, a good
government proceed
on this principle, when
man attempts to
educate man. [Louis
Napoleon proceeds
on the opposite principle
& therefore he is not
governing, but cutting the throat of
France].

JS: Louis Napoleon is a
dear friend of Comtes &
Buckles philosophy

FN: But Man's time,
Man's knowledge are
limited. He must
point out His Law,
must enforce otherwise than
by experience its being
kept.

The Ruler of the
Universe in His Wisdom
proceeds by *Law* alone
in His teachings to man.

JS: All again confusion!
God governs morally. He is
not bound & has not
bound himself by any law of Wisdom [?]

f60v

[17]

FN: The existence of this
Law which is to govern
& educate man has to
be discovered by man.
No voice reveals it.
No finger points it out.
Blindly & sadly man
has wandered through
his existence in ignorance
of it. Blindly & sadly
he suffers still, for it
is little recognised -
and how to keep it
righteously has still to
be learnt.

JS: Do not think me
wicked if I accept this
as receipt in full

FN: But, if recognised,
let us consider the
means & inducements
it would offer to man
to become individually
& socially what it is
right, healthy, appropriate
to his nature to become.

JS: If.

FN: From Law man may
learn the conditions
appropriate to individual
& social human life.

JS: But there is no such law
yet discovered.

FN: From Law he may

f61r

[18]

FN: learn how to desire,
to cause to be desired
these conditions, how to
realize such desire.

JS: {60v.} But there is no such law
yet discovered.

FN: Granting organization
& circumstances to be
(by Law), the conditions
which determine the
nature of a human
being, - *what power*
does not such an
admission offer to
Humanity?

JS: Take out the word Law &
put in the word *will* &
it reads quite plain.
It would give no power
whatever. Knowledge
is not power. Power
must exist before knowledge.
Power simply uses knowledge,
and gets more powerful.

FN: For how great is not
man's power over
organization? Unthink-
ingly he has exercised
hitherto this power.

JS: What organization.
It should be *over matter*.
Over organization he has little
power, although he has some.

FN: What is Agriculture,
Chemistry, Navigation,
Geography, all that
Art or Science puts
into the power of man
to render the earth
healthy, to supply
himself with appropriate
food &c - what is

f61v

FN: it all but means at
hand to improve
organization?

What is all appropriate
exercise of the nature,
of the Emotional, the
Intellectual, the Physical
Nature, but means,
directly or indirectly
to improve organization?

JS: You cannot improve society except through the individuals which compose it.

FN: And as to circumstances, what limits can we set to human possibility to discover & to realize the circumstances which will render human existence appropriate to human nature?

JS: Improvement is simply a personal, individual matter. We are all bound to work at it for ourselves & for others to enable them to benefit by our experience, but they must improve themselves.

FN: Distant as seems such a possibility, the character & tendency of Law reveal that God's Law shall, in time, have furnished to Mankind the inducement & the means to unite as one brotherhood in the aim to keep God's Laws aright,

f62r

[19]

FN: which is Human nature's real Paradise.

JS: {f61v} State what the inducement is. Man has affections & passions which all 'men must be taught to reverence. Man desires property which no man must covet or steal.

{f62r} Man must be taught the
sacredness of human life, which
no man must destroy
Man must be taught reverence
in God, whom none must
blaspheme.

Whatever one man desires
and obtains justly for his own
benefit, none must be jealous
of.

All must be truthful, & abhor
falsehood.

Every one must love God: & his
neighbours, in short

If this were all done, there would
be heaven on earth.

Now you must be able to shew
that men by simply observing
society & nature, will do all
these things. Can you?

FN: Yet there needs a
future to human existence
to satisfy the nature,
given by God to man,
as to the Law by which
God governs man.

In consequence of this
Law, Vice & Ignorance
have degraded beings
whose proper element
is progress in righteousness.

In consequence of this
Law, all progress is cut
short by death.

The Educational character
& tendency of God's Law, which
reveals to us what man
may do for man on earth,
reveals also the opportunities
which the Righteous Ruler,
who is manifested in His Law,
will afford to all ~~of whom~~ whose proper element
He has made progress in
Righteousness, so that
after death they shall
continue (or attain) to
make infinite progress
therein.

JS: The sum and substance of all this is that God created good & evil, sin & death, purity & impurity, murder & love, justice & injustice, all the opposites of Heaven & Hell, & centred them in Man, whom he has left to struggle through this gulf for unknown cycles in conformity with certain laws of process.

FN: Law, in accordance with which Righteousness

f62v

FN: is man's proper element & desire - Law, in accordance with which the conception, the desire, the attainment of Righteousness have been impossible to a portion of Mankind, - can be consistent on this hypothesis only - viz. that of a future, in which progress shall be attainable *for all*, attainable *by all*.

JS: Now to say the truth I cannot understand it one bit. It is contrary to all I have observed of nature & nature's laws. It is contrary to all I have read in history. It is contrary to my experience.

In philosophy it is strict necessitarianism.

In morals it is strict neccesitarianism.

It charges God with injustice & denies mens free will.

It confounds good & evil, & if preached to the human race & believed would simply introduce anarchy in everything.

Of course I would not charge you with these consequences, but I merely mean to say that I cannot conceive any other deduction from the theory than what I have stated.

I hold it on the same ground of experience that God leaves man to the guidance of himself. And yet governs him, leaving him free & responsible. For my man apparently differs from your man in being responsible which yours is not: and I hold mine to be the nobler creature of the two.

We all admit our responsibility & that simple admission subverts the whole "positive" hypothesis in all its forms.

In fact it appears to me that the whole hypothesis has its origin in a supposed necessity to reduce into some practical shape the terrible phenomena presented by the moral world. It is an attempt to introduce a kind of moral law of gravitation. You have shown in [breaks off]

f63r

FN:

III.

VII.

"I cannot but feel that
"there is still some
"difference that requires
"explanation in our
"definitions".

It is essential to
arriving at ANY truth
that definitions should
be definitions: i.e
defined.

I therefore repeat
my definition of *Law*,
& define my definition
still more closely.

"The idea of *Law*
"certainly involves the
"constancy of sequences
"without reference to
"the reasons of such
"constancy."

JS: (This of course presupposes that
the constancy referred to has
been discovered)

FN: The word *Law* is used
in two senses.

1. to signify any enactment,
proposed or carried out,
that a certain defined
state of things shall
be simultaneous with,

f63v

FN: (or successive to) some other defined state of things, whenever the former occurs.

2. to signify constant relations of simultaneity or succession between phenomena or events, such as would exist if that constancy were the result of Will and of Power to effect such Will.

JS: This definition is usually qualified in science by the expression "It is an observed law" or "it appears to be a law" But the fundamental idea is that there is a "decree" of some sort the operation of which we think we have discovered, although we may not know the nature of the decree, that is the reasons why the sequences follow each other.

FN: In this sense the word *Law* is used, sometimes with reference to a Ruler to whom constancy in those relations is attributed - sometimes merely to express the existence of those constant relations.

JS: When the term law is used in this latter sense it is used so to speak in *short*

FN: In order to explain "the idea of law"
3 "cases", or senses in which the word law is used are given
1. "God's will is constant

f64r

FN: "& unvarying, and
"in this sense it is
"God's law." (sic).

2. Supposing "God
"to have directed once
"& for ever an order
"of sequences and
"left" (?) "that order
"to evolve itself, this
"would be law in
"another sense".

3. "There is a
"tendency to generalizing
"& classifying in most
"minds, and we all
"invest our own
"classifications &
"generalizations with
"more or less of the
"attributes of constancy
"& say we have
"discovered such &
"such a law".

"The first 2 cases
"come within the
"range of philosophy.
"The last case is
"purely one of *reasoning*
"on *observation*"
(sic.)

I do not find here
the "explanation in our
definitions" ~~which Dr.~~
~~Sutherland thinks~~
required. *

I respectfully ask
for one ~~* see next page~~
(1.) Taking the 1st case,
"a constant & unvarying
will" is NOT another
way of expressing "Law".
Louis Napoleon's
"constant & unvarying
will" to have spies
throughout France is
NOT "Law".

It is true that,
conversationally, the
word Law *is* sometimes
used to express Will.
Conversationally, it
might be said that
Louis Napoleon's Will
is "Law".

But, if the word
"Law" is to have a
definite meaning, so
as to be of any avail
in an enquiry after
truth, I must either

f64v

FN: keep to the definition
I have given, or ask
to have given me *some*
reason for attaching
some other definite
meaning to that word.
To say "his will is Law"
generally describes a
rule by decree, not
by Law.

JS: Reply to * preceeding
page.
God is omnipotent and can
"decree", he can surely
exercise his own will in
giving "Law". To suppose that
there is no such power (I do
not infer that you suppose so)
is essential pantheism which
would combine in one personality
God & Creation, and merge
will in necessary evolution.

FN: (2.) Taking the
2nd case - neither does
will "directing" "an
order of sequences"
express "Law."

To will that certain
events shall follow
in a certain succession
would still be a
decree, *not* a "Law".
The essential character
of "Law" is *not* that a
prescribed series of
phenomena will
certainly exist, a
prescribed series of
events take place.

JS: True from the position of
observation merely not true
from the position of reflection.

FN: *The essential character*

f65r

FN: *of Law is that, when-
ever certain definite
phenomena exist,
certain other phenomena
will be simultaneous
with (or successive to)
the former - in other
words that, with (or
to) a certain event
another determinate
event will be
simultaneous (or
successive).*

It is essential to
keep this distinction
in view. Without it,
the whole bearing
of this subject has
been misinterpreted
& distorted. [This
will be shewn
farther on].

JS: The proper term for this would rather be "observed order" for it can only be known through observation of the presumed sequences.

You and I would not differ however on the principle, which from all we have discussed appears to be the one which lies at the root of your idea. We should differ in its application to the subject of Gods government of the universe. Unless 1st It could be shown that a certain definite invariable order of sequences had been discovered. 2nd. That such unvariable order was really Gods order & not men's order. And there the matter rests at present. After we had got through these points 1 & 2 we should have to be satisfied that the order of sequences was purely accidental & not decreed by God beforehand, otherwise man would fall under the old bug bear "necessity". If you would **{f65v}** would rest satisfied with realizing no 1 simply & not going further, you & I might possibly agree, but when you go further & say such & such an order of sequences represents the "plan" or "order" or "law" of Gods procedure then I do not think I am exacting in saying "prove it" especially as on its proof depends mans nature, Gods nature & mans destiny.

FN: {f65r} (3). Taking the 3rd case, - although a "tendency to generalize & classify" will

f65v

FN: accompany a tendency to search for truth, which is undiscoverable to any considerable extent without those operations - yet, of course, if men classify & generalize hastily & inaccurately, i.e. *incorrectly* "invest their classifications & generalizations" with "the attributes of constancy" and "say" they "have discovered a Law "without sufficient evidence, such "saying" can afford no instance of a "Law".

And therefore this statement appears to me no definition, but a caution.

On what constitutes sufficient evidence
I shall say more hereafter.

JS: Quite true, but the whole of our controversy turns upon this very point namely that certain sequences have been discovered so unvarying that we are bound to assume them as representing a Law. Now the question really amounts to this:-
1st Have these sequences been discovered or not?
2. If they have been discovered does it follow that they prove law or something quite other than law? Do they not prove disorder?

f66r

FN: Note. [I have only here to shew the absurd self-contradiction & most dangerous mistake of the Protestant words "private judgement". This idea was, I believe, invented by Protestantism. It is absurd, because it is not *private* "judgment", but God's "judgment" we have to seek after. It is dangerous, because it weakens the idea of *absolute* truth, as being the object we have to seek after & find. What should we say if a Lecturer on Astronomy were gravely to state, There is Ptolemy's system & Copernicus' system. Choose for yourselves, gentlemen - It is a matter of "private judgment"? We should

f66v

FN: say, Such a man
deserves not to be
in the Chair but
in Bedlam. It is
not a matter of
"private judgment"
at all, but of
absolute fact
whether the sun
moves round the
earth or the earth
moves round the
sun, ~~that~~ which we have
to find out. Coper-
nicus is not the
ultimate & final
discoverer of
astronomical truth.
But not the less
is ~~it~~ there to be discovered
absolute & ~~final~~ astronomical
truth.

JS: {f66r} You very properly fling
at the vulgar idea of
"private judgment" which
as regards religious truth (which
I take as the highest kind of truth)
has as you properly remark
no existence. We cannot
constitute ourselves judges of
such truth. We can only
judge of the evidence of such
truth. The term was
an unlucky one whoever in-
vented it: and its application
in deciding on the *nature* of
truth has led to all sorts
if infidelities.

FN: What *did* we say
when the Anglican

f67r

FN: Church exposed herself
to the laughter of
Europe, in the matter
of the damnation
of little babies, by
~~saying~~ gravely stating, You may
believe, gentlemen,
the one or the other,
or sometimes the one
& sometimes the
other, as you like.
Use your "private
judgment".

JS: Pitch into them for they
richly deserve it.

FN: The R. Catholic
Church, who declares
herself to be in the
possession of absolute
& final truth, shews
us the antipodes
of this. It is hard
to say which ~~side~~
doctrine is the most
dangerous.

But, on the whole,
I think both experience
among the Protestant

f67v

FN: countries of Europe and deduction shew that "private judgment", by shaking the foundations of all truth, leads the most directly to absolute infidelity - that is, to considering that there is ~~NO final or~~ absolute truth to be discovered in religion, as there is in all other sciences. But that it is a mere matter of "aspiration", of "imagination", of "private judgment", in short.

This is pure

"Comteism".]

JS: Truth absolute cannot be discovered by man. It is beyond his sphere altogether.

Religion from its nature does not admit of being discovered. You may wing your flight throughout the universe and you will not discover it. It is not to be observed. It "cometh not by observation". It is either in the heart or nowhere. "It is within you".

Straining the intellect after religion is useless, and can never get beyond opinion, and opinion is neither truth nor religion. It is neither a matter of "aspiration" nor of "imagination" nor of "private judgment"

We should never forget that at the culminating period of the human intellect, a period compared with which we are in our dotage "the world by wisdom knew not God", and on this sacred & profane history are at one.

f68r

FN:

VIII

I repeat very distinctly
that I am no disciple
of Comte or Buckle.
I still believe them
to be powerful minds,
who have obtained an
insight into certain
important truths, per-
ceived certain errors
in the ordinary beliefs
of Mankind. But
they have stopped short
of any true view of that
thought of God, which
is in process of mani-
festation in human
existence. The errors,
of which they have
become conscious in
the minds of others,
have subjected them
themselves to prejudices of a
different kind. Comte
& Buckle may afford
help to others in the
attainment of truth
which they have not
reached themselves.

f68v

FN: But to stop short
where they have stopped short is
~~would be~~ to leave to be supposed such
~~the~~ conditions of human
existence ~~such~~ as that they could
produce nothing but
utter repugnance in
a righteous mind.

[Calvinism & indeed
Roman Catholicism,-

JS: That may be, but neither Calvinism
nor R. Catholicism are necessarily
Christianity. The species must
not be taken for the Genus

FN: the close ally of
Calvinism *now*, - have on the mind
the same effect as
Comte or Buckle, viz. in
representing the conditions
of human existence
such as would be impossible, (because
~~utterly~~ abhorrent)
to the thought of a
righteous Creator].

JS: If you mean here that the
problem of humanity as given in
Christianity is *abhorrent &c* -
you ought to have shown how.

I hold the very reverse & am
prepared to sustain it.

FN: If a Law existed in
any mind that a
certain number of
murders should be
committed every year,
we may safely say
such a mind is not
good or wise.

f69r

FN: The idea of God either under a "necessity" to make such a Law, or making it of His own "Free Will", is obviously a contradiction in itself, if by God we mean a Spirit of Wisdom & Goodness.

No Being that could be called *good* would bring other beings into existence under such conditions as these:- viz. of living under a Law which compels men to be in such a state of mind as that they *must* commit murder. It is quite another thing to say that there is a Being, whose thought is the progress of imperfect natures towards Perfection; - such process being worked out through the exercise of faculties existing & regulated

f69v

FN: in accordance with His Law or plan - the consequence of such Law or plan being that a number of men of a certain organization and in certain circumstances will have the inclination to commit murder. Such are the conditions of Human nature in this country in the 19th century: viz. that a certain number of persons is so circumstanced that it is their will to commit murder. This is a fact. No one will deny it.

JS: {f69r} I read this passage as expressing your opinions. I agree as to your doctrine of progress. I dissent entirely from the statement in next page that it is part of the same law of progress that a certain number of persons are to commit murder, and also to the is being inferred from [see] the fact that a certain number do commit murder. No man ever was or ever will be circumstanced so that his *will must* be to commit any act **{f69v}** such as you mention.

Circumstances affect *will* not at all. They have no such power except through the will acting primarily. If the *will* in a certain number of cases & under certain circumstances is found to *will* to commit murder it certainly affords no reason for inferring that the circumstances were sovereign over the *will*. Murder has been planned & committed from *kindness*, as well as from revenge & malice or covetousness. If the judgment has not decided on the circumstances & the will has not acted on the *judgment* there is no murder.

You cannot admit any agency however trivial as necessarily influencing the will, apart from its own determination to commit murder without introducing *necessity*.

FN: To say that they are *necessitated* to commit murder would be, again, a ~~another~~ self-contradiction. ~~It~~ For it is their determined will, the fulfilment of that strong inclination

f70r

FN: without which no man ever committed murder.

JS: {f69v} True! But the *inclination* is a secondary phenomenon which has been preceded by other phenomena. In the case **{f70r}** supposed *inclination* has all the guilt of murder.

FN: The practical result of such a belief as that above-stated would NOT be to induce us to cease the struggle to prevent or to reform sin; but the very reverse.

The conviction that the existence of sin is *decreed* by a Higher Power would indeed be "*belief in Necessity*" or Fatalism.

JS: True! Yet I do not see how you can escape from this imputation.

Inclination to commit murder must come either of mans will or Gods will. You doubt the first. Or at all events you connect the *inclination* with certain external *circumstances* which through *inclination* & *will*, end in murder. This is simply *necessity*.

FN: But, in proportion as a mind feels some horror at the idea of a fellow-creature murdered, & *much more* horror at the idea of the state of mind in which a man is who commits murder, ~~he~~ such a mind will be urged to ask ~~himself~~ itself, Can I do anything to alter this state of things in

f70v

FN: England in the 19th century, consequent upon which this number of murders is committed? Can I, directly or indirectly, at once or in course of time, individually or with the help of others, raise the human mind to such a state as ~~which~~ will prevent or lessen murder?

JS: All Christians & all Neo-philanthropists?} will join in doing the best they can to prevent murder, and to teach men what is right in order to prevent it.

FN: We who are moralizing have no distinct impression of what the previous life is of anyone who has committed murder.

JS: Oh! Yes we have. Most men who dare to fathom themselves can understand the process.

FN: Can we doubt that, if we had, if we understood the frame-work of the Human Spirit,- in other words, its organization - if we could trace the various

f71r

FN: influences affecting a man from his birth to the commission of such a crime, we should perceive when & how the inclination to commit it might have been prevented, the mind opened to better influences?

JS: This can only be done
by the *will* of the individual.
The only controversy is how
best to do it so as to
guide the individual will.

FN: Such would be the
practical ~~result~~ power of
this belief, - when united
with ~~a~~ any strong horror of sin,
with any strong conviction
of the power of man
to raise man out of
it - that ~~it~~ such a belief would be
an *imperative* call
upon the human heart
& understanding so
to improve man's
circumstances as to
"incline his heart
to keep God's Law"
aright.

JS: One great reason of our
want of success in all
our efforts is the "sic volo
sic jubeo" philanthropy.
"I know better than you
follow me & you are safe".
The sinner answers "I wont"
and he is right. He won't
surrender his free will to
another. Entire self
abnegation is the first step
to recover our lost brothers
& sisters. I know you
agree in this. It recognises
them & sinks *ourselves*.

FN: *Would* Sanitary
Reformers cease their
efforts under ~~this~~ such a belief?

f71v

FN: The arguments which most men bring *against* the capabilities of man for ~~indefinite~~ such improvement have always appeared to me to tell in the opposite direction.

JS: You are quite right.

FN: Buckle says, "In India, slavery, abject, eternal slavery was the natural state of the great body of the people, the state to which they were doomed by physical laws utterly impossible to resist."

Granted - so long as circumstances rule man.

JS: Circumstances do not rule men except by his own will. They are like other tyrants they try to rule, but we must *let* them before they can rule.

FN: But God's Laws will teach man to *rule circum-*
stances. While circum-
stances rule man, the majority in hot countries will be lazy slaves.

JS: Quite true.

FN: Because food is plentiful,

f72r

FN: without labor. But let man *rule circumstances* & the abundance of food (without time & strength spent upon its cultivation) will set free that time & strength to be devoted to the cultivation of mental & spiritual food. Enough has been thought & felt & done in hot countries to prove that heat does not inevitably paralyse the exercise of the heart or mind.

With regard to the horrors described in those pages, let us listen to them well. It is the Eternal Voice "Not so, my children". Not so" I hear also repeated in every Cholera, Massacre, Vice, Degeneration ~~of race~~ ~~or~~ of man usually replies to it by prayer,

f72v

FN: (if he replies at all,) prayer for the removal of the evil.

JS: "ora et labora" is better.

Why should men who *do work* not pray for health & strength to do more work. It is surely not inconsistent with reason since the whole human race prays in some shape.

FN: And the
Eternal voice ~~speaks~~
answers again, *Not so.*
Cease to spend yourselves
in vain. What is this
buz of purposeless talk
from thousands of
re-unions of such talent as
~~which might redeem~~
mankind?

JS: Do not forget that
amongst much useless
ill directed effort there
is much really practical
good producing effort.
It is all our ceaseless duty
to hold up the lamp to those
who are in darkness & to
commit it to other hands
when ours grow weary & old.

If you must have a law

I give you that one.
But do not forget that those
who most obey this law are
those who pray most.
This I *know* to be a law
so far as my own experience
of man has gone.

FN: What is
this rattle ceaseless
in your cities, yet
purposeless for Man's
divine nature, when
such a purpose waits
to be fulfilled? Will
you stand by or
pursue these inane
follies while MAN
is being murdered
or is murdering himself?
Or, as inanely, will you
betake yourselves to
prayers for the salvation

f73r

FN: of Man to another,
whose express plan
it is that it shall
be your own noble
work?

JS: We are not workers
instead of God, but
fellow workers *with* God.

FN: The poisoned,
the paralysed nature
cannot help *itself*.
Man must rise
up & save.

JS: Pray do not forget what
experience we have in this
matter. Who so ready to
acknowledge humanity in all
its greatness & sorrow?, who
so ready to assist in
mitigating its afflictions
& teaching it better things
than were those who shed
human blood like water
at the end of the last century?
But these men did not pray
that is simply a fact.

f74r

FN:

IX

"Can it be shown that
a certain invariable
order of sequences has
been discovered?"

I would begin by
defining the question.

Is there ground for
believing in the existence
of a certain invariable
order manifesting
itself in every mode
of existence which
has a beginning &
is subject to change?

- In other words, is
there ground for believing
that no beginning or
change takes place
without some co-
existence or precedent
(or assemblage of
co-existences or
precedents) which
recurring, such
beginning or change
~~would~~ will again take
place - which not
occurring, no such

f74v

FN: beginning or change
will ever take place?

Practically, it is
upon this hypothesis
that every one of
our actions is based.
viz. that *all* phenomena
(i.e. whatever begins
& changes) exist in
such definite relations
to other phenomena
co-existing with or
preceding the beginning
of, or whatever
change takes place
in, them.

One specimen differs
from another of any
species of Plant, in
connection with some
definite co-existing
or preceding circumstance.
And Horticulturalists
study these concomi-
tants.

So with diversities
of animal life &
character. And breeders

f75r

[2]

FN: of stock study these
concomitants.

The Farmer, Gardener,
Physician, Sanitarian,
Teacher, Governor,
Artist, Artisan -
what is their whole
activity for but this? In order
to bring about some
beginning, some change,
some continuance of
what is, to finding the
means by observing
co-existences and
precedents - in other
words, "Laws of Nature" -
in other words,
"observed orders" in
nature. The phrase
"Laws of Nature" is
undefined & confused.
- unless "Nature"
expresses a conscious
entity which lays down
the "orders" we call "Laws
of Nature". By "Nature"
I understand the
course of phenomena

f75v

FN: without beginning or
end, but exhibiting
ceaseless change, so
that each present
set of phenomena
differs from what has
been & what will be.

Resemblances &
differences in phenomena
alike shew "order" in
nature.

A ship, a musical
instrument may be
made, to all appearance &
according to measurement,
exactly to resemble
another. But the exact
qualities in one cannot
be secured in another.
The inference is not
that co-existents &
precedents being the
same, results differ
but - that circumstances
so minute as to be
imperceptible to us
have differed & that,
so exact is "order" in Nature,

f76r

FN: ~~that~~ no difference in co-existing or preceding phenomena can exist without difference in the result. Through such uniformity & variety, classification & generalization only become possible.

Sensations, thoughts, emotions are to be classed as phenomena. i.e. they are modes of existence which begin & change. And such beginning & change are practically found to exist in relation to definite co-existences & precedents. Sensations, thoughts, emotions are the co-existents or precedents from which volitions result, and according to which they definitely vary - i.e. given certain sensations, thoughts, emotions, certain volitions invariably ensue. Given a certain volition, certain sensations, thoughts, emotions have existed, co-existent with or preceding it which not having existed, neither would that volition have existed.

JS: This is the whole case TO BE PROVED. The argument from analogy adduced above does not help the proof. All it can do is to lead the mind into a certain train of reflection, which may be true or not true. The Laws of external nature are however very different from those of mind. (Law being used in the sense of succession of phenomena) and will is subject per se to no law. It is above all law & is in reality the maker of similarities or diversities.

f76v

JS: You have reproduced in the last paragraph the whole matter we have debated almost in the same words. That which you have defined, so to speak, in that P. I do not call will at all. Whatever it is, it is not will. The coexistence of sensations & volitions, is no part of will. Will, *as will*, may certainly subordinate its functions to external conditions, but this can only be done by its own act.

The principle is a cardinal one either way as it affects human destiny.

As you state it in the preceding page it is the philosophic basis of all systems by which man attempts to subordinate man, whether in politics or morals. Teach it undisguisedly and in time you may rear a race which will have abdicated its will. This is not only logically possible. But the voluntary abdication of the will is one cause of the great social evils which afflict the world.

"Conformity to the world" is produced in this way. It is a voluntary act but not always a sensible act, for such an act must be preceded by mental or moral blindness which is the result not of God's law, but of mans perverseness.

{Following is a third person's hand. Pencil.}

The analogical part of the enquirers' argument is well stated; but I think that the concluding paragraph requires working out more fully.

It seems to me that the respondent does not go deep enough. Taking his case of the will subordinating its functions &c, there still remains the question as to the ground for the will so acting.

Might not something be made out in favor of law & order, from some such considerations as these? Will, in its widest possible acceptation, includes all phases from blind compulsive wilfulness, to intelligent deliberate will. Any given phase is a compound of the impulsive = (as it seems to me) the direct result of certain sensations, circumstances, &c &c, - & (2) the rational the indirect result of them, refracted, collected, & brought to a focus by the mind. - This is perhaps to hastily put down; but the respondents view appears to me like Vishnu on the elephant, the elephant on the tortoise, & the tortoise on nothing.

f77r

FN: "The proper term for this" (a definition of Law) "would be '*observed order*', for it can be only known thro' observation of the presumed sequences."

I ~~will henceforth~~ am quite willing to ~~always~~ substitute "observed order" for the word "Law".

F.N.

"You & I would not differ, however, as to the principle, which from all we have discussed, appears to be the one which lies at the root of your idea."

I do not know *what* "principle" is here alluded to.

JS: Neither do I. I have forgotten the M.S.

FN: The "root" of my "idea" is this.

Man when he feels the desire that human nature, human existence, human

f77v

FN: destination shall be satisfactory to the moral sense, (or the spirit of Right) which is appropriate to healthy * human nature, will desire to learn how to bring this about, as far as human possibility admits - but, feeling the limit of human possibility, he will yearn to discover ground for believing that there exist

* Editor's Note.

The first authority on Law in the kingdom, the Attorney General, says that the human existence appropriate to healthy human nature (with £20,000 a year) is "to be fond of horses & racing, of good eating & good drinking & keeping a good table". Sic. in re Sir Henry Meux

f78r

FN: a superhuman Power of such a nature as to be an assurance that, in accordance with the will of such a Power, the conditions of human existence are satisfactory to a perfect spirit of Righteousness. My ground for so believing is the "obscured order", according to which it is discoverable that phenomena & events co-exist with or are successive to each other. I believe this "order" to be a manifestation of Power in a righteous nature, because such "order" affords means & inducements, by which the Imperfect ~~shall~~ can advance towards Perfection thro' the individual & social exercise of capabilities existing in the Imperfect; fulfilling thus what is the appropriate desire of the moral sense of spirit of right in man.

JS: I may be wrong in the summary I am about to give of this, but it appears to be that what you mean to say is this.

"If we examine the world as it is with all its sins & sorrows its horrors, its heroisms & its grandeurs we may hope to discover that it is all created on a given plan and governed as well as created by a being of absolute perfection to a perfect end." If this be your meaning. Of course the evidence is every thing.

For my part I cannot see my way to admitting the proposition in the way it is here laid down either from observation, personal experience or history.

All three show me that there are two sets of principles at work, one directly opposed to the other. One essentially good, the other essentially bad, & by no possible process of reasoning could I make them the produce of one mind especially of an essentially good mind.

If I understand your desire [?] aright, I should say it is utterly, hopelessly, unproductive.

f78v

JS: "Your ground for believing" in the spiritual order you think exists is nothing but an analogy, and as such is open to the final objection against all analogies that they can prove nothing. But even in using the analogical form of reasoning there must be a certain correspondence between the things compared. Now no such correspondence exists between the laws of external nature and the observed spiritual laws of our own nature. Has not the want of correspondence been in all ages a matter of wonder & enquiry, The want of correspondence cannot be cloaked under any analogy. It is final & matter of simple fact.

FN: Our opponent
says "that" he
"should differ as to the
"application of the principle
"on which we agree"
"unless
"1. it could be discovered
"shewn that a certain
"definite invariable
"order of sequences
"has been discovered.
"2. that such invariable
"order was really God's
"order & not Man's
"order."

That the phenomena
of nature exist in
relations of simultaneity ?
& succession to each
other is universally
now admitted.

The only exception
is supposed to, by some, to be
volition. ~~Who might~~ This alone is said
~~This to be alone~~ to originate in a "self-
determining power"
existing in the mind
of man.

JS: not "by some". I
know no philosophy
that does not
acknowledge human
freedom.
The so called philosophies
which deny it, are
not philosophies but simply
talk about it. Emersons
expression "The omnipotence
of the will" inconsistent though
it be as coming from him is
the very root & basis of all
philosophy.

FN: Others indeed suppose
that here also exist

f79r

FN: constant relations of
simultaneity & succession.

The existence of these
relations, *here*, however,
does not admit of the
distinct proof which
can be brought forward
in cases where the
identical instances
of simultaneity &
succession can be
pointed out &
repeated.

JS: I shall here say a few words in reply to
the following pages.

Sin, crime & cholera (your illustrations)
are Gods judgments on mans
wilful perversity. (There is an
awful, an infinitely more awful
illustration given by Luther in one
of his tracts but which I cannot cite here)
Luthers argument suffice it to say is
exhaustive & final. He never thought
& no one who observes, (as I contend)
ought to think that these things are
Gods work. God is omnipotent. He
can slay them, but man is free &
as long as man is free, he must submit
himself to the consequences good or bad
of his use of freedom.

It hence follows that although nothing
can exist without Gods permission,
yet man may bring any amount of
evil on himself or under God he
may prevent it by the use of his
faculties.

But this is altogether a different thing
from Charging on a perfect Being, not
only the authorship of imperfection,
but the introduction of infinite abominations
into his universe for a purpose.

FN: Certain substances
being introduced into
the system of certain
animals, they die.

Certain external
conditions existing,
certain zymotic diseases
follow.

Till lately, such
diseases were supposed
to be an "inscrutable
providence", a
"dispensation". Such
they are supposed to

f79v

FN: be still by the
Horse Guards, by Lord
Panmure & the
Army Medical
Service.

JS: You do not put this in its
proper light. God, for instance,
has not decreed that the law
of gravitation shall kill men.
But he has decreed that if
men will throw themselves from
the top of the monument the
law of gravitation will kill
them. Is the law of gravitation
therefore an evil. It is the same
with the moral retribution here &
hereafter.

FN: In other words,
such diseases were
supposed to manifest
a special definite
will of God that they
should exist - just
as now cases of
moral evil are
supposed to originate
in the will of Man.

JS: Moral will *does* originate
in the *will* of men or there
is no *moral evil*. It cannot
come from God who is perfect
& knows no evil.

FN: Both these interpre-
tations are errors equally
dangerous, for this
reason.

JS: Besides the cases you put are not parallel.

FN: They prevent man from (or at least they fail to stimulate him to the) taking means within his power to obviate physical disease or moral sin.

JS: On the contrary, the idea that evil is part of Gods direct government of the world logically leads to fatalism & non-effort. And of this there is no doubt. The doctrine of the connection of evil with free will implies directly the power of coping with it. Man may reform *himself*, but who can resist God?

f80r

FN: While Dr. Andrew Smith was in power, it was "the gate to the kingdom of the" Army Medical Dept. to say that Yellow Fever was an "inscrutable dispensation" & that no thing could be done to avert it.

JS: I leave it for you to point out, if all evil (& yellow fever is one) be part & parcel of Gods plan of the government of the world, without reference to mans free will & power of coping with yellow fever, when Andrew Smith was to blame. He was on the contrary a true disciple of the philosophy which believes that the phenomena of spirit are governed by the same laws as the phenomena of matter.

FN: Much wiser heads
have believed that
Cholera was traceable
to no other origin
than the direct will
of superhuman Power
that it should exist.
And the means attempted
to prevent it were
prayer which it was
hoped would influence
God's will, or some
changing of circumstances
which were totally irrelevant to
the case, i.e. the divine
Will as now proved to exist
in respect to this disease.

JS: The divine will, so far as we can see
it, with regard to the matter is that
if a man is of filthy & intemperate
habits he will die of God's
angel, cholera, just as
if he commit murder he will
die of God's minister the hangman.
Absolute human freedom is essential
in either case, or both deaths are unjust.

f80v

FN: ~~What~~ This divine Will is now shewn by
~~is it is now proved by~~ experience and
observation ~~are making~~
~~more & more evident~~
~~viz.~~ to be that wherever
certain physical conditions,
(such as want of
draining, of cleanliness
&ct), exist, Cholera
will exist - that
these physical conditions
ceasing to exist,
Cholera will cease to
exist.

So, while men continue
to believe in no other
origin for crime but
human will, those
efficient means which
might be taken to
remove vice, like
Cholera, will not be
taken.

JS: True, but my point is that both crime & cholera are the result not remotely, (because we do not know remote causes) but approximate of human will.

If all men were *christians* there would, so far as we know of the evils, be neither Cholera nor crime for all men would have the spirit of power love & soundmindness.

FN: While the (so-called) Evangelical believes that "the heart of man is *desperately* wicked",

f81r

FN: (mark the word, which signifies '*hopelessly*' wicked)

JS: The word *desperately* does not mean "*hopelessly*". It means "*determinately*" & "*willfully*".

FN: that the "world" is "accursed", that "many are called but few are chosen", that those few are "saved" by the *murder of one God by Another* -

JS: I never heard of such a doctrine as this being held in any christian church. Some of the mediaeval Catholic theologies indulged in some such speculation, but it never was church doctrine. I know however, what you mean to express. It is an old defunct objection, to which christianity itself gave the reply long before the objection was made. The essence of the objection so far as it concerns morals goes to casting ridicule on almost every great deed that man has ever done on earth.

FN: while the (so-called)
Catholic believes that
the "Sacraments" are
the means of - not
Re/forming/creating the world
but - opening the
door of a place
called "heaven", which
does not appear to
be the earth made
heaven but a
segregated *pen*,

JS: *Earth* can never be made *heaven* any
more than *matter* can never be made
spirit nor the essence of *men* be
made the essence of *God*. The
ideas are antiquarian. It does not
follow however that heaven may not
be a *state* rather than a *place*,
but whatever, or wherever it is, heaven
can never be made out of earth.

FN: again set aside for a few -
while these things
are, what hope can we
have for the removal
of the Cholera of sin?

f81v

FN: *Crime, Disease & Death*,
by God's Law, always
go together.

JS: *Certainly!* but the Bible
first taught this to man,
only he would not believe it till
he saw it, just as he will not
believe other things now till he
sees them. Your proposition
was stated more fully 3000 years
ago than you state it now, but
most remarkable it is that it is
believed now by a very small part
of educated men, and even by them
only after experience.

FN: Therefore,
insensible & but immense
progress has been
made through Dr.
Farr's branding of
a certain class of
Diseases with the
word "zymotic" (&
its association of
"preventible" towards
the abolition of twin
vices. But oh for
a more direct acknowledgment of
this consequent
effort!

JS: So say I. Only your philosophy &
mine would lead to two very
different ways of dealing with the
questions. But happily
the two opposite sets of premises
lead to somewhat similar results.

People who won't help us will
not be made to do so by telling them
it is mans duty to do so & so,
but there is no responsibility to God
one way or another! Yet this latter is a
legitimate result of your system.

FN: Given the feeling
of what vice really is, of
what virtue really is,
together with the conviction
that view will certainly
prevail where certain
organizations & certain

f82r

FN: circumstances co-exist,
that virtue will as
certainly prevail where
certain other organizations
& circumstances co-exist
- then vice ~~would~~ will cease
& virtue take its place
in proportion to the force
of that feeling & that
conviction.

JS: {f81v} This is partly true partly not true as you state it. "Organization" & "circumstances" which you allude to are precisely those things over which man has power through his will. They exist through his will **{f82r}** acting in the course of ages. They are not God's ~~ordinances~~ law. That is, man is not so created that these "organizations" & "circumstances" shall exist as part of his being. God has ordained however that if man will, think speak & act in certain ways such & such "organizations" & "circumstances" shall follow, from mans free will. The conditions and circumstances are mans creating. It was he who willed sin & in willing sin he rendered disease & death inevitable: God's law being that if we "will" sin that is if we place our ("service" our "mind") "will" in opposition to his will these things shall follow. In other words He has created the world subject to certain conditions to be observed on the part of its reasonable tenant. We know that man has not observed these conditions. Of that there is no doubt. The question then renders itself into how to make him observe these conditions? That is the whole question of human progress here & hereafter. Have we any reason to believe that the *simple knowledge*

f82v

JS: of the existence of these conditions will effect mens delieverance? History tells us that for 3000 years man has had this knowledge and the result is what we see.

FN: {f82r} Given the conviction
of this invariable co-exis-
tence of definite
organizations &
circumstances, ~~together~~
and definite vices
& virtues - together
with the conviction
that human organization
& human circumstances
may be determined or
modified by human
will, or that, where
organizations cannot
be altered, circumstances
may - then man will
become what he is
{f83r} intended to be, viz. the
Creator, the modifier
of Human Destiny -
instead of being (what
he was not intended
to be) the creature
"prostrate" at the foot
of a priest, of "the
Cross", of all those
~~hopeless~~ expedients, born of hopelessness,
for smuggling a man
selfishly into heaven,
instead of setting him
actively to regenerate
the earth.

JS: I must confess not to be able
to understand this. It is not
the "expedient of the" cross or
of christianity you hit at. What it is
I don't know. Christianity
to me is altogether a different
thing from what it appears
to you.

FN: [Last night, ~~I heard~~
a mob of people in the
street was following for
its amusement a
poor drunken woman who was
violently resisting the
Policeman carrying her
off. Lady --- --- in
her carriage was saying to
her daughter ~~whose~~
~~marriage, as appeared~~

f83r

FN: "Don't look that way
to hear those curses,
to see those revolting
sights".

JS: These are the maxims of the
Devils kingdom & are to me
the most irrefragable proofs of the
existence of such a kingdom.
How are you to deliver such
people out of the Devils kingdom?
Philosophy gives you no remedy.
Neither does experience of any "law"
or "sequence".

FN: Is this the moral
precept to be given to
the (so-called) children
of Fortune?

 Oh no! Look & let
your heart be wrung
with the sense of
human degradation,
contrasting with the
sense of human
capacity for all that
is right & good - not
for all that is
"desperately wicked".

 Could such scenes
exist, if the better
educated felt that it
lay in their power
so to modify human
circumstances as to
prevent them?

JS: I don't understand your expression
"better educated". I know none such.
You may remember that the later
Platonists tried to establish a kind of
moral aristocracy. It was part of
their system; and so completely had
it over-run thought in the East &
West, that it had ruined morals &
wrapt man in Pharaseism everywhere.
It was a perfectly logical result.
You know also what Christ said on

f83v

JS: the subject. And here I think lies the radical difference between your philosophy & that of Christianity. You look for salvation through the efforts of a moral aristocracy upon society: now Christ knowing that society depends wholly on individuals gave it as an experiment made of his kingdom whereby it was to be distinguished from all philosophies that "to the poor the Gospel was preached". The poor being in fact the mass. If the poor won't hear Christ they will not hear the "better educated" depend on that. In what I conceive as the grandest sense, education exists among the poorest, and they have much to teach to "better educated".

FN: {f83r} Would the streets of London keep up

{f83v} their present sounds of ~~the~~ and pursuit of amusement, if it were recognised that time & thought might be so spent as ~~would~~ to prevent the wretched state of that woman & of thousands of women? - if it were recognised that man has power to realize all that is right & good, not by prayer to another Being to do his work, not by a mysterious "self-determining" power thro' which he shall "will" to do it, but by taking God's appointed means to incline his heart to will aright].

JS: Precisely. If man has ever done this & ever can do it out of his own power without prayer, which he has however abdicated by the terms of the proposition then is salvation very near. But unfortunately man acting *by himself* has furnished us with NO ONE example. "Man knows his duty. But he does it not". The root of every thought, word or deed which is to raise any human being out of the social & spiritual death in which he is must come from without him. The "better educated" can't give him any help, because it is essential to all such progress in action that man must *believe* before he acts otherwise he would not act, & he won't believe in the better educated, if he won't believe in Christ.

f84r

FN: "We should differ as to the application of the principle which, from all we have discussed, appears to be the one which lies at the root of your idea. We should differ in its application to the subject of God's government of the Universe unless 1st it could be shewn that a certain definite invariable order of sequences had been discovered 2nd that such invariable order was really God's order & not man's order".

 In considering these two questions, I must first define the nature of the "order" which is ~~has been~~ discoverable. It is an "order" of relation. Phenomena

f84v

FN: exist in *relations* of simultaneity & succession with & to each other. i.e. a given phenomenon or assemblage of phenomena existing, some definite phenomenon or assemblage of phenomena will co-exist or follow, which never would have existed, except in those definite relations of simultaneity & succession with or to those definite phenomena. and which always will exist, should those conditions be repeated.

~~In asking the question whether~~ As to the hypothesis that "order" is discoverable in the succession of phenomena & events, you who deny it appear to misconceive the *nature* of the "order" which I assert to exist.

JS: I do not deny it. I deny your hypothetical origin of it, if it exists. Discover the order if possible, but for the moral purpose it is intended to serve it must rest on reasonable moral evidence, of which analogy (the evidence you have hitherto used) is the very weakest link. Our controversy will really begin when the order is discovered. Viz. whether it be God's, man's, or the Devil's order.

FN: It is not expressed by representing that each phenomenon

f85r FN: which succeeds another
is what it is by the
Will of superhuman
Power & cannot,
thro' human means,
be otherwise. *This is
the proposition usually
controverted by you*
who disbelieve the
existence of "Order"
in the succession of
phenomena & events.
This is the hypothesis
which you persist
in seeing therein.

JS: True it is so!, and I will
continue to controvert it. Your
principle assumes the "observed
order" which you say exists, as God's
order. That although human
effort may to a greater or less
degree be involved in the order
observed to exist, the order itself
and mans part in it are of
God's design in carrying on
his plan from imperfection to
perfection.

Now on the contrary I merely say
"Choose ye which ye will serve",
"If God be the Lord serve him."
But in doing so the very idea of
evil attacking in any sense by his
own will to his moral government is
a contradiction.

If the Being who has planned this
universe & men in it is really
to be in any sense or degree charged with
the evil in it, as being part of the plan,
then that Being is not God but some
other being. (This was held by certain early sects
and logically from your ground.)
I may be wrong in this conception of
your doctrine. But if God be the
creator, our idea of God derived
from our own intentions tells us at
once that the faintest shadow of evil
cannot come from Him, wherever it
many come from.

To find such a being as would solve
the difficulty we must make a
concrete out of the Hindoo mythology.
or find an origin for evil apart from God.

FN: That each phenomenon
which exists, each
event which takes
place & the "order"
in which these succeed
one another is
determined by One
Will is undoubtedly
true. But such a
proposition does not
explain the nature
of the "Order" by which

f85v

FN: this Will manifests
itself to man. nor the
effect of such Will
on Human Nature
& Human Will nor
the results attributable
to it on Human History,
past & present.
nor the expectation
to be derived from
it as to Human
future.

The proposition that
each phenomenon or
event which succeeds
another is what it is
by the Will of Superhuman
Power, & cannot, by
human means, be
made otherwise is
Fatalism, ~~is~~ makes
Man's existence a
Machine, & makes the
Man's or Machine's
existence represent
the Will of another
only, in what it is
& does.

JS: The only philosophy that
can meet the difficulty must
rest on facts.

1. We see from God's works
that he is omnipotent in the
highest sense in which one
can conceive of omnipotence.

2. We see from the infinite
variety of his works that he is
free in the highest sense
in which we can think of freedom.

3. We know from our own
mental analysis that we
are free; but that we can
give up our freedom, we
know from sad experience.

Philosophy must if it can bring together

f86r

JS: man's freedom & God's freedom.

But to compound the two in
one general hypothesis of progress
or moral government is simply
to leave the problem unsolved &
to take refuge in a fallacy.

FN: The Alarm felt at
such an interpretation
of the ways of God
with man disinclines
~~people to any~~ you from
giving any fair or
full consideration to
a hypothesis which
leads to quite the
opposite interpretation.

 Therefore, in
considering your two
questions above, I
must ~~ask first~~ examine

 1. whether the
result of such "Order"
as is discoverable in
the past or present,
& ~~II. whether the~~ of such
anticipations ~~as~~ in regard to
the future ~~which~~ as are
derivable from it
would be satisfactory
to the Moral Sense?

 2. what is the nature
of the evidence to be
produced for the
existence of an "order"
of simultaneity & succession

f86v

FN: in which I ~~assert~~
~~that~~ phenomena (i.e
all modes of being
which begin & change),
shall universally exist
with regard to each
other.

f87r

FN: "Neither Calvinism, nor R. Catholicism are necessarily Christianity. The species must not be taken for the genus."

JS: It appears to me that the whole of this paper which follows has very little to do with the points of our previous controversy. The words you have placed at the top of this column were used by me simply to turn aside from Christianity certain objections you had raised against it *through* R. Catholicism & Calvinism. I merely repeated Rousseau's expression in another form. It is not my intention to discuss Christianity. We started to examine certain moral & Philosophical questions regarding free will. All these objections partly analogical partly moral against Xtianity have been made & disposed of very long ago.

Butler has finished up the analogical part once and for ever. You can never repeat the

f87v

JS: analogical argument such as it is on the opposite side, without answering Butler, and all men agree even opponents, that whatever the argument is worth, Butler has once & for ever used it. He has shewn to a demonstration that there is nothing in external nature with which we are acquainted that would lead us to believe that external nature & Christianity with its peculiarities did not come from the same hand, and there is an end of it.

If you were ever to succeed in proving that Christianity & the results of observation & experience in Society were at eternal variance, Butler's argument would remain intact. And you would have two analogies each perfect & each opposed which would reduce both to an absurdity & so would go the whole argument from analogy, & all your "laws" & "orders" with it irretreavably.

In so far as the moral objections are concerned, they have been made

f88r

JS: 1800 years ago. They have attempted to show that Christianity is unreasonable, that it is partly true, that is it a compound of sublime truth & gross falsehood, that it is unjust, that it mis represents the preconceived character of God.

In fact there is no statement of the kind that has not been made. But in spite of all, we do know that the most reasonable of human beings have trusted it. that the most part have trusted it, that the most truth loving have trusted it. That the greatest philosophers & theologians the world has ever known have trusted it, and that as a rule the great minds of all ages have made it their hope.

This shows that it is open to not one of these objections.

How have they arisen then? Simply because Christianity presents itself with certain conditions, which are precisely of the same nature as the conditions presented along with all other problems in God's universe, & while man accepts the problems with the conditions he rejects Christianity. with the conditions. It is his "will" simply not his "reason" which is in fault.

FN: {f87r} For Humanity the fundamental questions, of which all others are a part, or with which all others are connected, are the following:

I. Can Human nature, its history & destination, be interpreted, (so as to be satisfactory to a righteous mind -) out of what Man can learn of what is, what has been, what is to be?

II. What is possible to man to do towards rendering human existence satisfactory to a righteous mind?

III. Can man discover ground to believe that a Power exists of such a nature as to afford assurance that those

{f87v} conditions of Human existence, which it is not possible to man to change, are satisfactory to a righteous mind?

We cannot answer these questions by merely examining into what there is of true or of false in R. Catholicism or in Calvinism or in any other professed form of belief which has arisen since the publication of the writings contained in the New Testament.

I do not say since the publication of Christianity. For does not the way in which these writings have been rent & torn by disputants shew how imperfectly the minds which lived after that time penetrated the thought with which they were written?

{f88r} The agonies endured at
the stake, on the cross,
in dungeons, in the homes
of private life, do they
not *shriek*, so to speak,
the same tale?

There is more of
indifference now, there
is less earnest belief,
more concealment of
unbelief. But is there
a clearer & more
unanimous conception
of truth?

It is not the tendency
of modern doctrine to
say, with regard to
religion what, with
regard to any other
subject would be felt
to be monstrous &
absurd, viz. "Let every
man have his own
truth"?

Far be it from us
to allow any man to
construct a rail-road
from north to south,
as he pleases. But,

f88v

FN: in these (so called)
liberal days, - we

admire the TOLERANCE (Qy what does this
(what a word!) word mean?)

JS: Right, what does it mean?
There is only one way & that is Christ.
There is no need of either asking
or receiving tolerance at all.

FN: which
lets every man construct
the road from earth
to heaven as he pleases.

Enough. The search
after what is & what
ought to be, the belief
that they are *one*,
by which we wish
to shape all enquiry,
forbid us to have any faith
in those "revelations" (said to
have been addressed
to Humanity by super-
human Power,) ~~all-of~~
which in any way
contradict our experience
of what is, revolt
our conception of what
ought to be.

JS: Why should this be?
Both reason & analogy on the
contrary show that we may
consistently enquire & *receive*.
It is surely equally onesided to say
in such an argument that
revelation will teach us
what we can only get from enquiry
or to say that the results of enquiry
would render revelation unnecessary.

Christ's parable of the talents shows
how the two processes are combined
namely the human use of our talents
and our responsibility for using them.
The latter & super natural element
being in this case given by direct
teaching, in other words revealed.

FN: ~~while~~
This same search after
the true & the right
directs us to the Eternal,
~~the~~ Ever-speaking voice
of the Almighty & the

f89r

FN: Righteous One speaking
to us *through His Laws*
& their mighty results
to be seen in the past,
the present & the future.

JS: Never forget in using these expressions
that they *take for granted* that God
speaks or reveals himself through
his laws, & that a revelation is
pre-supposed as possible.
Xtianity agrees with this but
denies & very logically denies that
God reveals himself *solely* through
material laws.

If it be possible for God to reveal himself
in material laws it is equally possible
for him to reveal himself personally or
in any other way. The only question
is whether he has revealed himself
in any other way? Philosophy in its
true sense has never denied the
possibility. It is only our modern
rationalism that has led to such an
absurdity. The question in fact is
one of evidence, and the evidence
for Christianity is so strong that even
1800 years after its appearance
men are still trying to get quit of
it.

FN: Whether such Laws
really exist & whether,
(such as we suppose
them to be), they afford
ground for belief in the
existence of Almighty
& righteous Power,
we have to examine
to the utmost of our
possibility.

 That 18 centuries
ago there lived one
most pure, most
earnest in love to
God & man we believe
without doubt & with
feelings of tender love
& deep veneration. But
most imperfectly do
we know his thought
communicated only
thro' the words & writings
of others, 18 centuries ago;

JS: You admit God to reveal himself in
a stone. You doubt whether he has revealed
himself in a man!

 If you admit this you are
bound to admit that Jesus was
either what he said he was or
the greatest imposter the world
has seen. Or you must
admit that men who wrote
down such principles & died
for them did not scruple to
descend to the greatest falsehood.

f89v

FN: And, if we did, it is
the thought of His Father
& our Father that the knowledge of
truth should progress.
And it has progressed
beyond that possible
to him in his day.

JS: Read over what Jesus says about the redemption of man & point out what was true & what was false in that.

The evil of such admissions as you have made above consists in this that you select what you agree with & reject what you disagree with. It is kissing Christ & betraying him.

The only fair moral practice is what he himself requires.

"Either make the tree good & the fruit good or else make the tree corrupt & the fruit corrupt." But it is an old way of dealing with Him.

FN: Let us read the words we can trace to him, because they are the words of love & wisdom consistent with his life & death.

Let us read them with deep interest & rise up from them better prepared to love, to work, to suffer as he did. But, if we would speak the truth, deeper is the source of truth than those words, even tho thought of his God & our God, to be studied now & for ever in His Laws.

[the?]

f90r

FN: And now, with regard to "Xtianity" - what is "Christianity"? Some tell us it is a doctrine - some say, No, it is not a doctrine, but a rule of practice.

Then, what is this rule of practice?

JS: All objections grounded in the aspects of Christianity at any particular period have been long since silenced by Rousseau, who though no Christian had the sagacity to show the hollowness of all of them.

Christianity must be judged by its principles not by the acts of its disciples. It professes to be light let in on darkness, or leaven put in meal. It is not to be judged by the darkness nor by the unleavened meal.

It is a kingdom destined to subvert all Satan's power & all human perverseness, & it will do it, & it is not ever to be judged by the wounds it receives in the contest.

FN: It has been the rule of practice of twelve men who went about as beggars, ~~but~~ doing good.

It has been the practice of men who lived alone in holes in the rocks doing nothing - of men who lived in community, apart from every body else - of bishops who drove about, with servants in purple liveries behind their carriages, on £20 000 a year.

But these cannot be all Christianity.

f90v

FN: Then, is it a doctrine?

I look in books of
sermons & I find it
is - "the doctrine of
man's sin & Christ's
atonement."

Now, this is something
tangible - [but perfectly
incompatible with
the other doctrine of
there being no absolute
truth].

JS: There is one truth & that is
Christ who is the Way the Truth
& the Life. That is enough
for us. The *absolute* truth which
is the search of Philosophy, not of
Christianity, cannot be found by
human reason for it is beyond it.

FN: Christianity then lays it
down ~~then~~ as an
absolute truth that
the scheme of God is
the creation of a
vast number of beings,
called into existence
without any will
of their own,
the fate of the greater number
of which ~~the fate~~
is to be everlasting
~~damnation~~ misery, of the
lesser number eternal
happiness - & this
after a period of "*trial*"
(Qy. "*trial*" of what?)
of the average duration

{f91r} of, in Liverpool, 17 years.
in the healthier districts,
double that ~~amount~~ time
[the only variation in
this doctrine is a
greater or less prepon-
derance given by
Calvinism to the
"atonement," - by
R. Catholicism to
a *second* period of
uncertain duration,
(called Purgatory),
before the everlasting
~~misery~~ or happiness
begins, & by other Churches
~~of~~ to different words,
called "faith", "works",
&c &c &c &c]

This is a very
positive proposition
enunciated by Chris-
tianity.

JS: {f90v} Christianity does no such thing.
It tells men that through their
own wilfullness it is God's law
that they must perish, just as
they perish from Cholera or get
hanged. There is not a human being
to whom Christianity does not offer
eternal life. It condemns none
but it tells them that there is a

f91r

JS: time at hand when they will condemn themselves. It is the same process in the spiritual world which we see every day in the physical world. It offers them a way of life if they will take it. And those who die, die because they will not accept of life, just as we see people die every day to whom we preach Sanitary Science as their protection.

The whole misery of men is summed up in one simple expression of our Teacher & Friend. "Ye will not come to me that ye may have life."

As to church systems, creeds catechisms &c. They have nothing to do with the question, Christianity is not a system. If man has made it so, it is not to be blamed.

FN: (not *by Christianity.*)

FN: As positive is the proposition that

f91v

FN: God has created a number of beings ~~who are~~ (called into existence by no will of their own), who are to be led by Him through infinite progress to perfection, which progress is however to be ~~made~~ secured by Mankind for Mankind, in accordance with certain laws.

Whichever of these two propositions be true, surely each implies as much a matter of fact as those two of the motion of the Sun round the earth or that of the earth round the Sun.

f92r

JS: Both your propositions are in my opinion equally wide of the truth.

The first proposition does not represent Christianity. The second, say what you will, must be classed as ~~desirable~~ simple pantheism, & consequently as fatalism so far as human progression by will, is concerned. Your laws in such a proposition are *my* fates.

FN: Now, if the first Proposition be true, if there be a Being who has done such a thing, nothing but the popular belief that Power is ~~a thing~~, in itself, to be worshipped, could induce men to worship such a Being, much less to love him.

If there be such a Being, the only feeling ~~of~~ a right mind could have would be - to submit, because it must submit - (and here "submission" is the right word) but to protect, in as far as *it is possible*, its fellow - ~~beings~~ creatures from such a Creator.

JS: Your idea so far as I can understand it, is human freedom acting on a certain plan & subject to certain pre-ordained orders of succession, for they must be pre-ordained otherwise the result would be uncertain. It is true you attempt to deny this inference but I cannot let you escape from it.

FN: And doubtless the words, "submission", "resignation" &c have

f92v

FN: sprung from such a belief as this. For "Submission" to *Perfect Goodness* is absurd.

JS: In this Europe of ours the germ of Christian life is rooted too deeply to be injured by any philosophical discussions.

There are many men however, who do not like to face enquiries of this kind, because they have never examined themselves, when obliged to confront these questions they flee & take refuge in puseyisms and especially in Roman Catholicism.

Indeed arguments such as you have used are very frequently used by R.C. preachers, against human freedom in religious matters.

They attempt to destroy belief by a philosophical attack on it & knowing that the germ is still there, they offer the Church as a refuge from the doubts they have raised. That is the only use of such arguments as this. So far as the inner Christian life is concerned when one has to look at them from its platform it is like looking into the darkness, only one likes to look to see if there are any comets.

f93v:

JS: One word more.

Your proposition is that Christianity being impotent for the Salvation of man, - we are to seek the means of his salvation by ascertaining from observation what are the sequences in the moral government of the Universe & having ascertained these sequences we are to be guided by ~~them~~ their teaching in saving the world.

If I understand you aright: - then:

1. The sequences have not yet been discovered
2. They are to be discovered
3. They are to be applied
4. They are, being so applied, to save man.
5. What is to become of man in the mean time, and lastly

The whole thing would after all be an experiment & might fail - & what then?

I must confess I would rather keep what I have got. What I have got I know, what you expect to get is utterly unknown. And I contend that your search is neither in conformity with what we know of ourselves nor of the laws of the moral government of the world.

Add Mss 45838, ff93 onwards

f93r, pen

A SHORT ACCOUNT
OF
GOD'S DEALINGS ~~with F.N.~~
WITH THE AUTHOR.

Newton **{pencil}**

[end 11:781]

To Printer -

Please to page this,
as coming before (tho' in a
different Section) the part
("Practical Deductions IX")
sent yesterday -

30 Old Burlington St.
Jan 14/60

f93v

sparing from such
a belief as this. For
submission to *Perfect*
Goodness is absurd.

next section is FN, with sidebars, no further JS:

f94r

Practical ~~Shelley, Abbott, MS~~ [but little by Shelley]
Deductions ~~Abbot~~. It is a common idea that Sin is so easy &
pleasant that, if
we did not believe it to be our own fault
when we sin, & did not believe that we
shall have to account for it & receive its
punishment hereafter, every bulwark against
sin would be broken down.

{2nd hand, written in left margin:} Is the idea
that evil
is pleasant
a correct
one?

~~Look at the~~
and that this is the main check upon the
successful enjoying sinner, ~~& the broken~~
the main support of the broken-hearted suffering saint. ~~What would~~
~~they do without this faith?~~

~~MS~~ Is this God's view of it? Is this
the view which will practically help us to
most good? What a confusion there is in
men's minds ~~respecting~~ with regard to happiness! We say
~~look too - There is~~

Let us look at a successful sinner - Look at Louis Napoleon. Do you
think he is
happy? His uncle was probably one of
the most miserable men who ever lived.
If God's happiness is the only real happiness,
those who approach the nearest to oneness
with Him are the ~~only~~ **{pencil:}** most **{end pencil}** happy people. How
can you suppose that Napoleon, who cared
for no one person in the world but himself,
the type of selfishness, was a happy man?

He was one of the greatest sufferers.
~~JA~~ Perhaps indeed he did not think himself ~~so, nor have~~ such,
& other men may not have thought him such.

Other hand, written in left margin:

Sufferers
from sin
do not
consider
themselves
sufferers.

He cannot however
be denied to have been a

~~MS. Perhaps I should say~~ sufferers from
privation - privation from the happiness which
only a true course can engender - ~~I entirely~~

We agree with what ~~you say~~ is said respecting punishment,
(tho' we would leave out the word hereafter), in as far

~~course can engender as I we believe that God has made suffering or privation inseparable from sin. To these the word punishment may be given -- if you like it.~~

Now, as far as appealing to the selfish nature will keep man right, if ~~man~~ he can be brought to perceive, believe & feel this as true, ~~do not you think this~~ would not this do more to preserve him from sin than a vague fear of an indefinite future punishment, which besides may be escaped by means of something which is called God's forgiveness, ~~or faith~~, if he repent in time.

~~J.A.~~ But forgiveness can only be granted to faith - it is said.

~~MS.~~ Does that mean faith that the law of consequences will be altered - that the same means being used, different effects will follow?

{written in left margin:}

What is forgiveness of sin?
What is granting forgiveness to faith? **{end}**

~~MS:~~ I confess myself so stupid that I after reading nearly all the sermons on the subject, ~~these thirty years~~ I never could understand what forgiveness means. Does it mean that God changes his mind? that he thinks one thing at one time and another at another? that He is what is called 'just' today, 'merciful' tomorrow? What is the meaning of that cowardly prayer, Hide thy face from my sins & blot out all mine iniquities - ~~I always~~ What can one say, ~~when I hear that prayer~~ but ~~don't~~ Listen not my God; ~~don't~~ hear us not. Put, on the contrary, all my sins into the full light of thy countenance. Let me see them as thou seest them. To ask me, by their consequences, 1st that sin is not desirable, 2nd what is desirable, 3rd how to desire it 4th how to attain it. But, mercifully for us, there is no more occasion for the one prayer than for the other.

~~J.A. But is not that the meaning of
"blot out all mine iniquities"?~~

~~M.S. Well, it really is a shame for an old
fellow like me, but I can't understand the
phrase. Why, God could not if He would
that is, The Spirit of Right could not forgive, without
an absurdity. Can Will God make that which
has been not to have been? alter that
which is past?~~

~~Written in left margin:~~

~~How can
the spirit
of Right,
of Right Law,
forgive? {end}~~

~~The prayer, would be an
insult impertinence, if it were not an absurdity. For
it is asking the Spirit of Right to produce
a contradiction, to be in opposition to Himself.
But He is always the same, "yesterday,
today & for ever"-~~

~~J.A. Then there is no mercy, no hope for
the sinner — Your system is cruel at both
ends — for it alike cuts him off from hope
when he has sinned {pencil:} from any motive to deter {end} & deters him
from
sinning~~

~~M.S. If we really believed that, not only
sin, but, every ignorance of God's law, (be it
a spiritual, intellectual, physical or if
there be any other kind of law,) bring certain
suffering or privation, but the keeping
of those particular laws certain & ever increasing
happiness, which shall be beyond what
the "eye hath seen or the ear heard or what
it hath entered into the heart of man to
conceive" -~~

{written in left margin:}

Does the
giving up
the theory
of forgiveness
cut off the
sinners from
hope or
from any
motive to
deter him
from sinning? **{end}**
if we also believed that we shall
all learn the laws of God, & learn how to
incline our hearts, that is, to bring about our
wills to keep them - will is, even appealing

f97r

[4]

only to the selfish principle, induce us to
do wrong & *suffer for it*, because we
believe that, if we do so, we may say
"other than myself was the cause of it."

If another man knocks me down does
being able to say, "I did not bring this misfortune upon myself:
another did"

prevent me from trying to get up?

As far as ~~my~~ any selfish principle goes, it
is not the want of belief that sin was
entirely attributable to my individual
self, but the absence of conviction that suffering & privation are
entirely attendant upon it, which
prevents my going right. But the truth
is that Man's advance in goodness will be
extremely limited while it depends upon
his selfish fear that, if he individually is
not good, he won't be happy - or his selfish
hope that, if he is good, he will be happy.
He cannot advance towards that oneness
with the Divine Spirit, in which true
happiness consists, by thoughts & feelings dia-
metrically opposite to that Divine Spirit. "God
is love & he that loveth not knoweth not God."
To make happy is His happiness. And it is the
beautiful arrangement of love that happiness
to the individual shall be the result of exercising
his power for the happiness of others.

Appeals to the selfish nature do not touch
the affections, the conscience or the spiritual
nature. they do the part of the policeman
who will never help a man to be very
happy or very good.

~~J.A. I quite agree, of course, in that. But I [illeg] never to the idea that if it were not the thief's fault, it was that he should commit a theft, it was God's fault. You cannot get out of that. The thief, it is said, knows perfectly well, while he is thieving, that what he is doing is wrong - & that he can help doing it, if he will.~~

Written in left margin:

If it were
not the
thief's fault,
was it
God's fault? **{end}**

~~MS. I entirely acknowledge that~~ but it never has been possible to him ~~not to will doing~~ to do it; ~~that~~ if we could disentangle every the most minute circumstance, which has affected the will of the thief, we should perceive that it could not have been otherwise at any particular moment at which we contemplate him in the commission of his crime.

~~J.A.~~ No reasoning, ~~nothing that can be~~ it is often said can ever convince ~~me~~ the human mind of this. It would rather doubt the capability of ~~my~~ its own powers than believe it. For it ~~has~~ has that within, which tells ~~me~~ it absolutely & authoritatively that God is good,

Written in left margin:

Can any
reasoning
convince
us that
God is the
author of
sin? **{end}**

& it could not consider him good, if He, on the effect of His laws, - which is the same thing exactly as saying He Himself - has made it impossible, when a man ~~has committed~~ commits a theft or any other wrong action, that he could have done otherwise. It cannot believe this of a God who is Omnipotent & Benevolent, & it believes ~~I shall be~~ that there is more truth in doubting ~~my~~ its own capability of meeting or understanding this subject in which ~~I~~ there are certainly ~~feel~~ difficulties, than in giving up ~~my~~ its feeling & conviction that God is Omnipotence & Benevolence.

f99r

[6]

~~MS. I quite agree that~~ Unquestionably we should be more true in doubting our own powers of understanding any subject than in giving up our belief & our feeling that God is omnipotent & benevolent. But this belief & ~~feeling~~ may be weaker or stronger - & its degree will materially influence our present practice & our future progress. Shall we not be able to give "a reason of the hope that is in us"? ~~I think that,~~ Not indeed the isolated assertion that the sinner could not have done otherwise but, the right understanding of the laws, of which this is an instance, would contribute ~~greatly~~ immensely to man's belief in the benevolence & power of God - ~~would~~

Written in left margin:

Not the isolated assertion that the sinner could not have done otherwise, - but the right understanding of the law of which this is an instance - will teach man in what relation he stands to God, to others & to himself. **{end}**

to his help & sympathy for his fellow-creatures, & to his conduct of himself - would, in fact, as we have said before, influence the whole field of his practice with regard to his God,

{pencil, written in left margin:} Work out this field **{end}**

his neighbour & himself. ~~I would ask you~~
Therefore ~~to follow my~~ in making any attempt to inves-
tigate these Laws, if it is not conclusive
~~to you I shall quite agree with you that~~ to us, it
is certainly more true to doubt our own finite
capability of understanding the ways of
the Infinite, than to doubt His infinite
perfections:- but in as far as we can
follow His track & learn the ways of His
providence, ~~I feel that~~ no subject can be
so interesting or indeed so practical.

f100r

[7]

But people will fight "a long hour, by Shrews-
bury clock" about how their couriers have
behaved, or who is going to be married, &
have such questions unsettled as *what* man is &
why he is, - ~~so unsettled~~ & nobody caring to know.
Could mankind but reach mankind's
sense upon the matter & compare each
other's opinions, some progress might be
made. But every body is afraid of every
body else on this subject. ~~the~~ men of
being thought to say the "foundations of
religion" - ~~the~~ women of being thought
pedantic & presumptuous - ~~the religious~~
~~Professions* of saying anything but upon~~
~~authority.~~ And so Thus nothing is said & little
thought upon the matter. ~~What a good~~
~~word that is~~ * Note. A Profession ~~the clergy as a~~ is a set of men
paid to *profess* some kind of opinions -
the clergy are paid to profess one kind
of religion - the Wesleyans another. In
the Medical Profession, the Allopath is paid
to profess one system of medicine, the Homeo-
path another. &c And all have their small families
to support

~~J.A. Leave carping at mankind & woman-~~
~~kind & come back to your own abominable~~
~~assertion, which was that no man who has~~
To return to the assertion that no man who has
committed a wrong action could have
willed other-wise than to commit it.

~~MS. I don't mean~~ It is *not* that God decreed it
i.e. that there was an absolute definite
express volition, unconnected with any other,

Written in left margin:

In what
sense ~~can~~ is it
~~you say~~ true
that a man
could not
have willed
otherwise
than as
he did? {end}

f101r

[8]

in the Almighty mind. If we could read in
the thought of God, we should not see there
"this man [illeg] shall will to commit a ~~theft~~ murder,"
we should see certain unvarying laws, by
which such circumstances & such natures
being brought together, such effects will
follow.

Each human being that has lived differs
from every other human being. What A is
was not *decreed* by God - i.e., God did not
will, A ~~shall have~~, when he comes into exis-
tence, shall have - exactly such & such
capabilities - but God's laws (that such
& such uniformities ~~shall~~ of succession, &
of coexistence shall be) made him what
he is. or, in other words that A is what he
is, at the moment he begins to exist, arises
entirely, to the very most minute particulars,
from the laws of God, i.e. from the uni-
formities of Nature, referable ultimately
only to God's will, as a cause. Exactly
the same circumstances never arise,
therefore never the same natures - therefore
one identity can never have exactly the
same Thought, Feeling, Will as another.

~~J.A. Of course~~ We acknowledge that there
are certain laws, the consequence of which
is that the child's physical, intellectual
& spiritual nature is affected by the
parents.

Written in left margin:

Do children
begin existence
in a certain
definite state,
which could
not have
been other
than it is? **{end}**

We acknowledge therefore

~~MS.~~ ~~Rud~~ that children therefore begin
their existence in a certain definite state, which
would have been different from what it is, had

f102r

the parents been different from what they
were.

In consequence of the first ~~identities~~ individuals being
ignorant of some of God's Laws (which is
the natural consequence of its being God's
plan that men should learn by experience)
the children inherit some deficiency of
organization

~~Ia.~~ ~~Then you do visit the sins of the
fathers upon the children?~~

~~Ms.~~ The "sins of the father are visited
upon the children," not only "unto the third
& fourth generation", but throughout all
generations.

{Written in left margin:

Are the
"sins of the
fathers"
thus
"visited on
the children"? **{end}**

This process has been going on
as long as man has existed. The laws
which influence descent & which concern
the well-being of man are almost ~~wholly~~
unknown. Yet each has taken its natural
"effect, since the beginning of the race.
It is probable that, knowingly or unknowingly,
from self-indulgence or inevitably from
the state of society & circumstances, all
parents have more or less disregarded
the laws for securing a well-constituted
nature to their children.

~~Ia.~~ ~~You~~ This is not supposing ~~there~~ a constant degene-
ration in the race of mankind?

{written in left hand margin:}

Is there then
a constant
degeneration
going on
in mankind? **{end}**

~~MS. No,~~ Because another process is also
going on, a process of Regeneration. Man
improves by experience. God & the Divine
spirit in man are ever at work to turn the evil
into good.

f103r

[10]

Had none of these laws been disregarded by the
parents & ancestors of A, A would have begun existence
with good & well-balanced dispositions. Had
all the wills which have influenced A been
true, that is, known what experience only
can teach, these dispositions would have
been truly cultivated.

~~JA. Then you acknowledge original sin?~~

Written in left margin:

Is there any
truth in
the doctrine
of
"original
sin"?

~~MS. Certainly.~~ We may truly say that there
is "original sin" in each of us: that is, sin
which originated with our first parents -
& the effect of which exists in us - ~~that is,~~
we sin because the first man sinned.

~~JA But what would be the practical
consequence of sin~~

{written in left margin:}

Wherever
there is
sin is
it the
consequence
of
ignorance? **{end}**

Suppose then it were admitted that,
wherever there is sin, there has been
previous ignorance ...

~~MS.~~ on the part of the sinner or of others,
ignorance of God's laws, ~~which~~ this has been the
antecedent to his sin, of which it is the
inevitable consequent - or in other words,
without which the sin would not have been,

with which it could not but be.

~~IA. But I know, I know perfectly well that I am doing wrong in the very act of doing so.~~

{written in left margin:}

Even when

we know

that we

are

sinning? **{end}**

But we often sin it is said with the clearest knowledge that ~~I am~~ we are breaking God's law.

~~MS. yes,~~ But ~~you do~~ we did not know how to incline your hearts to keep it. ~~You~~ We know it intellectually, but not *by heart*. Perhaps at one time ~~you~~ we did not perceive the full consequence of what ~~you~~ we were doing - & when ~~you~~ we did,

f104r

[11]

the habit was so strengthened ~~if you~~ that
~~you~~ we did not know how to overcome it.

~~I.A. Of course~~

Written in left margin:

Is it not
acknowledged
that the
will of any
individual
would have
been different
from what it
is, had his
antecedents
been
different? **{end}**

It is acknowledged that each
individual is *in some respects* what he is
in consequence of the laws of God regarding
the effect of parents upon children - &
that the will of ~~every~~ any individual would
have been different from what it has
been *in some respects*, has those ante-
cedents been different.

~~MS.~~ Perhaps this is all we can say. We
are so ignorant of what these laws, ~~are &~~
~~what~~ or uniformities, are that, modified
as they are by other laws, we cannot with
any accuracy assign ~~what~~ the effects which
arise from our immediate ancestors, still
less from those ~~which~~ who have preceded them,
up to the beginning of the human race on
this earth. ~~We c— You allow however that~~
We may safely affirm however that, had these
ancestors of A been different, A &
consequently A's will would have been
differently affected.

~~J.A. But is not~~

{written in left margin:}

What is a
man's will? **{end}**

Whether a man's will is a
separate ~~some~~ ~~what?~~ thing or whether it is
merely some part of his
nature in activity - or rather, the effect
of the balance of his various capabilities
upon one another at the moments ~~you~~ we
speak of his will is an independent question. ~~I suspect however~~
~~that we lay immeasurably too much im-~~
portance upon the will. The question

f105r

[12]

is not, Can a man will what he please?
He *is* willing *what he pleases*. He cannot
will anything else but what he *does* please.
The question is, Can he do what he will?

{written in left margin:}

Some can,
some cannot
do what
they will. **{end}**

~~Some can, some cannot.~~

~~J.A. And can he?~~

~~M.S. Some can, some cannot.~~

~~J.A. This question about the will is
however rather beside the mark.~~

~~M.S. Well~~

{written in left margin:}

What are the
antecedents
which make
will what
it is? **{end}**

But whatever the will be, let us
now look for other antecedents which make
it what it is.

From the first moment of A's existence
in this world, he freely does, as far as power
goes, what he will - he stretches his limbs,
he cries, he takes his food. but why does
he will to do these things? At each moment
of existence what his capabilities & wants
are depends upon the laws of God - & out
of these capabilities & wants arises the will
of the man for all he wills. What he wills
at any particular moment arises not
from a decree of God "this man shall
will so & so" but from a will in God
"certain laws or uniformities shall be".

~~J.A. But you are not denying that,
according to your system The man's will
is thus really just as much occasioned
by the will of God as if He decreed it.~~

~~MS. Certainly not. I quite admit it.~~
Only, what is His will? Not that A shall
murder B; not that Calvin shall burn
Servetus. But that man shall attain to

f106r

[13]

oneness with God by the exercise of his own capabilities, & that God shall supply him with the means & inducements to do so, which arise out of His being the Spirit of Rights. And what is oneness with God? God's nature is activity, & ~~ours there would not be oneness with God without it.~~ & there would be no oneness with Him without it.

{written in left margin:}

What ~~are~~ is the effect of circumstances? **{end}**

~~J.A. Well~~ Let us now see the effects of circumstances upon the child already in the world. ~~The~~

~~M.S. The nation, the family~~ the age, the family, the education ~~are all you~~ we acknowledged to produce an effect. Any individual would have been different from what he is, had he been differently placed in these respects. Where there is the line between what he wills through these & other influences & what he wills because he wills it?

~~J.A. I can only mean [?] what I said before, that in that case Man has no Free Will,~~

~~—can have no likeness with God~~ If we say that in that case man has no "free will", do we

~~But do you~~ believe that God Himself wills so to speak the antecedents in consequence of which, or the nature in coexistence with which His Will ~~at a particular moment~~ is what it is?

{written in left margin:}

Is there any
meaning in
the word "*Free*
Will" applied
either to man
or to God? **{end}**

And it would be a contradiction to
suppose that This will could be different
from what *He* is. But God has formed us
in the image of Himself.

~~J.A. There~~ It is not that God Himself is the subject of
necessity? ~~But~~

{written in left margin:}

Is God then
the subject of
necessity? **{end}**

~~Shelley. Certainly.~~ Nor that ~~And~~ God can have no will

f107r

[14]

respecting our actions. If we cannot help
doing other than we do & if He has no
"Free Will" Himself it is often said, He can have no preference
for one line of conduct in us rather than
another.

~~M.S.~~ Why then did He make that immu-
table identity of right & happiness, wrong
& misery? Even if He had no will
concerning ~~you~~ us, can ~~you~~ we help preferring
happiness to misery? ~~You would be no kind~~
~~of Being, create or uncreate, that we know~~
~~of, if you did.~~

~~—Shelley. But if God Himself is the subject~~
~~of Necessity? You say that He could not do~~
~~otherwise.~~ Isaiah says that He "formed the
light & created darkness, that He made
peace & created evil: that He did all these
things." & ~~you~~ we say that He could not do
otherwise than create evil as well as good -
murderers & tyrants as well as Howards
& Fenelons. Even dropping the word
"Necessity", ~~in order not to affront you,~~ therefore, it will be said
that, He is
Himself the subject of Law - and

{written in left margin:}

Or is He
the subject
of Law? **{end}**

~~J.A.~~ no better than the ancient Fate
~~Shelley.~~ And if Religion is our *tie religio*
to God, part of our religion must be to hate
Him for His evil as well as to thank Him for
His good. If we thank Him for "our
creation, preservation, & all the blessings
of this life," we must abhor Him for our
sickness, destruction & all the miseries of this

f108r

[15]

~~life. And, of the two, I am sure our abhorrence
will be much more sincere & extensive than
our thanks gratitude.~~

~~—J.A. I think that Mr. Shelley, though his
words are strong, is right according to you.
I do not see how you can escape the conclusion
if, instead of saying that God made the good
& man the evil, you say that God made both.
For either you must come to this practical
conclusion, or you must admit that God is
Himself the subject of Necessity.~~

{written in left margin:}

If God
willed
evil, was
He not
subject to
necessity? **{end}**

~~M.S.~~ He wills the Law of attraction to be
in force at this moment, because His goodness
desires the well-being of His creation, & His
wisdom knows this to be a means of promoting
it. That He should will otherwise may truly
be said to be an impossibility, unless you
suppose the absence of Goodness & Wisdom.
But then He would not be God. This is not
saying that another will than His own obliges
God to will what He does will - It is not
Necessity. It is that He would not be God
if He willed otherwise.

{written in left margin:}

Is it not that
God cannot but
that He will not
will anything
contrary to
Perfect
Wisdom. **{end}**

Thus it is with Man - No other being at
any particular moment obliges His will to
be what it is. But he would not be himself,
he would be somebody else, if his will were
different from what it is.

~~I (illeg.)~~ It is not correct to say that he cannot, if he will, will
to do what he
knows to be cruel & foolish, in as far ~~then~~ as he is good & wise

~~M.S. I would not say, he cannot, if he will.
But~~ He will not will. It is impossible that

f109r

he should will. Will is only the emanation of
the Being. It is as impossible that a being
should will contrary to itself as that a
flint should emit carbonic acid gas, or
charcoal silicine acid. And if he is selfish,
& has not the wisdom to see that he cannot
himself enjoy as much as if he were in a
different state, is it possible, in the state
in which he is, that he should will otherwise
than as he is?

May we not then conclude, 1st, that a
human being, such as he enters the world
today, is such in consequence of the laws
of God ~~respecting~~ which regard the effect of the parents
upon the child from the time that man
began to exist upon the earth?

2nd that certain effects take place re-
specting that human being the first moment
he is in existence, which influence his state
the second moment, in accordance with
certain laws of God, & so on from one
point of time to another thro' his existence;
so that at any moment he is what he is
from the operation of these laws

~~J.A. Well then
what they are.~~

{written in left margin:}

What are the
Laws which
make man
what he is? **{end}**

~~M.S.~~ To ~~do so~~ point out what these laws are & to trace their effects in every instance & at every moment is not in our power, & this inability leaves the subject in uncertainty. Moreover, the existence of law as all in the spiritual world is hardly yet acknowledged. & therefore it is not so extraordinary that we cannot perhaps point out a simple law. But the more we study

f111r

[7]

human character & history, the more glimpses shall we have of Law making it what it ~~has~~ is ~~been~~. You acknowledge, in the ~~mass~~ rough, the effects of country, of soil, of climate, of age, of race, of family, of associates, of what we call education. (a free word, if we mean *leading out of*, for the circumstances of every kind which affect the nature of man, spiritual, intellectual & physical, do LEAD, or educate, OUT OF the being which enters the world that which he is during his existence). You hear it said, even in common conversation, "there is the man who grows upon the green clay." Do you doubt too that many a thief, under certain circumstances, would have been, under others, an honest man?

What we see *in a degree* is perplexing & unsatisfactory with regard to God's Providence, unless we can see it pervade through out. Either it is a defect, or it is, if rightly understood, complete - a part of a perfect whole.

The Englishman has his national character: the member of a family - his family character: the eye has its character: so has the race, so has the soil, so has the climate, so has the profession. This does not mean that an individual cannot will as he please, because England, or his family, or the age or the climate he lives in wills for him. But his will is in some respects what it is, because his nation, his family, the age & the climate in which he lives are what they are - & his will

would, in some respects, have been different, had they been different.

Now, does it no seem to you very improbable that the influences of Providence on the will should be so great & distinct in these instances, but that, beyond these instances, another state of things prevails & a man can will what he wills, merely because it is his will - independent of any past or present influence on it. I believe that, if we could trace each separate volition from the time there has been volition in a human being, we should see a spring for it, which according to God's laws, could not have had another sequence than it had - we should see the effect upon him of circumstances at a time when he is acknowledged to have no capability of "choosing to will one way rather than another," as we call that mysterious supposed process - the effect of nation, age, climate, education which he could not, or at a time when he could not, have made them other than they were.

{written in left margin:}

Is man not
the arbiter
of his own
will by
his own will? **{end}**

~~— J.A. You want to prove that it is not God's plan to make man altogether by his own will the arbiter of his own will?~~

~~— M.S. The arbiter? Yes, he Man is the arbiter of his own will in the sense that he wills for himself & no one else wills for him.~~

{written in left margin:}

Is man's will
not at all
times of his
existence &
in all that
concerns if
determined
himself? **{end}**

~~— J.A. Well then, that a human being's will is not, at all times of his existence & in all that concerns it, determined by himself?~~

~~— M.S. His nature determines his own will~~

f113r

[19]

always. but, as to determining his own nature,
sometimes he does & sometimes he does not.
The child does & ought not - yet the object of Law
is to bring us to that point that we shall
determine our own nature.

{written in left margin:}

Is it nation,
climate , age
&c which
have powers
over us or
which give
us our power? **{end}**

J.A. How can we do that, it is said if we have no
powers over ourselves? if nation, climate, age,
all these things have power over us?

~~M.S.~~ Why It is all these things which give man his
power. They give him the power of seeing
the desirableness of certain things. God works
out in man, (if we will not say, gives to man)
such an organization as shall have the
power of finding out.

1st that not any, but a well constituted nature
is desirable

2nd what is a well-constituted nature

3rd how to desire it

4th how to attain it

& this by the exercise of human nature.

And all that he is suffering is to bring him
to this.

{written in left margin:}

How near
are we to
creating
Mankind? **{end}**

J.A. And how near are we to that? it
will be asked.

~~M.S.~~ Very far indeed from it at present. In fact, in the
sixth thousand, or perhaps a great deal
more, of the world's years, men are still
marrying exactly like the brutes, without
knowing any one of the four. But what
is are six thousand years to educate a being
meant for Eternity?

~~J.A.~~ Well, I must return to this - that

{written in left margin:}

Yet man
determined his
own will some-
thing else deter-
mines it not. **{end}**
your system doe not prove that man cannot determine
his own will - that something else determines it
for him

f114r

[20]

{written in left margin:}

Can man
choose to
will *any*
thing? **{end}**

~~M.S.~~ Everyone will acknowledge that ~~he~~ man cannot
choose to will *anything*. The uneducated thief
could not will to be a man of cultivation &
refinement. He could not even wish it.
Somethings we may will, but not be able to
obtain.

But let us cease this jargon about the will.
What is ~~the~~ will? Will includes Wish,
Purpose, Conviction that you can effect your
purpose. Now you ask, can I will as I please?
Certainly: you are willing as you please. You
will not please to will what you believe
impossible, what you *know* that you cannot
effect, or in other words, what is contrary
to the laws of God. Whether you can do as
you will is another thing, & depends upon
the *knowledge* with which you have
previously willed.

{written in left margin:}

What is
"will"? **{end}**

~~J.A. It seems to me rather to depend
upon the your Power to act out your will.~~

~~M.S.~~ If you have willed unwisely, that
is, in ignorance of the laws of God, which
alone will enable you to carry your will
into effect, the want of *knowledge* with
which you have willed prevents you
from having the *power* to do as you will.
The more knowledge you have, the fewer
rash resolutions you will make. If "I will"
includes I wish it, I intend it, I have
the conviction that I can bring it to be - in

your thief may fail the wish. But you do not want to include in Free Will the power of willing what you do not wish - there may fail the intention - but you would not call it absence of Free Will if a person wished to have lived in the 14th century & did not will it - there may fail the belief that he can obtain his wish - but then he would not will it - as, we do not will to go up to the moon. Lastly, there may fail the knowledge whether the laws of God permit his carrying his will into effect. & then he may will in ignorance, & not be able to do as he will. I believe what you wish to ask is, Can a man will what he wishes? Certainly not. Because, in the very definition of the word Will, there must be Purpose - & there cannot be purpose unless with a belief that he can accomplish it. But the truth is that the whole controversy about Free Will & necessity is a jargon. Free Will is the very definition of conscious intelligent being - acting from within. Necessity is the law of inorganic or unconscious nature - being acted upon from without. This is the whole mystery ~~abo~~ of these oft-disputed words.

{written in left margin:}

Can a thief
will *not*
to steal, at
the moment
he is
tempted? **{end}**

~~J.A. Well then, if you say the will be free,
I say that your thief, at the moment, an
object standing before him, which he feels
tempted to steal, can will not to steal it~~

~~M.S.~~ There are laws which concern each particular volition, & if at one moment a man wishes that a future volition shall be or shall not be somewhat, he may, in accordance with those laws, take means to make his volition what he wishes it to be - that is, some can & some cannot. It depends upon the state of his knowledge of the laws of God. & of his power of applying them.

{written in left margin:}

Can I know
whether I
can or cannot
will a thing? **{end}**

~~J.A.~~ But how can I know whether I can or cannot?

~~M.S.~~ This is a matter which comes within the proof of our own daily individual experience. How often have many of us resolved in this way, By this day next month or next year I will have completely conquered such & such a particular fault. I may have taken means too for my end. But it was not within my will. Human nature was not in such a state & my nature was not in such a state ~~that I could not~~ as to enable me to do what I willed. Either I was ignorant of the laws,- or it was not possible within the time - or &c &c. What I say is that no past volition could, by the laws of God, have been other than it was; the laws of God must have been different, or that could not have been different. And if they had been different, it would not have been God. If that speck of dust had not been on the table, the whole universe have been different, & if the whole universe has been different, there would have been no God.

{written in left margin:}

Has then
every
crime of
history
been
brought
about
by the
laws of
God? {end}

~~J.A.~~ Then ~~the whole~~ every horrible Revolution of ~~48 & 49~~
~~war~~ has been brought about by the laws of God. Every
atrocitiy committed ~~was~~ has been God's doing. Every
life butchered ~~was~~ has been God's killing - will be said.

~~M.S.~~ I once saw the most extraordinary
storm on the Nile. The river seemed flowing
bottom upwards - the whirlwind of sand from
the Desert literally covering it, & blowing
up in ridges upon it. The Israelites might
have almost passed upon dry land. Our eyes,
mouths & ears were filled with sand - & it
was impossible to drink, for, instead of water
from the river, we drew up sand. To try to stand
against the wind was useless. Presently five
vessels floated past us, keel uppermost - &
we saw a little whirlpool of oranges, the
unfortunate ~~crew~~ passengers having broken open the
cabin in their efforts to escape. At 3 P.M.
it became quite dark & the waves were like
a moderate sea in the Channel. The Arabs
thought that the Day of Judgment was at
hand & were quite helpless.

Now we know that there was not one
molecule of sand or water in that confused
whirlwind, which was there by chance, which
had not a sufficient cause, so to speak, for
occupying the place which it did, which
was not rigorously where it ought to be,
according to the laws, or uniform rules of
God. No atom of this turbulence fulfils
A vague & unnecessitated task
or acts but as it must & ought to act.

f118r

In other words, a ~~mathematician~~ Natural Philosopher who knew the acting forces, & the properties of the atoms acted upon, would demonstrate that each atom acted with precision in the way it ought to act, & could not act otherwise than as it did.

In the terrible convulsions which have shaken Europe ~~during the last 4 years,~~ have upset empires & annihilated Liberty, there has not been one single action, not one single word, one single thought or will or passion, in the destroyers or the victims, which was not the infallible sequence of its antecedent, which ~~did~~ had not uniform - by its allotted succession or co-existence in this moral whirlwind. An intellect which could appreciate the acting forces & the characters of the nations acted upon could have demonstrated like a Q.E.D. the results.

f119r {written diagonally in top left corner}

30 Old Burlington Str
Jan 13/60

*Practical
Deductions*

Shelley, Abbott, MS.

IX. ~~J.A. But let us~~ In order to see where ~~your~~ our doctrine will lead us practically, you must push them to the extreme & ~~then see~~ look what they bring you to & ultimate limits which they will bring us to.

~~M.S. Certainly, — that~~ This is the only test. Now ~~it seems to me that~~ our whole relation with God, with each other with ourselves, is practically overthrown by what is commonly called the "Free Will" doctrine. †.

{written in left margin:}

What is our
relation
towards
God,
towards
others,
towards ourselves? **{end}**

These relations cannot be based upon any other idea than that of († we will not say necessity but/ Law.

~~J.A. Take, first, our relation towards ourselves. It is the easiest & you are less profane than when you talk about God.~~

~~M.S. What I believe~~ Our belief amounts to this: that I may look back on any particular moment of the past & ~~truly~~ say, It was ~~just as~~ impossible at that moment (God's laws being what they are & having operated on all preceding that moment as they did) that I should have willed otherwise than as I did.

{written in left margin}

Is it true
that at any
given moment
it was
impossible
to us to
will otherwise
than we
did?

~~J.~~

~~A. Yes, you may say so, but will
it be true?~~

~~—M.S. We believe this to be just as true as that it was impossible
at any particular moment, that the Earth
should not have pursued the course
she did (God's laws being at that moment
& having been till that moment what they
were).~~

f121r

[2]

It is therefore untrue & useless for one to cry out, Oh ~~how wicked I was! how wrong!~~ how deserving of blame! how deserving of punishment I was! - my good friend, I say to myself, don't be afraid, you will have suffering enough in what you have done. you exhaust the powers which you have in you for finding out the Laws to alter nature or circumstances by these exclamations - "Come back," I say kindly to myself. "I know you could not help it. Let us have patience with our self - & see what we can do". But it is the custom in our religion to appeal almost exclusively to the Conscience. A wretched drunkard tries to awaken himself by tormenting this faculty, he says, I am very wicked, I hate myself, I am a dreadful sinner. He exhausts himself till he often flies to that very drink again just to escape these terrors of his conscience which he has roused to save himself. I know a butler once who denounced himself to his Master, in great agony of mind. & before 12 o'clock the next morning, when he was to meet his Master, in order to be dismissed, as he had himself entreated, to escape a temptation too strong for him, he was drunk again.

~~J.A.~~ That ~~you~~ we should not have had him go on in his course, without troubling himself about it, [other hand?] we need hardly say.

f121v, pencil. {doesn't look like FN's hand. VR}

Rhetoric is not logic.

(but logic is often the best kind of Rhetoric)

f122r

[3]

{written in left margin}

Is sin not
to feel
repentance? {end}

~~M.S. I need hardly defend myself from that.~~ But just take the common course of a drunkard. He may abstain once, by force of conscience or even feeling or some other motive, but his physical state, which has been accustomed to stimulus, will want it more at the end of 24 hours than of 12. We must consider the *whole* of the nature on which we wish to work whether it is our own or an one else's. It is not enough to address yourself to the Conscience, while perhaps the nerves, the spirits, which have also their Laws may be in a state of severe suffering from want of the stimulus to which they have been accustomed - But what ~~is~~ do we do? Twice a week, we say, We have done nothing that we ought to have done, ~~(in order to make sure of~~ and we have done every thing we ought not to have done (in order to make sure of leaving nothing out.) And we mean to lead an entirely new life from this moment, to do something entirely different. But it is very ~~sure~~ certain that we do not, because we intend to say the same thing again in the after noon ~~dinner~~. The science of Moral Recovery is at least as intricate as that of Physical Recovery. ~~& only~~ Imagine if a man with a broken leg, or an inflammation of the lungs, were to say, There is not a fibre in my body that does not give me pain. Every function I have is going wrong. But I mean, as soon as it is half-past twelve, to walk about as if nothing had happened. I ~~intend~~ propose that nothing more shall be the

f123r

[4]

matter with me. (intending to repeat the same thing at a quarter before three) You would say, He may well say the same thing again, because there *will* be no difference. ~~He has an inflammation affection of the brain~~ His intellects are affected, not ~~of the~~ his lungs.

Of all the fatal mistakes that have been made to impede the progress of the Human Race, I believe this to have been the most fatal - viz. that we have nothing to do but to exert the Will, as it is called, & all former ~~mistakes~~ error will be rectified, all future good secured. ~~Only~~ Think if this mistake had been made ~~about~~ with regard to the physical health, Mankind would probably have come to an end. If we believed that a man with only one diseased lung ~~had~~ has nothing to do but to will in order to have two good ones; if we believed that a man when he is hungry has nothing to do but to will in order to eat, ~~I suppose~~ we should agree that the human race would soon perish. Are not the laws of the spiritual world at least as numerous, important, & worthy of study as those of the Physical?

{written in left margin:}

What are the "means of grace"? **{end}**

J.A. ~~Will~~ But we don't *only* say "Will." There are ~~ways~~ means appointed for our growth in grace.

M.S. The means usually enumerated are, ~~Prayer~~, Self-Examination, ~~Reading the Scripture~~, observance of the Sabbath & Public Worship, including the Communion of the Lord's Supper, Reading the Scripture & Prayer.

~~M.S. Now, what shall we say of these?
If we are in prayer, we are already observing
the laws of God, we are already at one with
Him - but to send a drunkard or a
profligate to prayer, would probably be
to send him back to vice. He would be
disgusted with an employment for which
he was not in a frame, so little disposed - which had no
relish for him.~~

{written in left margin:}

1. Self-

Examination **{end}**

1. Self-Examination? ~~I suppose~~ I am
telling the history of half my race when
by saying that. ~~I have you~~ we undertake the practice over & over
again, & insensibly left it of examining,
~~myself once or~~ ourselves once or twice a day - & insensibly
~~left~~ leave it off, from dislike to the operation.
Which of us who have ever tried it cannot tell the same tale?
Suppose you were to say to a man afflicted
with the Tic Douloureux, now twice a day
examine yourself diligently for one quarter
of an hour (that is not much) to see
where the pain lies, whether it is better
or worse. And be very sorry for it,
remember to be very sorry for yourself
while you are doing it. & reproach
yourself bitterly that you are no better.
Then make a resolution that you will
be quite well for the rest of the day.
& observe yourself carefully from time to
time to see whether you are keeping
your resolution. Why, it would be
better to try & forget your pain ~~filled~~ or your sins altogether
than to do this. But no, it would not.
Anything is better than to be altogether careless,
because the pain you feel will drive you at last to
take some means for cure.

2. Sunday With regard to the Sabbath, I am sure ~~±~~ we agree that one day in seven set apart by common consent of all the world for finding

out the spiritual laws of God is an inestimable advantage. We should only like to have two.

Even in discovery the material laws, which every body acknowledges to be very important, how many hindrances people find, in consequence of the consent of mankind not being with them. Some are hindered by hunger, others by the "laws of Conventional Society", unfortunately not the same as those of God.

~~Some~~ Those who are ~~therefore~~ prevented by the fear of starvation & ~~others~~ those who are frightened by that of being "thought odd" are therefore equally out of the pale of true discoveries.

Now a Sunday which is granted by universal consent both to the very poor & the very rich is inestimable. Only let us use it as such.

3. Worship ~~And~~ As to a "common worship," as it is called, instead of having it once a week, I would have it every day, twice a day. The word "Worship" I do not like - because

~~I don't think that is~~ it seems to be hardly what God wants of us. He does not want ~~us to~~ be praised, to be adored, to have his glory sung. We can scarcely conceive a good man, a very limited edition of God's perfections, wishing it ~~for that~~. How tiresome it must be to Him then all that praise? And ~~I am sure they can~~ people only do it, because they are afraid of Him, for they cannot really think Him good, with such qualities as they ascribe to Him. vanity, anger, revenge.

~~J.A. Well then, what could you make your worship consist of?~~

~~M.S. What He desires, I think, is~~ seems to be accordance with Him, that we should be one with Him not prostrate before Him.

{written in left margin:}

Is humility
an essential
of goodness
in Man? **{end}**

~~J.A.~~ Then you do away entirely with the
virtue of humility. And your It is said that the parallel between
~~the~~ a good man listening to the singing of his own
praises & God doing the same is no parallel,
because humility is one of the essentials of
a good man.

~~M.S.~~ What is meant
by humility we do not well know. We think ~~the~~ greatest harm
is done by a striving after what is called
"humility", by a checking of what is called
"pride". It is a cry of nature ~~that~~ to wish
to be something - to do something. To check it
~~that~~ is to check the appetite for activity
which God has placed in our nature

{written in left margin:}

What is
Humility? **{end}**

~~J.A.~~ No, Humility is thinking ~~lowly~~ meanly of
ourselves, placing ourselves below others,
& ~~a willingness~~ being willing that others should do so too.

~~M.S.~~ But I call ~~that~~ Is not this rather absurdity & untruth?
What I want is a true estimate of myself
not a fake one. I want to see myself as
God sees me. If a man who has none, You are
stronger than I. You can cut down that tree
better than I. ~~you~~ we should say, ~~absurd~~ how wrong. If a
~~Mr.~~ Macaulay were to persuade himself, for
the sake of being humble, that he could
not write history so well as any of the people
at that moment walking down the Strand,
would that be true or desirable? I do
not see how the maxim ~~of Humility~~ Let-a-Man-know-what-he-can-do &-do-it
is
compatible with that of Humility. Humility,

~~J.A.~~ You ~~pas~~ if logically carried into our
conduct would lead to ~~a man~~ our giving up
everything we ~~could~~ do into the hands of those
whom we ~~had to~~ ~~ought~~ to be convinced could
do it better than ourselves.

{written in left margin:}

Are we
to have
Pride
then,
instead of
Humility? {end}

~~J.A.~~ Then you think Pride & Conceit very desirable are not qualities either which will contribute greatly to our oneness with God.

~~M.S.~~ But Pride & Conceit become impossible when we have a knowledge of the laws of God. If his laws have made me what I am, if, without them, I could not be what I am, & with them cannot be any thing but what I am, how can I possibly be proud of what I am? They do away equally with Pride & ~~Discouragement~~ Humiliation. The laws of God have brought me where I am. ~~the~~ His laws will carry me through.

You ~~want to say~~ wish to believe that God has done every thing: ~~man nothing.~~ I ~~want~~ We wish to prove it. You say, how horrible for man to think that he has merit - that his virtues are self-deserved. I say, ~~[illeg] horrible.~~ too, It is untrue. For God does everything by means & inducements.

~~J.A.~~ Well, we have wandered far enough from our subject. You have ~~disp~~ summarily disposed of Public Worship. now you may dispose of the Bible.

4. Bible ~~M.S.~~ What is morality to be referred to? It is not to our sense of Right? But we have referred it to a Book. which book makes ~~the~~ most many contradictory assertions. ~~The most important~~ Discoveries are being made every day in Physical Science. but, in the most important science of all, no discoveries are made of can be made. Why? because the book is final. Supposing Moses had written a book about Mechanics. & that this book was regarded as the ultimatum, we should have made no progress

in Mechanics. Aristotle ~~did~~ was supposed to have written such a book & for 1800 years people disbelieved their own actual experience before their eyes, because they could quote chapter & verse of Aristotle. Yes, with the sounds of two weights falling simultaneously in their ears, they maintained that the weight which was ten times heavier than the other fell in one tenth of the time of the other because they had it from "Inspiration", because *Aristotle had said so*. Is not this an exactly ~~similar~~ case?

Insert (1, 2)

~~J.A. But what do you say about Prayer, the greatest of all the means of Grace?~~
 5. Prayer ~~M.S.~~ The doctrine of Prayer is the kingdom where unbelief & inconsistency reign triumphant in England. Did ~~†~~ we believe in the efficiency of Prayer, (in the sense of *asking*,) there are things ~~†~~ which we wish for so much that we should be all day & night upon ~~my~~ our knees till ~~†~~ we obtained them. But ~~† never~~ ~~any one~~ how many do we ever see on their knees in England? except twice a day, when they say what is called a "form of Prayer" - what a good word - a *form* of prayer. ~~Now~~ The German mystics ~~† can understand~~ are quite different - they ~~† illeg†~~ really kneel down in the middle of what they are saying & go on, ~~almost~~ in the same voice, "Now, dear ~~Jesus~~ Lord, give me" so & so. They believe in prayer & they act upon their belief. But we say we believe & we don't. We care so little about it that we don't even note what the effect is

{ff128x & 129 are fragments, both glued on the same manuscript page.
f128x is an insert for the previous f. f129 doesn't seem to fit here at
all. VR}

f128x

P.9 -

1, 2. Religions ~~instruction must be given~~
partly of assertions considered ~~by the teacher~~

f129

[2]

to be proved, partly of subjects for farther
consideration among mankind. Much is to be
learnt from the Bible, & probably from all
books which have been accepted by large
portions of mankind as inspired; but Man's
capabilities of observation, thought & feeling
exercised on the Universe, past, present
& to come are the source of religious knowledge.

But how may we ever hope to
accomplish the existence of such a race?

Let us look at your foundations for hope.
~~You have principles to go upon:- which you~~
~~have convinced yourself are sound.~~

I. Religion is discoverable to man thro'
the exercise of his nature

II. Life ought to be the manifestation
of the religion so discovered

III. It is possible to man to make life
the manifestation of religion.

which follows our prayers. We don't look to see whether it comes or not. The Prussian mystics believe that prayer has a distinct objective effect, that it influences an extreme will to do something for them which is beyond their control. & they act accordingly. We are not quite sure whether it does or not - but we think it as well to try & take the chance. ~~But~~ We have not, however, sufficient belief in it even to watch whether the effect follows.

{Written in left margin:

What is belief in prayer? **{end}**

~~J.A. But how do you know that — what would you call having a belief in it?~~

~~—M.S. A clergyman once asked me to tell him a certain fact, which I only could know, on the plea that, without such information, he would not know which of two things to pray for. Here was a distinct practical belief. He believed that, if he gave God certain information & asked for one set of things, a certain definite effect would follow, different from what would follow if he informed God of something else. This is real belief, logically pursued to its practical consequences. But this we rarely find in England.~~

~~J.A. [illeg] you disbelieve~~
This will be allowed, viz. that belief in the objective effects of prayer in its changing something in the will of God, is certainly less often found than it was. But belief in its subjective influence, in its changing something, in our own wills, this ~~surely you &~~

f131r

[11]

{written in left margin:}

Is there
a "reflex"
action in
prayer? **{end}**

~~every body must entertain.~~
it will be said, still exists.

~~M.S.~~ If we are in prayer, we are already observing the laws of God, we are already *one with* Him. But to send a drunkard or a profligate to prayer would probably be to send him back to vice. He would be disgusted with employment for which he was so little in tune, which had no relish for him.

~~J.A. Then you disbelieve altogether in the power of Prayer.~~

{written in left margin:}

What is
the "power
of Prayer"? **{end}**

~~M.S.~~ I gave up praying, in the sense of *asking*, from experience & not from theory. When I was young, I could not understand what people meant by "their thoughts wandering in prayer". I asked for what I really wished & really wished for what I asked. And my thoughts wandered no more than those of a mother would wander who was ~~asking~~ supplicating her Sovereign for her son's reprieve from execution. The Litany was not long enough for me. I wished for all those things & many more. & tried to cram in as many requests as I could, before the *spell* at the evil came, in the form of St. Chrysostom's prayer. I liked the Morning Service much better than the Afternoon, because we asked for more things. In private prayer, I wrote down what I asked for, specified the time by which I prayed that it might come, continued in prayer for it & looked

f132r

[12]

to see whether it came.

{written in left margin:}

Does God
ever grant
a definite
request
directly? **{end}**

—J.A. ~~And did it not?~~

—M.S. ~~No, it did not.~~ It never did. I have by me now
papers upon papers "~~by the 7th to the~~" by
the 7th of July I pray that I may be "so & so -
When the 7th of July came, I looked & I was
not.

Never?

—M.S.

{written in left margin:}

Is prayer
ever
answered? **{end}**

Sometimes indeed I was - but then I knew
very well how it ~~came~~ was - & that it would have
been just the same if I had not asked. I
could not bamboozle my own consciousness
& say, as in the case of a sick man, If I had
not prayed, this Laudanum would not have
given me sleep - or my Doctor would not
have thought of it. or else, This sleep is the
effect of my prayer & would have been,
whether I had taken the Laudanum or not.

I always prayed for something definite,
specifying the how, the when & the where
of my want. People generally take refuge
in the indefiniteness of their prayers,
(so that they cannot say whether they have
been answered or not/ from the disap-
pointments of finding out that God has not
heard them.

I was always miserable, if I ~~were~~ was not at
church when the Litany was said. How ill-
natured it is, if you believe in prayer,
not to ask for every body what they want.
If the burning of the "Amazon" had taken

f133r {page is cut off an inch from the left hand margin.}
Written in left margin:

jumping over as

place, & I had not prayed at the Litany before, with all my heart, for "all that travel by land or by water", I should have felt bitter remorse & believed that their blood was upon my head in proportion to my share among the prayer-sayers in England. I well remember when an uncle died, the care I took, on behalf of my Aunt & cousins, to be always present in spirit at the petition for "the fatherless children & widows" - & when Confalonière was in the Austrian prisons at Spielberg, at that for "prisoners & captives". My conscience pricked me a little whether this should extend to those who were in prison for murder & debt. but I supposed that I might pray for them spiritually. I could not pray for George IV. I thought the people very good who prayed for him & wondered whether he ~~would~~ could have been much worse if he had not been prayed for. William IV I prayed for a little. But when Victoria came to the throne, I prayed for her in a rapture of feeling & ~~felt myself guilty if~~ my thoughts never wandered.

In short, I believed what ~~was taught me~~ I believed about prayer. & I should have thought it as disrespectful to God not to wait for the answer as if I had been a servant, which I truly believed myself, sent on a message.

f135r

[14]

I thought it rather absurd to pray every night, "Give us this *day* our daily bread," but I supposed that people were not attending to what they said & that they meant, Give us *tomorrow* our daily bread.

Once a friend of mine, who died of Scarlet Fever, shewed an intense anxiety to live thro' the Sunday, in order to be prayed for in church. She died immediately after the Service.

It did strike me as odd, sometimes, that we should pray to be delivered "from plague, pestilence & famine," when I knew that all the common sewers ran into the Thames, that fevers haunted undrained land & that the districts which Cholera would visit could be pointed out. I thought that Cholera came for us to remove these causes, not for us to pray that God would remove the Cholera.

At last, not from reasoning, but from facts, not from thinking what was likely to be, but from observing whether prayer was answered & finding it was not, it occurred to me that this was not God's plan, that His scheme for us was not that He should give us what we asked for, but that Mankind should obtain it for Mankind. that we were not paupers asking at a Poor Law Board for relief, but men working for themselves & their fellow creatures.

f136r

[14a]

And, if you observe, it always comes as a surprise when a prayer *is* answered. We record it in little books. We print "Encouragements to Prayer." "Extraordinary answers to Prayer." A man prays for "three & sixpence" over night, & it comes by the post the next morning. Straightaway it makes its appearance, ~~as~~ being *extraordinary*, in "Illustrations of Faith" or some such like book. But is it not rather extraordinary, if there are so many millions praying twice a day all thro' their lives, & if that *is* the way in which God imparts His gifts, that there should be so few of these instances, instead of so many?

{written in left margin:}

Prayer or
 communion,
 accordance
 with God,
 our chief
 support. **{end}**

~~J.A.~~ And are we to It will be said, we are to have no prayer? Are we to lose our chief support & comfort in this painful world?

~~M.S.~~ Oh! Never, never let me us be understood to mean that there is no communion with the One Perfect. Is there nothing but asking? Can it be that Man has nothing to say to the Perfect Spirit of Love, in whose presence he is always dwelling - to the Spirit of Power, of Wisdom, in whom is his trust, in the struggles which convulse his life, - to whom he refers the bliss of existence to which he feels himself destined. Man is capable of love, admiration, gratitude, reverence sympathy with Right & Truth & Goodness - shall he not feel these towards the only Being who can give them full exercise?

{written in left margin:}

How are we
 to speak
 to God, if
 not in
 asking
 prayer? **{end}**

~~J.A.~~ But How are we to speak to Him, if we are not to pray? it will be asked.

~~M.S.~~ We cannot dogmatize on this highest intercourse. There can be no "form of prayer" which will be the voice from all hearts. Yet, (to man in his true state,) to have intercourse with God, to be at one with Him, to feel devoted to His purpose is the highest happiness that Man can enjoy, is essential to give reality to every other interest. Unless we know what we are working for & Whom we are working with, we shall work with no zest or zeal. To be without God in the world leaves every joy without brightness, to be with Him makes every sorrow in some sense bliss.

But what is the intercourse we have now with God? Prayer, in its present sense, is to give utterance, at stated times, to a form of flattery & to selfish or unwise requests. It is, as in the Litany, to say to God, Don't go this way, don't go that way, till we have marked out the whole line which He ought to go. And interdicted to Him the ~~excise~~ fulfilling of almost every law which He has made.

What ought to be our intercourse with God? It is not well with any man who does not desire such intercourse. What it is to be in private each enlightened man's nature must tell him. What it is to be in public, could we but learn each other's hearts & discover? that, when that solemn period of an eternal existence, called a Day, begins, we might meet with our own fellow-creatures in order to be sent forth to it with all that is within us of Divine roused to activity - by words of truth addressed to the reason, - by music from the human voice expressing the wish to go forth with right purpose, with love & gladness to God's appointed work - by sympathy with our brothers & sisters in this preparation for it - by true emotion resolved into true work. and that, when evening comes, we might again meet to thank God & hail our fellow-workers before we slept.

~~J.A.—But~~ We want, it is said, the direct personal communication with God & Christ - that † we may ask

{written in left margin:}

If we ask
we want
an answer

the cry **{end}**

& hear them answer. ~~Oh!~~ Do not take from ~~me~~ us
~~my~~ our saviour, the Christ who died upon the Cross
for ~~me~~ us.

~~M.S.~~ And does not God do much more than
die upon the Cross for us? Is he not, in every one
of us, going through sin & suffering, "descending
into Hell" with us? Does he not suffer, not
once for us, but every day in us? And can you
want any thing more than communion with
the Perfect & Eternal Father?

{written in left margin:}

We want
communion
with a
Divine

brother **{end}**

~~J.A.~~ I want, it is said, communion with Christ, my
Divine brother, who feels for me.

~~M.S.~~ And you will have it with the Son, the
Divine in man, with many Christs, who
suffers for all mankind.

{written in left margin:}

Does God
want
"intercession"
from the

Son? **{end}**

~~J.A.~~ But ~~I shall not have~~ we want a Son "to make
intercession for ~~me~~ us".

~~M.S.~~ Do you suppose that Christ is ever "making
intercession" for us? It is true he "ever liveth," to
work for us, - but to "intercede" for us? He had
better not exist at all than be employed in this way -
the one in persuading, the other in being persuaded.

{written in left margin:}

How can
man
receive
an answer
from the

Eternal? **{end}**

~~J.A.~~ But ~~if~~ we want an answer. ~~Your~~ It is no comfort to say that God may hear me, but He does not speak to me. Man wants an answer.

~~M.S.~~ Can he received it from the Eternal when he cannot comprehend what Eternity is, from the Infinite & Perfect when Infinity & Perfection are beyond his understanding? Were God to speak

f140r

[18]

to him, could he hear? Were God to tell him his plans, could he comprehend them?

{written in left margin:}

Do we ever hear God speak? **{end}**

~~J.A.~~ And am I never to hear Him speak?

~~M.S.~~ Yes, But God will does not refuse to answer the longing, devoted spirit, which says, Speak, Lord, for they loving child heareth. He hears as the Father, he answers as the Son & as the Holy Spirit. I could not understand God if He were to speak to me. But my Holy Ghost tells me what I am to do. I am conscious of a voice that I can hear telling me more truth & good than I *am*. As I rise to *be* more truly & more rightly, this voice is ever beyond & above me, calling to more & more good.

{written in left margin:}

If prayer is not asking what is it? **{end}**

~~J.A.~~ But ~~if~~ you have to invent what it says & that is very laborious.

~~M.S.~~ If you have still I believe that ~~we do not, yet know whether we have or not. We see that~~ each man has his Holy Ghost - that is, the best part of himself inspired by God. But whether it is I who speak, or whether it is God speaking to me, I do not know - I call upon my fellow creatures to ~~ascertain~~ study this subject. That Prayer, as *asking*, will entirely cease, I think we are certain. If we give up *asking, confessing* our sins & formal *praising*, will I t be said, what remains to be expressed to God? ~~Oh!~~ Surely, infinite are the sympathies, infinite the thoughts & feelings of Man towards the Perfect Spirit with whom he deserves to be one.

Add Mss 45838, microfilm

notes, ff141-, pen

f141

-21--19-

If, though I
have much
to say to God,
He has nothing
to say to me,
what does
it profit
me?

~~J.A. Yes, but that is not enough for me,
I may have many things to say to Him. But
if He has nothing to say to me, what does it
profit me?~~

M.S. The perfect exists in three relations
to other existence.

1. As ~~willing~~ the Creator of all other
modes of existence, **its purpose, & the means of**

fulfilling

its purpose. This is the

Father

2. As partaken in these other modes
of existence - This is the Son.

3. As manifested to these other modes
of existence. This is the Holy Ghost.

What is the

~~J.A. But What reason, **it will be asked, is there**
have~~

~~have you~~

for a

ground for
this belief?

belief so fanciful? ~~You have laid aside
the "It is written," & have no right to speak
of a Trinity, the belief which comes to us from Holy~~

Writ.

M.S. Grant a perfect Being, as inferred
from what is, what has been & what may
thence be deduced is to come - & it follows
that, if the two former of these relations
be denied, the Perfection we have asserted
is denied.

The Being would not be perfectly benevolent
who, being omnipotent, did not will other
modes of existence, with the purpose of
producing happiness. The being would not be
perfectly wise, who did not will the means
to exist for fulfilling His purpose -

constitutes

Neither would the Being be perfect, who
did not cause others to partake in that which
well being.

{in another hand: *Pebody*}

We find that that which constitutes well=being of the highest kind is the exercise of Goodness, Wisdom, Power, those attributes which we have ascribed to God as existing in perfection in Him. These being the essentials of the highest mode of well being, God would not be perfect unless he ~~partook them illeg~~/caused other beings to partake in them.

To say that God is perfect is to say that He exists in those two relations, which relations have perhaps been felt when He has been spoken of as the Father & the Son.

The third relation seems to consist in our consciousness of the existence of these attributes, in the communication of which, if we seek it, these attributes hold with us - ask of perfect wisdom - you will have an answer above & beyond yourself - Speak articulately or inarticulately to perfect Goodness & Love - Such existence hears you, answers you - through the exercise of your own nature, it is true, but it is not your own nature which answers you but a Higher - It is not the mere fact of using words which brings this answer - Many, many are the words spoken to this Holy Spirit which receive no response - Time has already disclosed conditions which, if kept, allow a communication between the Holy Spirit of God & the Holy

Spirit in Man - It used to be thought that God spoke occasionally to individuals, ~~men~~, with no other condition than that it was his arbitrary will so ~~to~~ occasionally to speak that He called Man out of his sleep with no reference to a

particular

state in Man, the consequence of which would be always communication of the Divine in Man with the Divine in God -

Holmes

But experience shews that there are times when Man may ask this communication, but cannot have it, because the conditions for ~~it~~ having it have not been kept. He has strayed after false Gods - But let him have patience to find out & to keep these conditions and Wisdom & Love & Goodness, which he will feel above his own, will dwell with him - he may interpret their words -

Where is the proof?

~~J.A. But again I say, where is the proof of all this?~~

~~M.S. I believe it~~ Evidence for this may be found in

experience - Do not you believe, from always, as it were in a state of reference to that higher being? that, as the world's ways improve, far as we are from it now, man's intercourse with man ~~would~~/will be regulated so as to help this intercourse, to keep it unbroken, whereas now it is almost impossible not to break it as soon as man is with his kind?

Newton

Deep souls who wanted it fled to wildernesses,
to monasteries - as always happens, others
who did not comprehend them, imitated
them - & fleeing from the world became
a fashion -

What is

J.A. ~~I do not quite understand~~ although it is hard to
understand what

it

means - Since ~~the~~ the world is what we have to
mould - ~~is it not?~~ not to fly from -

Insert

(1) (2)

The Methodists, again, ~~on the contrary,~~ have
tried for ~~such~~ intercourse with God by exciting
discourse, by imparting their "experiences,"
& have sometimes mistaken the workings
of men's excited nerves for the still small
voice of God.

(illeg Lombin?)

Would that our intercourse with each
other could be such that, to be together
were a means of being more, not less, in
the *conscious* presence of God! Would
that we felt that awful, though lovely,
presence, so as not, (while we profess to
be especially seeking it) to be repeating
words without feeling, to be telling lies with
such indifference that we are not conscious
of them - I passed the church yesterday
morning, which was Sunday, on my way
to visit a sick ~~friend~~/person - The people were
all in church saying that they had
done every thing that was wrong & nothing

in urging man to isolate himself with God & devote himself exclusively to his Creator - whereas man's natural inclination, implanted in him by God, urges him to devote himself to his fellow-man, urges all mankind mutually to unite in benevolent ties - But those who say this do not see that the first motive for mankind to unite is devotion to God -that devotion to God is the spring of love to man - makes it necessary - is the same thing. One with God, one with man.

The Novel - what a false idea it is it brings two people through no end of troubles, to make them at last - what? - exclusive for one another caring alone for one another - 'wrapped up,' as it is called, in each other - an abyss of binary selfishness - (2)

f146

-25- -26-

{illeg **Tomkin?**} that was right & that they meant to do entirely different in future - As I came back, they were just going into church again to say the same thing - It was to be hoped for the sake of their sincerity that they had ~~illeg~~/done something wrong, between this & then otherwise they would be telling a lie. But how dare we say this? We said it last Sunday - have we led an entirely different life since then? And what expectation have we that we shall do so next week? what prospect have we? have we taken any means? have we any hopes?

{illeg **Dyce?**} We say that we wish to conform ourselves to the pattern of Christ. The Roman Catholics, some of them, do act - something after his pattern They go about doing good.

They

beg

about without shoes. But what do we do? The most of what we do is to confess every Sunday that we are not like it.

There have been ~~deep~~ & holy souls who, in silence, like the Quakers, - in excitement, like the Wesleyan, in form like the Church of England=man - have sought & found His presence, but the imitators of such often find it not there. They go to church or to chapel because it is a "duty," & feel no want in not having seen God there - They did not expect His presence - & they are not disappointed

at not

f147

finding Him ~~there~~, because they did not expect He would be there -

X.

Cleft ~~XXI~~ *Practical Deductions*

I. ~~"Portia, I don't think/~~Never perhaps has there ~~ever~~ been ~~was~~ less

religion

in the world than at this moment - except ~~perhaps~~ when Christ came into the world. Then ~~I suppose/~~probably there was scarcely any religion. The Jewish had become a mere form - There had not been a prophet for 300 years - The Greek religion no educated man believed in. Aeschylus & Socrates & Plato were dead - And Plato was, ~~I suppose/~~indeed, the last of *their* "prophets" - So that it was more than 300 years since the Greeks had had any true religion. The Romans had none - The Egyptian was long since extinct. Where Christ & his apostles went, therefore, there appears to have been hardly any religion left -

And, ~~do you know? I think that state is~~ **not this** the case again now? ~~I doubt whether /Was there ever was a time when there was so little~~ There is so little religion now that we do not even feel the want of it. ~~I am sure w/~~We want a Saviour now as much as they did then.

~~Yesterday~~ This morning I read to my dear ~~Aunt/~~Grandmother, the Psalms for the Day as usual. I sang "unto the Lord a new song," I sang "praises unto his name." "For why?" as the Psalmist very properly asks - ~~And why do you think?/~~indeed - Because the Lord had ~~set Jacob for himself,~~ killed all the young Egyptians, ~~the/~~both human beings & ~~the~~ animals - because he had favoured the Israelites & damned every one else. ~~Just the same as/~~ So do we think now - viz that He "hath set apart" the English for himself ~~now,~~ & favoured them.

f148v

63a

x) Suppose that we had done with steam, as we have done with morals, that is, ~~said~~/asserted that, "every thing has been discovered, nothing more is to be done, you ~~must~~/have only **to** believe"- should we have had any rail roads, any steam boats, any manufactures? Yet within the last thirty years, almost everything has been discovered -~~You say I said,~~ We may indeed say, ~~if illeg I say~~ what will be thought of us,

200 years

hence?

~~But 200 years hence there may be less of religion than there is now - It does not at all follow that a nation will certainly improve I illeg consider -But W/what England will think of herself 200 years hence depends upon whether there arise Saviours/deliverers or not. A nation does not always necessarily improve - Two hundred years hence one /It sometimes thinks England must-/comes to an end. There seems/We may indeed say illeg/ There has perhaps to have been been less of religion than there is~~

now

But two hundred years hence, there may be *less* - The Roman Empire, when there ceased to be religion, ceased to be. May not England too? A large number of us ~~We~~ believe in nothing. or by a caricature, a painter makes himself a Roman Catholic, in order that he may believe, & be able to be an Artist.

What our most religious men, the working men, seem to be doing now is renouncing religious error, not announcing religious truth - They seem not to be seeking after ~~some~~ light, but giving up ~~some~~ darkness.

If Religion is lost, ~~I believe,~~ what ~~will~~/is to become of England? ~~I don't know~~ - unless ~~o~~/One comes to raise up another religion.

to the achievement of every other nation - And really that such things should be "sung & said" by educated men in every church in England "throughout the year"! Two hundred years hence, what will be thought of us? ~~you may~~ That we ought to have been in a Lunatic Asylum - But the people in the Lunatic Asylums are more sensible - ~~Really I don't think it so/~~Is it as extra-ordinary that a man should think himself a teapot as that ~~he/we~~ should think God like ~~that/~~this? Like what a small & half savage tribe thought Him three thousand years ago? x Insert opposite page x 63a It is not ~~I used not don't think me~~ "profane," ~~Portia,~~ ~~I used not to like~~ to say these things. ~~But now~~ ~~I feel like those who thought think it, I believe.~~ By some it is thought a

kind

of tribute & homage paid to God to laugh at Bacchus & Jupiter & the Gods of antiquity, & to wonder "how people could believe such things & ~~to think they are paying Him a~~ ~~compliment when they do so.~~ ~~For a long time, I~~ Such could not bear to laugh at anything connected with our worship & with our God. ~~It made me feel/~~To do so makes th/seems

to

them to be blaspheming like Voltaire ~~-I thought I was blaspheming~~ But ~~now my/~~the Perfect God is so unlike that of the Protestants & Roman Catholics, He is such an entirely different Being that ~~I/we~~ too may almost feel as if ~~I/we~~ were doing Him good service when ~~I/we~~ laugh at "their other Gods." At all events, there is such an absolute separation between ~~the two/~~them, we are such an opposition of natures that ~~I feel I am/~~we are no more laughing at Him, - ~~Him,~~ the Infinite Wisdom, the Perfect Love - than when ~~I/we~~ speak of Jupiter & Juno, or the Egyptian cats.

~~You say/ask, Portia, don't I believe in the Bible?~~ There are three ways of reading the Bible - There is, first, "I dare not doubt a word ~~which~~ Christ says to be absolutely

true & inspired ~~Oh!~~ /Do not prove to me that it is not so, for if you do, I have lost my Christ" ~~Take not the smallest jot or tittle away from me/it, for else, I shall lose/be without my Christ.~~

And yet there are things which nobody does really believe - Suppose I were to say, "Consider the ~~Riber~~/Laurel of the garden - how it grows - it toils not, neither does it spin - Do you do like the ~~Riber~~/Laurel, & you will have food & clothing too." ~~Oh!~~, ~~p~~/People ~~say~~/answer, Christ did not mean that, he meant something else - Yet such is the vagueness of ~~people~~/men that this is preached one day in the seven, & the other six days the Board of Guardians preaches something quite different - The people look & see & they see that the Guardians are right & that Christ was wrong. And some are frightened & say, "I don't want your Christ." These are two alternatives, equally unsatisfactory. But if ~~you~~/we put in juxta=position with this, "The kingdom of heaven is within" or some other of the truly divine things which Christ has said, & ~~you~~/we feel that, after all, ~~that~~ there was no one like him, none who knew so much truth as he did, none who lived as he lived - then ~~you~~/we are neither hardened nor frightened, ~~you~~/we do not lose the truth, & ~~you~~/we have not to lie to ~~yourself~~/ourselves about the untruth, ~~you~~/we can truly say, Never man spake as he did.

~~I am so glad that I~~/Many who do not believe Christ miraculously inspired

do not ~~feel myself~~ getting/become hardened about him -~~I~~/they love him more than ever ~~I~~/they did = ~~I~~/They admire his life & character

f150v

65a

x Is not ~~that~~/this "idolatry"? Idolatry is worshipping something which is not, which has no existence, ~~is it not?~~ w/Whether that something ~~is~~/be a calf or an untrue idea, ~~it is~~/is it not the same? ~~thing, is it not?~~ ~~Those/The poor people, I believe,~~/at that Methodist Meeting ~~which we went to together,~~ ~~had~~/have been nearer in feeling to God for having been to that Meeting - But again I ask myself, nearer to whom? ~~do you think it is~~ to God? The being they fancy is surely not God And if it is not God, they are "idolaters" - just as much as those who worship a cat. ~~Those who go to church are not worshipping God, I am sure the Being whom you find at church is not God & therefore they are idolaters,~~ But ~~I do believe that~~ they have been nearer to some good Being, whether it is Christ who came to save them *from* God - or whoever it is. ~~they have been nearer to Him.~~

~~ten times~~ more than those do who think him God.

But many men who never read the Bible because their common sense resists such things as, "Take nothing for your journey, neither scrip, nor staff, neither bread nor money - nor even two coats" & "shake off the dust against ~~tho~~ any who do not receive you" - things which belong to the times of the Essene Communities, but not to these, & which do not even sound perfectly just & good, ~~even~~ belonging to *those* times, - men who cannot bear to read these things will yet be shocked at not thinking Christ divine - Divine? ~~±~~/we too think him divine, as all men are divine - but ~~He~~ not the *only* Divine One - ~~but, a~~, As he said himself, Those are Gods,, or the sons of God, to whom the word of God comes.

~~Oh! Portia, p~~/People preach Sermons, not because they have anything to say, but because there is a Sermon to be preached - They sit down to write it on Saturday nights, not because the spirit ~~moves~~/stirs them to say something which they ~~will~~/*must* preach ~~in~~/to ~~a Service~~/to all who will hear - but because custom compels them to preach a Sermon for which they must ~~say~~/make something to say -

~~But s~~/Some ~~people inde~~/it is true, find God in church, ~~you~~ say. Yes, but *whom* do they find there? Not ~~Infinite~~ the Spirit of Goodness & Wisdom, but a being whose *merit* it is that he does not wish to kill what he has made &c! x

Insert x (opposite Page) 65a

~~but yet It does seem to me so curious that we should go to church to tell God all that/Surely it is curious that we should come~~

to God

Him every morning &/to say to Him - ~~You are/~~ that He is so good, ~~you are~~ so merciful, ~~you are~~ so compassionate - ~~Can you fancy a child doing that,~~ If a child were to do so every morning to ~~you,~~ should you/its mother, would she not say, 'My dear child, don't bother'? And if ~~it/she/it~~ were to go on saying, 'Oh! mother, do be kind to ~~William/brother,~~ do be kind to ~~John/sister,~~ do be kind to ~~Eliza,~~ baby, ~~should you/would~~ she not say, 'My dear child, don't be impertinent'

~~Do you think it would make any difference at all in the parish, if the Church & the Vicar were to disappear altogether, swept away by the Deluge?~~

XXII

~~"You ask me, Fulgentia, if I think that/Would then the sudden sweeping away of the Parish Church would make any/no difference in the parish? - Yes, I do/it would - There is something in thinking it a duty to go to church - It is something/better to think that there is any-duty to be performed, even if the thing performed is not really a duty. If you were to believe that you ought to go out every morning, wet or dry, hot or cold, regularly at 5 o'clock whatever the weather/difficulty be/were & make a bow to that gate, it is better than to think that there is nothing you ought to do - So those people are in a more religious spirit who think that they have performed a duty when they have been to church. which is no duty, than if they thought think that they have no duty to perform. It is better for them to think that they~~

have something they ought to do, even if it is nothing, than to think there is nothing to be done.

~~XX~~.III

x What is ~~this~~/the craving after sympathy which we feel, ~~Portia, is it~~/but the craving after God?

~~"Yes, I believe it is. Because a/A~~ part cannot apprehend the whole. How can we receive God? How can we receive the sympathy of the All, or understand it, if it were given us? We must receive it from parts like ourselves, from the fragments of God, who are our fellow=creatures. The craving for sympathy which there exists between two, who are to form one indivisible & perfect whole is in most cases between man & woman, in some between man & God. This the Roman Catholics have understood & expressed under the simile, Christ the bridegroom, the nun married to him - & the monk married to the Church, or, as St. Francis, to Poverty, or, as St. Ignatius of Loyola, to the Divine Mistress of his

thoughts,

~~as St. Ignatius~~, the Virgin - This sort of tie between man & God seems alone able to fill the want of the other, the permanent exclusive tie between the one man & the one woman -

~~"But how~~/It seems unnatural that one man should be more interesting than God & ~~Humankind~~/Mankind

"It is unnatural, & the most selfish of all ties, if the tie is to be as Milton has put it, "He, thy God, thou mine" - if they are to serve & divinify one another, - then one can quite conceive the Mahometan profligacy, which says that a man must have many women, in order to sympathize with different part of his nature - But if the

f153v

P.68a

(a) Here again comes in that fatal mistake about the Will! A boy, William

happy in some occupation, for which he has a Vocation, that is, ~~for~~/to which God calls him. If it is right for the convenience of parents, or for the conventionally ~~more~~ ~~proper/right/code~~

is good &

that he

should adopt some other occupation, parents seldom hesitate to say, "this is not the thing for you - go & be good & happy in the law or the Church or at College"- & they would not doubt but that it was in his power, &, if he is amiable & feeling, he will probably try to say it - but ~~I do not believe that~~ to be it is not in his power - & this is just the practical mistake which shews the want of ~~truth~~/a true conception about the Will. It is taken for granted

that there is this uncomprehended something, called Will, which what we call William can command, what we call Will will obey, without our understanding what Man is, what the man William is, what the Will is, & thus, ~~I believe really~~, among well-intentioned people, half the mischief in life arises. Oh! What a dangerous immoral doctrine, people ~~will~~ say, ~~than~~/that we are in the hands of circumstances - No, we are ~~only~~ in the hands of God.

two come together to serve Mankind & second God more perfectly together than they could do separately, ~~making up~~ supplying each the deficiencies in the other's nature, so as to make up one perfect whole, being one with another in order to be one with God, then it is a true & glorious tie, & we can understand why it must be always one, permanent, exclusive & indivisible, in order to fulfill its purpose." -

XXIV

~~"The great discovery, I think I have made, Portia is that w/We can't/cannot be good in all circumstances. God does not intend it. And this, instead of making us do nothing, is the greatest spur we can have to exertion. I think If God does not intend us to be good/right under such & such circumstances, we must alter them -~~

It is very seldom, ~~you/it will say/be said~~ that we can alter them for ourselves - Mankind must alter them for us - But we shall not lie down & say, 'God did not intend me to be good now, I must be bad,' but, 'what circumstances can I bring forward to make me good'?

God is ~~so very~~/always *definite* - an evil is always an evil & a good ~~is~~ a good - It is not by thinking that we can be good under *all* circumstances that we neutralize the evil of any evil of any particular circumstance - the effect of which must always be the same & no other, but

by bringing forward ~~others~~ circumstances which ~~can make us good~~/will have a good effect - which again will always be the

same, perfectly defined & invariable - It is like Dalton's discovery in Chemistry that there are precise quantities in every atom - So there ~~are precise~~ quantities are precise ~~of/in~~ the effect of every circumstance & are never any other -

To think that we can be good under *any* circumstances is like thinking that we may be healthy when we are ~~taking poison~~/*living* over a sewer - If a person has to go to an unhealthy climate, he does not say, 'I can be well, if I choose, under any climate' - but

(B) The clerk who said, "you may pray for rain, but its no use while the wind is in that quarter" - spoke according to experience & observation' - In the same way, you/we may pray for self=forgetfulness, but "it's/is no use," "while you/the ~~are living a life~~ /wind is blowing in the quarter of luxury & idleness

~~are living a life~~ - You/We may pray
 for humility, but "it's no use," while ~~you have nothing~~
 there is no wind of sufficient strength to blow Your
 thoughts away from ~~yourself./ourselves.~~

How ~~often we/I~~/many have struggled against a sin of vanity
 & prayed & prayed & gone through years of self=morti-
 fication & self=inflicted tortures & wondered why God
 was so far off, & whether "his arm was shortened that
 he could not save", & ~~whether~~ why he was so deaf that
 he would not hear, & been brought to the very ~~limit~~/verge
 of despair, "the sorrows of death compassed me & the
 pains of hell gat hold upon me," whereas, if ~~I~~/they had
 lived a life which had afforded ~~me~~/them one interest so
 strong as to make ~~me~~/them forget ~~myself~~/themselves, "my soul would

he takes means as far as he can to arrange other healthy circumstances - If the heat is intense, he takes care to have exercise in the early morning - If the dews are ~~noxious~~ hurtful, he takes care not to be out ~~after~~/just at sunset. For there may be circumstances under which it is right for a man to go to an unhealthy climate - So there may be circumstances under which a man cannot be good & yet which he cannot, at present, rightly alter. In that case it is not by saying, 'I can be good, if I only will, under any circumstances' that he will maintain himself so, but by supplying, as much as in him lies, circumstances which will make him so. (Insert a P 68 a)

~~The other~~/"I can be good, if I will" is the road to despair. For a person says, 'I will be good, when I go back to ~~those~~/such & such circumstances - I ~~will~~/resolve to be good - I know I can; if I will.' He "wearies heaven with prayer" -He fails & fails. He thinks the fault lies in his will - And he sinks lower & lower till he gives ~~it~~/himself up at last (Insert Pages 69a 69b)

~~You say~~/It is asked, *what* circumstances make us good? These are different for different idiosyncrasies - just as different climates suit different people.

But "I like it -why don't you?" is the ~~remark~~/tacit feeling of every one - as if *he* were the last of a healthy state.

~~You say~~/It is said that 'grace is the gift of God,' that ~~you~~/we ~~can't~~/cannot calculate ~~whether~~, if the same circumstances do recur, that they will produce the same effect -

If ~~you tell me~~/this means that, with the same circumstances & the organization in the same state, ~~I am~~/we are not to expect the same mood or state of mind, that that mood is dependent -not on laws, "with which is no variableness neither shadow of turning"-, but on an arbitrary

f155v

69b ~~have been delivered from death", & I should/they would have forgotten my/their own puny reputation from the mere force of another interest -~~

In the same way, with pride. The desire to be something, to do something, is implanted in us - Every body ought to command & ~~to obey~~ - No one's faculties are fully called out till they do command - There is nothing, so invigorating, so inspiring, so regenerating. Every body ought to obey - How delightful it is to obey some one who really knows what he is about - & can teach you - ~~how~~ to learn, when one really feels that one is learning something. But ~~I can't remember that any one ever taught me anything~~ - Let children speak & say how much they have learnt from their masters & their lessons - *Every body ought* then to command & to obey - And then we should hear no mine of pride & thinking much of oneself - For pride is the perversion of that desire of action which would then have found its proper exercise -

state in the mind of another, which I/we cannot calculate upon, nor foresee, & over which I/we can have no control, - that I/we can only expect ~~that~~/this mood as a free gift - ~~it seems to me~~ /is it not just the same as if you ~~were to~~

tell

~~me~~/saying that, if I go today through Whitehall as I did yesterday, there is no reason to expect that I shall find the Admiralty ~~there~~ where ~~I did~~/it was yesterday. God ~~But~~ does not leave our highest moods at the mercy of chance, so that we cannot reproduce or calculate upon them -

But the same state of mind never does recur, ~~you say~~/it is said.

No, because exactly the same circumstances never do recur. But if they did, it would. The whole state of the Universe at this moment is the consequence of the whole state of the Universe ~~the~~ at any past moment - both as regards its spiritual & its physical Laws. ~~You do not believe that~~ God does not wills, 'on Monday it shall rain, on Tuesday the wind shall be East' or 'The Spring of 1852 shall have three months' drought' by an ~~single~~ arbitrary ~~volition~~/decree - ~~but that~~ the drought of 1852 is the consequence of His Meteorological & other laws which have ruled since ~~the beginning~~/eternity, not as in those noble words, "As it was in the beginning, is now, & ever shall be, world without end" - ~~only I would say~~/but, As it was ~~without~~ the beginning - is now & ever shall be -

And we, if we knew all these laws which have been without beginning, could have prophesied that, in 1852, there would be three months of East wind. So, ~~you don't believe that~~ God ~~says~~/does not will on Monday A shall be in a "state of grace," on Tuesday B shall be in a "state of grace" - It would not be

(a)

~~I used to~~/Many think, ~~Portia~~, what is the good of my theories, my principles, since they cannot keep me ~~good~~/right except in certain circumstances? But ~~now I see~~, they are to point out ~~to me~~ that only certain circumstances are those in which man can be good ~~in~~. The knowledge of science will enable man to breathe in gas which God has made destructive to human life, or to live permanently under water. But science reveals the safety lamp to warn him of his danger, the means of taking respirable air with him in a Diving=~~bell~~. And so morally, man may have safety lamps, & contrive for himself air to prevent suffocation for a time in unfavourable circumstances. But let us not blame a principle for not making us well & contented to abide, as, in truth, it is not well that we should abide. Insert (1) (2)

The other road leads to despair, as we have often said. ~~We do not~~/There is no cause for wonder that people came to saying, 'I can do nothing of myself, Christ must do it for me' - they found they could not control that uncomprehended something, called Will - they said, 'I cannot will what is right' - they did not say, 'I must discover the laws which cause me to will right, bring about the circumstances which produce in me a right will'. They said, 'Christ must will for me. I cannot save myself. Christ must do it.'

God, in truth, must do it. Union with His laws, which we have to discover, is what we have to look to -

~~Oh!~~ If one could but help people to learn by experience! what they have to become & what their means are - what life is, what the nature of God is & the destination of man -

(1)

The impression of a past fruitful time, the gain of it is ingrained & digested into one & benefits the present - but the sentiment of interest & enjoyment which one has had is as being reminded, when one is thirsting, of a pure spring enjoyed on a past day. However, there seems this good in the food of the higher part of the nature that it nourishes for all the future, whereas the best of bread nourishes but for an appointed short season. Yet ~~I doubt what I have said as soon as said;~~
~~I think~~ it often happens that one who has ~~relished~~/the capacity for high

things sinks,

perhaps, more when deprived of them, when sent into a land of famine, than one who is not used to good food.

~~I rather think that t/The Diving=Bell simile is the "dodge" for me. that I/ an exact one. We must not attempt to live on the past, or the present, as presented to me/us by x circumstances (without 'special interference' for a purpose by me/ourselves). I believe/17.1.zz I/We must each day try purposely to collect what good air I/we can, & put it into the Diving Bell, in which I/we go under the stifling & oppressive waters of life, as it is now, to fish up ----- what pearls ~~can I/we can find.?~~ Perhaps some ~~experience~~/say - I would, with all my heart, seek those pearls - but not in these muddy waters where I can find so few - My brethren of mankind (unconsciously to them= selves) have forced me into these waters, or rather I accepted this Fishery, thinking it of high promise - But my brethren of the past arranged the means & inducements of Life as it is - May Saviours come to reveal the higher means of inducements, ever existing in God's Laws, to a higher life! In trust that so it will be, I will~~

f157v

(2)

try not to sink in these waters, but to preserve
Life for a blessed day of working with God, a
day in which I may learn how so to work - a
day in which I may see those whom I love attracted
so to work also -

Now, when ~~you~~/we read Dalton's discovery that
all is be weight & measure, that the proportion
in which bodies combine follow a numerical law
as, for instance, carbon expressed by 6 unites
with oxygen expressed by 8 & forms carbonic
oxide, - it will ~~then~~/otherwise unite only with oxygen
expressed by 16 & forms carbonic acid &c &c.
when ~~you~~/we discover such & similar laws, does it
not seem ~~to you~~ that there must be a Spirit of
Wisdom? God is so accurate, so definite - He
knows exactly how long we shall go on in a given
way, just as He knows how much of the oxygen
will combine with carbon, hydrogen &c.

Omnipotence, Benevolence & Wisdom which *could* will in this way - Our wisdom is relative, because dependent upon external circumstances, which we cannot, at present, prophesy-

~~Thursday~~/to=morrow I will water the garden, because ~~I don't~~ we say, ~~on~~ we do not know

if it will rain - but ours is an ignorant will - an ignorant wisdom, at best. ((a) Insert Pl 71 a)

~~The clerk who said, You may pray for rain, but it's no use, while the wind is in that quarter.~~

XX V.

Brooks

~~I don't know, Fulgentia, why you don't try to propagate your/These doctrines - I believe they are, after all, what the greater part of educated men believe - Why don't you try conversation, if you want to do good? It was always said that Sir James Mackintosh did more good by his conversation than by anything."~~

~~I would not go, Portia, to/But educated men because they consider it/them as a matter of curiosity - as an amusement to be derived from a subject of speculation in their Libraries. They don't/do not mean to do anything different for it/them to alter anything by reason of such opinions - Opinions/Religious opinions are to them a pure matter of curiosity & speculation - They do not even care about them enough to teach them to their own children - On the contrary, they rather wish their wives & children to belong to the existing religion - they think it a good thing that their families should go to church - they would like their wives to be "in society", their daughters to marry well, their sons to get on in the world, all of which objects would be rather hindered by their being "heretics," because the husbands of the daughters, again, will like their wives to go to church, & the sons will not be able to go into for/become Bishops or for/to do Profession/any thing which requires the signing of the Thirty=nine Articles. The~~

f158v

72a

father would rather, therefore, that the children were not of his opinions - so he says nothing about them He may, perhaps, write a liberal Review, or a philosophic book, but further than this, he would not go on any account - If he has such opinions, therefore, he always keeps them to himself & a few select old friends. "It would distress my wife." "You cannot trust women with such opinions" - "It would make a Revolution" - "England is the country of compromise" &c.

If Christ had said, "But suppose we should shake the Pharisees! - ~~Only~~ Think if we were to put down the Sanhedrin!" - we might have been Jews & Gentiles still - If he had said, "we had better not shake a stone in the edifice, for fear the whole should totter", we might still be sacrificing in the Temple of Jehovah or in that of Jupiter, for the world never seems to make much progress, except by Saviours -

But, when one thinks that clever educated men go year after year to church to listen - or not to listen - to such stories as those of ~~Balaam~~/Adam and Ahab, & to say such things as that "~~He~~/God does not desire the death of a sinner," there really seems to be not much difference between those who are in & those who are out of a Lunatic Asylum.

What is going to church? ~~You~~/We say, first of all, that ~~you~~/we have done everything wrong & that ~~you~~/we mean to do something entirely different, but it is very clear ~~you~~/we do not, or ~~you would~~/we should not intend, absolutely intend to come back & say the same thing next Sunday, putting a premium upon saying what ~~you~~/we do not mean. ~~You~~/We say the Lord's Prayer two or three times. ~~You~~/We then (very impertinently pray) for a few people, whom ~~you~~/we think

f159

God will ~~won't~~ not take care of unless ~~you~~ we remind Him. But do ~~you suppose~~ the best people, who say the Prayer for the King, really believe that George IV will do ~~the~~ better next week because they have said that prayer? Saying our prayers "what an expression it is! how much it means! She is "saying her prayers" reciting a form-When an ardent brother or sister is imploring a parent to pardon an erring brother, should we say, "Oh! he is *saying a prayer* at the moment to ~~ask~~ my father to forgive my poor brother?" You will say "Oh! then you do allow that In human relations, if intercessory prayer is used ~~can be indeed necessary~~

~~I thought you did not"~~ Yes but the parent. cannot be a good parent to whom such prayer is necessary. If he would do it for this ~~the sake illeg that~~ for the sake of the intercessor he ought to have done it before for the sake of the right ~~and only~~. Think what those ~~are saying~~ imply who make Intercessory Prayer viz. that God is not a good parent, not perfectly wise & ~~good~~ or benevolent.

After this we desire God not to do a great many things which we know He will do- ~~not~~ to do a great many ways which we know He will not - go & having told Him all He is to do, we listen to those beautiful solemn words, ~~about~~ "The peace of God which passeth all understanding," which now have come to mean nothing, & we go away, after a Sermon to which hardly anyone has listened.

Yet the Church would last forever, if it were made up of such men as the Bishop of ~~Sodor & Man~~ Bath & Wells the Dean of Hereford & the late Bishop Stanley of Norwich, men who do immense good by their own strong good sense & benevolent feeling who don't examine whether that which the Church says *is* the thing to say to

f159v

73a

God ~~which the Church says & make superstition/who~~
"lovely & of good report" ~~Just as/~~ So a very
"amiable" family is a positive evil - an "amiable
family" generally meaning one without any strong
idiosyncrasies or character of any kind - & tending
therefore to perpetuate a slavery by making it
tolerable -

What varying lives & characters ~~have~~ pass
~~passed~~/in the course of 50 years before ~~me~~ of late/many of us! †
 often

~~fear lest~~

o/One impression ~~should be~~/becomes thereby weakened by
 another.

A conception of variety in Unity & a
 realization of it in life will cause all true
 impressions, however various, to strengthen
 each other. The child lives through variety
 without any unity, & many a man is a
 child, but a thread of unity ought to run
 through each varying phase of life - Without
 this there can be no strength, - for it is the
 reference to the *One* perfect purpose, the
 confidence in the realization of it, which
 gives strength. Without this, there can be
 no *connection*, as life passes with its constant
 variety - &, without connection, there can be
 no consistency. There is nothing to be
consistent with - But, while ever striving
 after keeping up one uniform thought, feeling,
 purpose, it is well to yield with a
 certain elasticity to varieties in life -

The man, it is often said, who could
 thus carry one thought, feeling, purpose,
 through all possible varieties of human life,
 would be righteous in all circumstances -
 circumstances would not affect him -

~~I think t~~/This is a misapprehension of the divine course of human duty & destination - Circumstances, (in accordance with the divine thought) are to regulate & modify human being. Man has capability to learn *how* circumstances regulate & modify human nature - to learn what circumstances develop & exercise human nature aright. By the united efforts of Mankind, in accordance with God's ever present, ever efficient law, to bring about such circumstances is man's work - The capability for this is man's power.

But do we not see, it will be said, the truly great & good become the greater & the better in adverse circumstances?

It is most important, it is ~~most~~/indeed essential to discern what are adverse circumstances - In the first place, adverse to *what* do we mean? - Those circumstances are really adverse to man, which impede in him the development & the exercise of the divine nature ~~in him~~ - It is said, "such a man is in good circumstances," "is in easy circumstances" - When we hear this, we know that it conventionally means;- such a man has an abundance of money - "He has ample means" signifies that he has an ample supply of money. But, whether the possession of money is equivalent to "good" circumstances, or "easy" circumstances, opens ~~we know~~, upon other questions, general & individual

It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven, says the wisest & best of our instructors. Curious how many hear his read as indisputable authority, yet habitually speak of riches as "easy circumstances". How little must ~~be thought~~/we think of what ~~is heard~~/we hear & ~~accepted~~ as truth! *or of what is said*/we say.

But there are those who are rich *within*, whether, externally they are rich or poor - Riches or poverty do not inevitably stand for favourable or unfavourable circumstances, as regards the development & - exercise of the Divine in Man. What circumstances will develop it, what will strengthen it, what will afford it satisfaction - this is the problem for the united efforts of man to solve, these are the circumstances for the united efforts of man to strive to effect - But no considerable portion of mankind have, as yet, had this problem distinctly before them & there is little union in trying to discover it or to realize it in life or work.

To "get money" or to use it as other people who have as much money usually do, this occupies much of human life, employs much of human effort - ~~there is, in many~~ - a/some bestow their *surplus* of time & thought ~~bestowed~~ on divine objects & purposes - But there is not the *Unity*

which should make the whole of the object of the whole of Mankind a search after the divine. - This object would, no doubt, remain, in part work for money. ~~Deferentially let us say that~~ money *may* facilitate the entrance into the "kingdom of heaven" Whether it will or not depends upon whether it becomes a means to exercise a righteous nature -

But, ~~do you hold is it impossible,~~ it will be ~~said/asked, for/will to/never~~ attain a state, in which it ~~would/will be impossible~~ for circumstances to stifle the divine light in him?

If ~~not, it would/such~~ a state can be attained, it will be through the

attainment

of wisdom by which to change unfavourable into favourable circumstances. ~~Illeg/Upon~~ an actively good & strong nature unfavourable circumstances tell with more intensity than upon feebler ones - ~~increasing the evil in them but then/the~~ activity of the nature increases

evil in the circumstances. But the good & strong have more power to modify or to change ~~them/the~~ circumstances. It is not passive endurance, * but such change or modification which helps the good through evil circumstances -

Note * Arguelles, alone, in the dark, in prison, felt himself in danger of going mad. A feebler spirit, a less living soul would have been in less danger. But he modified the circumstances. He did not attempt passively to endure them - with the end of a cigar, he wrote on his prison walls such passages from books as he could recollect. When light was brought with his food, he read them, & thus he kept himself sane for better days.

{illeg} (The following paragraph has diagonal lines drawn through it)
 Philosophy, Botany, Chemistry, Natural History,
 by reading Mrs. Somerville &c., to instruct
 the young in schools under their influence & with
their own children, & to direct their own
 households, I did not see what ~~else~~ there
 was to find fault with in the system of
 society - but that now women of the educated
 classes knew nothing beyond a little music
 & French ? nothing but a kind of literature
 which they had better not know.

XXIX VII

~~Dear father, now I~~/Is it possible for people now
 to "think seriously" of any thing? Think of the
 importance of a day! ~~The~~ Roman Catholicism ~~says,~~/teaches
 that in the Mass the great sacrifice of Jesus Christ
 is renewed every day - & every day He is solemnly enshrined
 on earth - so, when morning breaks, that
 solemn portion of eternity called a day, is every
 day renewed. But ~~do we/does~~ what are called the "upper classes" begin
 it
again in that
 spirit, preparing ~~ourselves~~ for our work, keeping

f164v

(a) Should we not, by some time of communion with
 God (the manner to be arranged as *Mankind* shall
 hereafter appoint,) ~~should it not~~ try to rise each morning to a point
 of
view
 whence we may see & feel the day before us as truly
 as possible, may estimate its importance, whether it
 is to be past in doing or suffering - Thus may we
 hope to be in the spirit best to do that small work
~~that~~/which awaits us, to prepare for that larger & higher work
 whenever it comes, which, as ~~we~~ believe in the Spirit
 of Perfection, so ~~we~~ must believe is in His purpose for all
 which ~~we~~ therefore may be prophesied, undoubtingly, however
 distant ~~for me~~ the time, will come - To try, then,
 now for the Spirit in which to meet the small
 things before us, to wait for the larger ones surely
 expected, must be our 'matins.' May this day be
 passed in such union with Him that we may
 draw out such nourishment as may be found,
 may gather in, in any way possible, for a future
 day!

up the spirit to the frame necessary for that solemn day's work? We get up & hurry down= stairs - ~~to breakfast - saying a prayer~~ saying our prayer first by our bedsides (at least some do - some do not) - we then come down to breakfast, & talk of this thing & that thing & a thousand other things, till our minds are all dribbled away. Are our minds then pitched to the tune necessary to begin our work? But it is ten to one that we don't ~~it~~ begin it ~~then~~ ?- we sit about ~~in~~/for a few hours longer reading the paper, writing a letter, talking to our friends, paying a visit, doing a little bit of accounts, reading a light book, till we are all broken up for the day into little fragments - ((a) opposite page)

But, ~~I~~ Instead of winding up the watch for its work, beginning the day with a solemn dedication to God in some way, ~~breakfasting by ourselves in our own rooms,~~ & taking every means to fit ourselves for our work we seem to take every means to unfit ourselves -

~~I feel~~/There is as great a difference between ~~the time/when~~ ~~I~~/people who

have

been sitting all the morning; as young ladies usually sit in the drawing room with friends - & ~~when I~~/those who have been at real work on things suitable to ~~me~~/them - as ~~I do~~/there is between ~~the times when I~~/people

who have been shut

up for 10 or 11 hours in a close room ~~or~~ carriage without food, & ~~when I~~/those who I have had ~~my~~/their walk/exercise & my usual meals - ~~just as great as~~ difference - Yet nobody seems to notice this - Every body is aware of the ~~other~~/latter, but ~~I believe~~ very few are aware of this. ~~They don't notice it./~~of the former. And till this is noticed, ~~I don't see that~~ parents will make ~~any~~ difference. If a parent were to

say, No, you must not eat your dinner, or you must take no exercise, because I cannot spare you, you must stay & read to me & only eat at odd times - the whole world would be amazed at the selfishness of such a parent - Yet the moral starvation, which parents inflict, is just as great - But this is not noticed - neither by parent nor child - And it *is* better for a girl to do what her parents tell her than for her to be doing the same thing by herself - For there *may* be some exercise of her social nature, her affectionate nature in the first case, instead of no exercise at all of any part of her nature - But if a man were to do it, if a man devotes himself to sitting with his mother, to driving out with her, entertaining her company for her, how the world does laugh! They say, he is only too good; he has but one fault, & that is that he is ~~too~~/so *goody* - And this, even if he is not obliged by necessity to be earning his own bread by a profession. What is the difference between a man & a woman? The first difference is that it is laid down as a thing taken for granted that a woman's time is of no consequence - A man belongs to the world & to God - a woman to her parents till she belongs to her husband - They dictate what the use of her time & her faculties is to be - how her days are to be spent - she may draw at one hour & play at another, if she likes it, but farther, no margin.

In ~~our~~/what is called the "higher class" it is all laid down what we are to think - there is no exercise of the nature. People are said to lose their reason when they become

insane, but they may lose their reason just as much by never exercising that part of their nature - & there are quite as many, who have lost their reason, *out of as in* a Lunatic Asylum.

~~xxx~~/VIII

What a choice it is, ~~dear father,~~ before a woman! It is notorious how few are her acquaintances among men - a few out of the few are likely to give her the opportunity of marriage - & how slight it is the acquaintance which she has with *them*! If then, among these few, to those who like *her*, she says, 'I know you so little that I cannot make up my mind to marry you,' she will not be a very singular exception - ~~That mothers are extremely anxious~~/The anxiety of mothers to marry their daughters is a current joke - When ~~their~~ daughters are grown up, ~~the poor~~ mothers do not know what to do with them, they are aware that the daughters have not what is called a "sphere" at home, ~~that they~~ are not satisfied & ~~they~~/the mothers think therefore naturally enough a great deal about ~~their~~/the marriage of their daughters, perhaps hardly consciously to themselves - Therefore the usual talk about children staying at home to take care of their parents means nothing as this desire among mothers is universal.

Now, if the daughter does not marry, what is her alternative? She is penniless - unless in exceptional cases, where she may have had some thing left her. She must remain at home, ~~you say~~/it is said, to take care of her parents. ~~I think I~~/It is the hardest slavery - either to take the chance of a man whom she knows *so little*, or to vegetate at home, her life consumed by ennui as by cancer.

What does she take to? In the absence of other spheres of action, she very often takes to *governessing* her parents, ~~so that I have heard two fathers say, they did not like to sit next their daughters at dinner~~. Where she is fond of her home this is generally the case - An active spirit doing nothing must find something to do - & ~~that~~/this is the nearest thing at hand - ~~So that I am sure the parents as often wish to get rid of the daughter as to keep her~~. People who have nothing to do generally take to playing the policeman over their ~~for~~/relations - If she is too gentle or too indolent for this kind of action, *ennui* consumes her life.

~~To be sure w/~~We do the best we can to train our women to an idle superficial life - we teach them music & drawing, languages & *poor peopling*, - "resources" as they are called, & ~~then~~ we hope that, if they don't marry, they will at least be quiet."

XXXIX

{in another hand illeg}

~~The next time I saw my daughter, I could not help saying to her,~~

"Portia,, you will/It will be said that this doctrine sets the father

against the son

& the mother against the daughter & there will be five in one house divided, three against two & two against three."

~~"Yes, father, she said,"~~ If ~~¶~~/we were to lock them all up together in the same room, certainly there would be nothing but their tails left - But ~~that~~/this is just what ~~¶~~/we want not to do - ~~¶~~/We want to send them forth."

"But the *poor* children often don't want to be sent forth" ~~I think.~~ "they have nothing which they want to do - they are like canary=birds which you *might* let go & they *would* come back again.

~~"Yes & I~~/We don't want to force them out. But, if they are not canary birds & want to go, ~~I/we~~ would let them go/out. ~~Oh! yes,~~ If they are quite satisfied, let them stay by all means. But, in general, they are not satisfied at home, & yet have nothing they want to do abroad.

~~"But, my dear child, just let me ask you one question.~~ Do your children owe you/their parents no duty? no love or gratitude for all that you/they/these have done for illeg/them?"

"Certainly they do. But what is duty? Not to sacrifice but to improve your/their life. ~~for them/us.~~ Love & gratitude? Certainly. But ~~I/they~~ can't be grateful to people for making a slaves of me/them. ~~I acknow~~ They acknowledge our/the kind intentions of parents with all their hearts - They are grateful to us in two ways, for what we/parents have done which is kind, & for what we/they intended to do which was kind - But gratitude is a sense of kindness, ~~is it not?~~ And they can't love & be grateful to people for enslaving & injuring them.

"But is there to be no forbearance, no respect, no mutual self-denial? ~~You seem to think/suppose that~~ Is every member of a family is to think only of improving, or what you call developing himself, without any regard to the duty of yielding to one another's desire or even caprices?

~~"I think t/~~There should always be a whole in our dealing with every body. ~~I mean,~~ that is, we should always see the whole of our intercourse & or a type of it before us. If, for instance, I were to see before me the whole of my intercourse with

~~Mary,~~/my child or friend, not ~~who~~ merely what I should like to
 give her today, I should not let her go on inter=
 rupting me every half hour - there would be no
 type in that - but I should settle with myself
 what amount of time & forbearance I ought to
 give her - I should not sit today two hours after
 dinner listening to her, thinking, ~~Oh! just t/~~Today
 it would not be kind to go away - but I should
 consider *her* whole life & *my* whole life - & the
 type of each - & how much we ought to give to
 one another - And I should not allow these
 things to be determined by accident - by moment=
 ary impulse, vibrating, like a pendulum, between
 resentment & remorse, resentment at having
 so much exacted from one, remorse at not giving
 so much as is expected of one - A woman who
 accomplished one of the greatest works, which has
 ever been accomplished either by man or woman,
~~told me/~~mentioned that she had had the plan of it three
 years in her head, before she did anything -
 Why? because she had no type of what her
 intercourse should be with her own family - nor
 had they - & she allowed them to monopolize
 all her time, - the time for doing the thing to
 which God had called her, - & thought it was
 ill=natured to go away after breakfast or after
 dinner - ~~whereas s/~~Some day ~~they/~~such a family will say to her
~~Oh!~~ "how could you? You saw, & we did not see,
 & you let us? How could you ~~let/~~suffer us to do it? An
~~Aunt/~~friend of mine had a crooked finger, because
 when she was a child, she would not let ~~them/~~her nurse
 take off the rag when it was hurt, to dress it &

~~they let her. Now she says~~/the nurse allowed it: might she not say,
 "I was

not know; ~~& they~~/how could the nurse let me do it?" How could
~~they/she~~

a child & did

indeed? x {illeg}

~~her/the family will one day say to my friend/the~~ And
~~you mean to say that i~~ /Is it better/well to go on without
 a type, leaving it to the accident of the moment to
 decide? thus is frittered away our life - When I
 think of the lives I see around me, squandered by
 the fancies of children who know not what they do,
 I see so strongly the danger of having no type.
 For, if you were to ask people seriously, 'Do you
 intend your life to be spent in this way?' they
 would say, 'Oh! no, it is only for today - it would be
 thought unkind not to give way today.'

~~I think t~~/The audacity of people in forming an
 opinion & not only forming but urging one is curious - merely
 "because it is my opinion" - ~~where I should be a~~
~~month thinking & writing & making up my mind.~~

'It is because they have no type before them -
 When they give unhesitatingly their opinion that
 such & such should be done, A go to college, for
 instance, it is because they are thinking, "what
 will people say? B will say what a bad thing
 that he should not go!" not because they have any
 clear type in their minds of what A will be when
 he leaves college."

XX

"God makes the family," ~~Portia, you say,~~ So it is often said. ~~I believe~~/Perhaps it is just the contrary! God makes attractions - & the principle of the family is *not* to go by attractions. There may be one tyrant in the family, & the tyrant may go by attraction - but the others ~~don't~~/do not. In an amiable family, the common course of things is for every one to give up just enough to prevent such a ~~noise~~/"row" as would make it ~~quite~~ intolerable."

"But is it not ~~very~~ good for the character to give up its own way? does not God intend all our peculiarities to be softened, our selfishness subdued in ~~that~~/this way? ~~said Columba, my youngest daughter.~~/is often asked.

~~Well,~~ ~~t~~/The question is a very simple one. Are we intended to go by attraction or by repulsion? Are we to put on a strait waistcoat? Good people make themselves resigned to a family - They do not kick nor struggle - & unquestionably ~~that~~/this is much better than mere impatience of it - But it is as if we were to say, There are plenty of things in that room for me to do, plenty of people whom I could help & whom I could work with but, it is good for me to deny myself; I will put on a strait waistcoat - & I will be resigned to it. I will sit quiet & not complain nor resist.

"Then, is there no truth at all in the universal opinion of good & earnest Christians that it is right for us to practise self-denial & forbearance, to give up our own way, & have our sharp corners rubbed off by a little contradiction?" will be said. ~~Columba.~~

"It is good for us to walk about & exercise all the muscles ~~that~~/which are in our body. But to

graze our elbows, ~~produce an abrasion on~~ and our shins, rub the skin of our knuckles, - ~~I don't see~~ how can that ever be anything but an evil? God always does what He likes, & ~~I believe~~ He means that we should do what we like - "For joy that a man is born into the world," Christ says - And that *is* a subject of joy - But a woman must be born into the *family* - If she were born into the *world*, it would be joy too - But what joy is there in her being born into the smallest of all possible spheres, which will exercise perhaps no single one of her faculties?

~~"Well,, I think you are right, Fulgentia,"~~ said Portia, "though Every one will say ~~you are~~/this is preaching the most subversive of ~~all~~ doctrines - subversive of all morality. But ~~I agree in this~~ what right have an old man & woman to absorb all the powers of four or five daughters? The right is all the other way. If I have brought them into the world, ~~they~~ have the right ~~a right~~ to expect that their powers shall be exercised, their lives made worth having, opportunity given them for developing all their faculties - I brought them into the world without consulting them - they had no choice in it - & I ought to have thought of this, whether I was able to give them all this, before I did so - 'The mother that bore you' is often mentioned as such a subject of gratitude - as if life were such a boon that the mere ~~gift of it~~ circumstance of *my* having given *you* life entails slavery upon you. But whether it is a boon or not depends upon whether ~~we~~/parents can make it so for ~~them~~/children. "Bore you" to what? To take

care of me? By the beautiful arrangement of Providence that the good of one shall tend to the good of all & vice versa, that one cannot be injured without injuring the whole, the parents are injured as well as the children by this absorbing of their services.

And ~~nobody likes their/~~none like their own family. ~~That/~~This is the

most

curious part. ~~You r/~~Rarely find has any one ~~who has~~ any attraction to ~~their/~~his own family. ~~Just -/~~Look round among all the families you know - & see whether you know one where they do not think there is something very peculiar in them - "We do not go on well, but" - "I should not like it to be mentioned, but" - "there is something ~~so~~ 'very peculiar' about that child" - "Such an unusual reserve" or, "I know there is a 'peculiar' deficiency in myself." ~~Tell me if/~~Do you know one family where the mother has what ~~you would/may~~ truly be called a beautiful relation to the daughter? ~~if you know~~ one which you would call a very happy family, except the "Happy Family" in the cage, which travels about? "If I had but children like So & so," we have constantly said in private - "but mine are so "very peculiar."

~~"Yes, I do really begin to think you are right -~~
 "Robbed & murdered," we read in the newspapers -
 The crime is horrible - But there are people being robbed & murdered continually before our eyes & no man sees it - "Robbed" of all their time - if robbing means taking away that which do not wish to part with - slowly "murdered" by their families - There is scarcely any one who cannot, in ~~their/~~his own experience, remember some instance where some amiable person has been slowly put to death ~~in/at~~ home - ~~aye too at an estimable & virtuous home - With~~

With regard to time, however, ~~now I think of it, I don't~~/it is often

said

~~see~~ that, if people made the most of their odd moments, they would have ~~so~~/not much to complain of - ~~But~~ that they waste their spare quarters=~~of~~=~~an~~=hour so grievously"

"The maxim of doing things at "odd moments" ~~I never can~~/is a most ~~understand~~/dangerous one. Would not a painter spoil his picture by working at it "at odd moments"? ~~I don't know, I am no artist - But I should think, I~~/If it is/be a picture worth painting at all, & if he be a man of genius, he must have the whole of his picture in his head every time he touches it, & ~~that~~/this requires great concentration, & ~~that~~/this concentration cannot be obtained at "odd moments," & if he works without it, ~~that concentration~~, he will spoil his work. Can you fancy Michael Angelo running up & putting on a touch to his Sistine ceiling at "odd moments"? ~~I should think, i~~ /If he did, he would have to take it out again - But the beauty of fresco is that ~~that~~/this cannot be done - & that is ~~the~~ one reason probably why great masters preferred fresco, & said that oils were only fit "for children & dogs" - The very gist of fresco painting is that it should be all painted in at once from one master-idea - not niggled & dawdled at."

~~But t~~/The Chancellor Oxenstierna is ~~always~~ recorded, - ~~in all little good books & odd corners of Moral newspapers -~~ to have written a folio volume during the ten minutes his wife kept him waiting for dinner every day." ~~said Columba.~~

{illeg Mergou?} ~~I would have been a very bad book then.~~ "I am sure ~~I~~/It was not worth his writing them, not our reading - Every thing that ~~I have~~ has ever been done at "odd times" had better ~~not~~/never have been done - even a letter, written in a "spare quarter-of-an-hour" had better not have been written. Can you believe that *any* work, requiring thought, can be done at "odd times"? You may perhaps write down at those times what has been carefully thought out in the watches of the night - yet hardly even that, to do any good."

"Then are we to do nothing with our odd times? are we to ~~spare~~ waste the spare moments, which make up the greater portion of a woman's life? If you are to do *anything* you must do it then," is again said.

~~It is/sounds to me, w/~~When people give ~~that~~/this advice, it sounds as if they said, "Don't take any regular meals - But be very careful of your spare moments for eating. Be always ready to run into the kitchen & snatch a slice of bread & butter at odd times - But never sit down to your dinner, you can't, you know" - We know what *can* be done at odd times - a little worsted=work, acquiring a language, copying something, putting the room to rights - mending a hole in your glove. What else is there? ~~I am thinking?~~ I ~~really~~ don't know - Nothing requiring original thought - Nothing, it is evident, which required a form, a completeness, a beginning & an end, ~~which is not merely copying~~, a whole, which cannot be left off "at any time" without injury to it - which is not "mere copying," in short.

When ~~a composer writes~~/Beethoven wrote a bar, he must have had the phrase, the movement, the quick time, which ~~is~~/was to succeed, the slow movement which came before, the whole piece, in short,

in his thought - And ~~so you think~~ could he write a bar now, a bar then? ~~when he had~~/at an "odd moment"? This is what we call being a "dilettante", ~~is it not~~, when a man does works in that way & most of the works of Dilettanti had better not have been - Women are almost always Dilettanti, - & have women ever produced any original work, any, with a very few exceptions, which the world would not be as well without?

~~"But what are all those~~/Many indeed are the stories ~~which we read~~/told of great men mastering a whole science in their spare moments.?"

" There are, no doubt, some minds which can work & some employments which can be taken up at odd times - where it is *acquiring* which is to be done -

But if there is no digesting done, or if there is no time for digesting afterwards, the acquiring perhaps is not of much benefit. Or ~~the~~ a mind may become so possessed with a subject that it can work at it at all moments - but then the moments cease to be "odd". The greatest geniuses, which cannot & ought not to work without seeing the whole of its subject before its eyes, - the most important ~~employments~~/subjects of thought which require this - these cannot be referred to "odd moments". People get out of the difficulty by not having any subjects of thought which require to be ~~illeg~~/pursued at other than "odd times" -

~~"But I don't see how it can ever be otherwise -~~

~~You must make the best of it~~ How, in a family, where the one has to wait for the other, - where, if they have any amiability, the employments of every one must give way to each other, - where some time must be given up to the mechanism of ~~society~~/domestic life - or social intercourse could not go on at all, - how can members of a family, excepting those who have professions, ever have anything but "spare moments"? ~~said Columba.~~

"How indeed? You constantly hear it said, ~~Mary~~/so & so has given up all her music since she married, or her drawing,- what a pity,- such a first-rate artist as she was!" ~~but a~~/A married woman cannot follow up anything which requires exercise - & if, even for such second-rate things as these, people cannot command the time necessary, how will they do for subjects of *thought*? - And ~~w~~/we are slower still to apprehend that we must not rob you of the state of mind *with* which to think than of than of the time *in* which to think - If visitors come in, the lady of the house often complains that she will not have time to ~~write her letters~~/do this or that, she does not complain that she will not be in a state of mind when they go, to do it, if it is ~~really~~/something important & requires thought. She settles *that* by not having anything important to think about ~~"~~

~~"Ah! Fulgentia, you can think, I cannot.~~ Half the people in the world have indeed no power of thinking - "What does it matter to give me time for that which I cannot do?" ~~said Portia~~ is often said.

~~My dear Portia, people often say that You are/~~ These people are the reverse of the man who was asked if he played the German flute - & ~~he~~ said 'he did not know, he dared

say he could, ~~if he~~/he had never tried' - ~~But you~~ /These people say, "half the world cannot think," & it is because they have never tried. How is it possible? People get up in the morning & come down to breakfast, can they think then? After that, they read the newspapers or write letters, or sit in a room reading a book, where every body is reading bits out of their own book aloud, or talking, till luncheon - Then they ride or drive - then they read a book or write letters till dinner - Then they spend the evening together till bed=time. This is interspersed, for women, with housekeeping, & visiting the poor people - for men, with House of Commons, managing their estates, the Bench & the Board - Now, how are you to think? when are you to think? Not sitting with your feet on the fender - that is only dreaming - ~~I don't believe any one, but/Few except Descartes, can think/ever thought without a pen in their hands - You can't possibly tell whether you can think, for you have never tried - I dare say you have often said to Mary,~~/Mothers often say to daughters, "Now, my dear, all

the people

are gone, you have all the afternoon to yourself, you can go up & be comfortable in your own room" - But is she in a state to think? Is she not frittered away into little bits? If she has breakfasted in a ~~room~~/crowd, if she has been standing about for 2 o 3 hours after=wards, not knowing whether she might go away or not, how is her mind in any condition to think after that time? Sir Walter Scott even did not ~~even~~ write his Novels in that way" -

"But we are not all Sir Walter Scotts nor Michael Angelos nor Beethovens - On the contrary, such geniuses only come once in a thousand years"--

f178v

(a) ~~My mother~~/A friend of mine & Michael Angelo both had a turn for architecture - Michael Angelo studied it - ~~My mother~~/friend never did - All she did was pure genius - To compare her with Michael Angelo, of course, does not come into ~~my~~/our head for a moment - How could she be compared indeed? The one had no possibility given her; the other had -

f179

{in another hand: Mac} ~~—57—~~

How do we know that? I am often struck by the richness & power of organization at 17 or 18 & how they go off afterwards. I am oftener surprised by the power than by the poverty of young characters. In ~~our own family we had~~/most families, you see, one ~~who had~~/with a first

rate

dramatic talent, another with a genius for Music, a third with one equally remarkable for the pencil, a fourth who ~~wrote/writes like Coleridge a poet~~/Coleridge, yet we know perfectly well that these will be neither Michael Angelos, nor Beethovens, nor Mrs. Siddons's nor Miltons - Why? (Insert a) opposite page (56a) But people never think

of this - they think nothing of being in a *state of mind* to think a great thought, to do a great work. They will fritter away all their power, & then think they have enough to do anything *they* want to do with it - They will let others play with them all the morning & then think, 'I shall have the afternoon to myself' You may do your accounts, or you may play with the children, or you may read an idle book, but do anything important which requires thought, you cannot. And therefore the best way is to give up all subjects of thought & that is what people do -

~~"But I do not quite agree - I don't think/Many say there is that/not the absolute want of steady application in a family which you talk of/here mentioned. Because there is "Reading Aloud,"~~

for

~~instance - there is almost always that going on."~~

~~"Reading aloud, But don't you feel when you are being read to, as if a pailful of water were being poured down your throat, which, but that it comes up again just as it goes down, would suffocate you? But v/Very few swallow it at all; it runs down on both sides the baby's mouth, &~~

f179v

57a

(a) I remember hearing Lord Jeffrey say, only the year before his death, that he could not bear to be read to - He always read to himself, at eighty years of age -

fewer still digest it - Many people like to reading aloud - But how many can bear ~~can~~ being read to without going to sleep? Yet every body can't be reading aloud."

~~— Oh no! I assure you, there is nothing very many like so much as the/having some one to read to them" said Columba.~~

~~— Yes because we/Women like something to tickle our/their ears & save us/them the trouble of thinking, - while we/they have our needlework in our/their hands - We/They like to be spared the ennui of doing nothing without the labour of doing something."~~

~~"No, indeed, there are many minds in a state of real activity which like to be read to . I always thought it a great want in myself that I did not like it, a want of the power of attention." said Portia.~~

~~"Perhaps the difference is between receptive & reflective people-- Those who have a great power of receiving impressions, a ready perception, thus like being/to be read to, but a reflective person does not because there is no time given nor opportunity given for reflection - And therefore he ceases to attend. (Insert (a) opposite page)~~

But

In a family, the common practice is for one to read aloud & for the others, of course, to listen or - not to listen - What does it signify, then, whether I am there or not? Generally, I am not there, tho' my body is. For the others would be very ~~angr~~ much vexed, of course, & think it very unsocial, if my body were not, ~~there~~, even though if it is/be asleep - ~~"But I should say, if you want to see me asleep, you may come & look at me in bed."~~

~~— "Oh! I can't do that - A family is a strait waistcoat One person can do nothing after 8 o'clock. P.M. but goes to sleep - Another can do nothing before~~

But both unfortunates ~~persons~~ are obliged to be present in the body at whatever is going on, altho' they are not really there - ~~I think~~ we shall think it so comical/curious looking back, in a future state, to see that we have condemned people to do nothing & called it a duty, a self-denial, a social virtue" -

~~"I do think, t/~~This, perhaps, may be one reason why grown-up people ~~never/seldom~~ improve - We ought to improve, of course, every year, as long as we are capable of gaining any experience - & the more experience, the more improvement - Young people, during the time of their education, do improve - ~~You hear mothers say, 'Mary is so improved'~~ - But ~~does an/~~it is set down for granted that old people are not to improve - does any one ever say, 'Do you think Aunt Eliza/Mrs. _____ is improved since last year?' Nobody ever thinks of such a thing - unless, indeed,

~~"Sometimes -~~When there is exercise of some faculty. For instance, ~~you see in the newspapers,~~it is said "Pauline Viardot is much improved since last season - she shows marks of careful study" - & that, after she has arrived at mature age - or "George Sand's style & ideas have undergone a complete regeneration since she began writing." or "Sir Robert Peel's powers as an orator are sensibly greater than last Session" - Raphael, it is well known, ~~entirely~~ changed his manner, - & most of all but the pre=Raphaelites, would say for the better - Schiller ~~unf~~ made the most tangible progress so that Gæthe said of him, 'if you met him after the lapse of a week, you did not know him again' - ~~Don't you think/~~Is it not evident,

{in another hand: Guppy}
 then, if exercise goes on in mature age, as it does in childhood, that progress will be made in the same way? nay, probably even faster, as the vantage=ground of experience becomes greater - But people have no *type* before them - neither nations nor individuals - We say ~~so~~ vaguely that "times improve" - whereas sometimes it is evident that they do *not* improve, as in the Roman Empire, as in Spain, where they have degenerated - In England it is always taken for granted that ~~they make~~/we are making progress - Then comes ~~com~~ some Statistician & says there is more crime, more disease, more ~~disease~~/madness than formerly - Macaulay says the contrary & shews that food is cheaper, that the "condition of the working classes" is more comfortable, education & literature more diffused &c. No one seems to know ~~what~~/which is the case. Both these statements may be true - & are not inconsistent -

~~I do not see~~ How can nations ~~can~~ improve, however if they have no *type* before them? -

~~"I don't think you have any right/It is perhaps incorrect to say they~~

have no *type* - England has the *type* of making money. In commerce, in trade, in many manufactures, in rail=roads, in mercantile speculations, she is far beyond all the rest of the world -

And, which is truly having a *type*, ~~(illeg)~~/she seems to make money for
 making

money's sake - A Cabinet Minister, of the highest moral worth, subscribes to Hudson's testimonial, &/when Hudson, ~~even after he has lost his reputation/character~~ † ~~was very/quite anxious that he should not/without losing all his money, in order to see whether he would/was still be "received" He was.~~ A man leaves A relation/man ~~of mine~~ left nine or ten thousand a year to a boy of nine years old whom he knew nothing of, to his only sister with whom he had lived in the

most affectionate intercourse all his life, a small annuity, (& ~~this/that~~ was prompted by his attorney) to his niece nothing - for the sake of keeping a large fortune together after his death, which he had spent his life in amassing. Lately, a most distinguish- ed & respectable man leaves his whole enormous fortune to a young nobleman, known to him & all the world as a profligate, & deeply in debt, so that the fortune was tied up till these debts were paid - while he left to some of his best friends, - nothing - Such things as these, ~~I should think,~~ could perhaps happen only in England, where money, for its own sake & not for that which money procures, seems to be valuable - ~~And therefore, I think,~~ England has a type"

~~"And what type has France?" asked Columba.~~

~~I don't know France well enough - But is it not a~~ type of beauty, of Art in every thing that concerns the eye & the ear - ~~"You hear that the~~/some women it is said furnish their apartments to suit their complexions - ~~that every~~ barricades ~~was/were~~ a study for the painter - you never see a Frenchwoman ill dressed, nor a Frenchman who does not know how to talk - You have only to enter their gay little capital, smiling & beautiful, like a gem, to see the difference of its type from that of ours - You had only to go into the Great Exhibition of 1851, & see their counters, arranged with an artist's eye, even their *Papeterie*, so as to be perfect studies, set up upon a thing like the ornament- al paper of an inn fire=place - to see the difference of the two nations - And then the cleverness of their talk, by which their wits become sharper every hour -

the point of everything they say & write - You see at once that their type is to elaborate ideas into conversation - but ~~I suppose~~ no one would say that ~~that~~/this is an English aim - & therefore the sooner, ~~I think~~,/perhaps,

they give up a mere attempt to imitate their neighbours over the water, the better - The French elaborate their thoughts into words - the English into work. The Word is good & so is the Act but ~~I doubt whether~~/can the two nations ~~can~~/ever interchange? & a copy is seldom worth having.

~~"There is some truth in what you say/Yes, that is true. But for all~~

~~that," said Fulgentia, But I do not think any/Perhaps no nation or individual has any tangible type before them now - All they do is to imitate -~~

When the Greeks believed in their Gods, there came forth an Apollo Belvidere, a Ludovisi Juno - Now we no longer believe in them, but we still imitate them - And there come forth ~~Etty's Nymphs, &~~

Titian's Venuses & Canova's Perseus. When the Italians believed in the Virgin Mary, see what Holy Families - Raphael's & ~~divine~~ Guercino's & Guido's. ~~How they still~~/And the same

~~produces Holy Families~~/whose Venus is an earthly profligate, paints a Titian

Virgin fit for the skies. We still go on painting the Holy Family, tho' we have ceased to believe in it. And what Holy Families! But ~~there is~~/I should like to paint a new Holy Family ~~to be produced~~, the Holy Family of Mankind. And if we were inspired by that, as ~~new era of Art would be~~ the Greeks & Italians were by their Gods & Goddesses, a new Era of Art would come in - But ~~I would~~/go into Mr. Vernon's Gallery & ~~I saw~~/see horses & cows & game & cottages & dogs & little boys grinning & ladies on horseback, all very beautiful in their way, but no Holy Families, nothing of what in the future *might be*, - of the ideal - of the type which God intends mankind to reach & poets & artists, who are no prophets, to set forth."

{in another hand: Pebody
Miss 293}

XI

"Is there not a science of moral ~~proof/evidence~~? This is what ~~I~~/we want to know - Faith is, ~~I suppose,~~ a *belief in the Universe* - & people make a merit of it, whereas it is no merit at all; it is what ~~you~~/we cannot help" -

"But what do ~~you~~/we mean by a science of moral proof?, ~~said I~~ -

"I believe that, if Dr. Arnold could, by placing a boy at the top of the class (~~in order to ingratiate /the master/himself with a certain family, (could be done by Dr. Arnold)/~~though he could do it without detection, he would not do it. I believe this with as great, ~~may I not say with greater certainty than I believe~~ as that the Sun will rise tomorrow.? ~~Is there, to say the least, any/~~There is no difference in the conviction with which, I assert these two things.? And is not this ~~latter~~ faith, conviction or certainty about the Unseen? ~~You~~/I believe it, ~~you say,~~ because ~~you~~/I cannot help it. ~~And m/~~May we not attain to the same certainty about God? May ~~I~~/we not feel, for instance, the same certainty that He will not blot me out of existence tomorrow as I feel that the Sun will rise tomorrow? a certainty drawn from my knowledge of His nature, as my ~~first~~/former certainty was drawn from my knowledge of Dr. Arnold's nature - To some minds this would carry no certainty at all. I heard a Bishop of the Church of England say, speaking of his own brother=~~in~~=law, who had become a Roman Catholic, 'It would not have happened, if he had been made a bishop.'

Now his intimate knowledge during many years of that brother-in-law, of his undoubted disinterestedness, single-mindedness, earnestness & purity of aim, carried no conviction to his mind. He believed that he would do as he probably would have done himself - It appears ~~±/therefore, I am aware,~~ that ~~that~~/the mind to which moral proof brings certainty, must be in a particular state. ~~to which~~

~~But alas,~~/Neither, however, can you cannot demonstrate mathematical truth to a mind wholly ignorant of ~~&/or~~ untrained to it - And in the same way, as my Bishop was incapable of receiving any moral proof about his brother, may ~~be~~ a mind be incapable of receiving any moral proof about God's character.

~~But~~/If it is said, what presumption ~~it is~~/in us to say what God will & will not do " -

~~"Do you think so? I think,~~/Answer, On the contrary, ~~that~~/it appears as if all His purpose ~~is~~/were to train us to such a knowledge of His nature that we *shall* know what He will do. Oh! what a Gospel there is to be revealed! The Gospel of His nature - ~~Columba~~/The nun sees her God in the Loretto miracles - She would fain believe it that she may find *Him* there - But we should lose our God if that miracle were to be proved to us - if we could fancy it by possibility true - We should not find Him ~~either~~ in that or in making wine or in any of the miracles of the 1st century."

~~"Well,~~ p/People however take your moral proof & they say, God is good, therefore He would not have left the world without a revelation - Therefore there was a revelation."

"But ~~I say~~ He *did* leave the world without a revelation - And He leaves numbers of tribes & nations to this day without revelation!"

"Oh! then," they say, "He makes allowances."

"What a weary life God must have of it! Always weighing & balancing our sins against our disadvantages - Or listening to Christ, who is always asking Him to do what He would not do without His such asking - ~~I am sure nobody~~ Who would wish to have such a God? ~~But what I was going to say is I/It~~ is not every mind however to which the discovery of the laws of Nature reveals anything of the nature of God - To one it reveals that he will get paid for his discovery - to another that he will have fame - to a third that he will rise in society. ~~I do not suppose that m/~~Many of our scientific men receive ~~any/no~~ revelation about God from their discoveries - Like our Bishop, their intimacy with such a character has made no revelation at all -

Again, not phenomena but laws are the only evidence of character. We cannot estimate a man's character from any action which he performs, but only from the principles which govern his whole conduct. So with God - We see a waving field of wheat & we say, what a good God! we see floods & earth quakes, & we imply, though nobody says, what a bad God to drown & burn all these people! But it is from the law alone that we can detect His character."

~~"Well, tell us what you have illeg about His character."~~

~~"I have been thinking whether God can be said ever/never to do anything, except actuated by the Spirit of Goodness - whether/that His Wisdom, His Activity are not all directed by His Love - As St. John says, God is Love."~~

~~"Has He no love of Beauty, independent of His Benevolence? in the little mosses, which grow upon the Alps, where no foot treads, in the crystals which strew the deserts where no man can dwell, ?" do you/we detect no pure love of beauty?"~~

~~"There may be Beings to enjoy them. - I cannot/It seems help thinking/to tend to this that all that Good does is the fruit of Love." And, "But why the speculation?"~~

~~"Because, if it be so, - & man's happiness be of the same nature as God's, as we say it must, - man's/the only happiness of man, which is/can be worth calling happiness, must be working with/in the spirit of benevolence. I have been thinking that n/Nothing, of which Feeling is not the origin & the head/end, will be happiness."~~

~~"But do you mean that/is not the spirit of invention, even if not set going by Feeling, by love, is not satisfactory? was not the inventor of the rail=road, of the steam=engine, the discoverer of the Law of Attraction, happy?"~~

~~"Not unless there was Benevolence with it. It was not happiness, because not God's happiness."~~

Does He ever do anything except with ~~that~~/the aim? of benevolence? If not, neither must we. But often the spirit of invention is only for itself, genius spends itself for the love of fame only, or the pleasure of the discovery, or that of 'getting on.' But is the meaning of 'all is vanity & vexation of spirit,' - a meaning realized & felt as true by so many, - if not that, where is only what is called *vocation*, - nothing of benevolence or of veneration in it - it always comes to be ~~that?~~ felt unsatisfactory?"

{in the margin in another hand, *Tomkins*}

"Comte says that there will come a time when intellectual power will be acknowledged to be no higher in itself than brute force - Both must be actuated, he says, by Love - There was a time when Physical Strength was respected. Then Intellect took its place. But, in reality, Intellect he/Comte says, is not more worthy of veneration than Strength, unless inspired by Feeling."

~~"I think that is true, don't you?~~ Scientific men are frequently absorbed by their Science, & seldom think of pursuing it from love or benevolence - And the Artist, the Musician - how few think of anything but their art, or of what it will bring them! All these men are in the possession of a kingdom only, not of the Universe - It is only the Universe coming into their schemes, which will raise high their Art or their Science -

We hear of Newton forgetting to eat his dinner & becoming imbecile during
~~forty years~~/part of his life, - we hear of Schiller & other poets becoming so much interested in their subjects

that they will take stimulants & walk up & down their rooms all night & die at 37. You/We see this, on the one hand, - &, on the other, men like the type idealized in Faust, giving up their pursuits in disgust -

~~I must confess, if/If~~ an Astronomer is solely intent upon discovering the Law of Gravitation, it seems ~~to me/to~~ be little better than discovering a trick. You cannot think why these planets move about in the way they do - you find out the law of Attraction. Is there anything higher here than finding out a very clever trick at cards? It is ~~the/only~~ veneration, ~~the~~ devotion, ~~towards the supreme~~ benevolence which elevate ~~it/the~~ discovery.

Yet you/the discoverer must not be moralizing & ~~talking~~ about schemes of benevolence ~~to yourself~~, while you are discovering laws - your/his attention would be divided between Moral Philosophy & Astronomy you/he must not be saying, 'I must be benevolent, ~~± must be benevolent~~, whom is this to please?' You/He must be absorbed in your/his pursuit, as it is justly called."

~~"Yes, all that is quite true - And y/Yet~~ the spirit of devotion & benevolence must be at the bottom of it - You/He must be out of your/himself, yet within call. If not, if ~~you are/he~~ is pursuing ~~on~~ your/his vocation only, you/he comes to 'all is vanity & vexation of spirit' - there is nothing of the Universe in your/his kingdom - If, on the other hand, you/he ~~do/does~~ not consult your/his vocation, but thinks, 'Keeping school will be more useful than engineering - I will teach' - without any vocation for it - then

it will end in schools being undertaken & badly done - & a great deal of *doing=good* attempted & nothing but harm done - as we see every day. There must be *both* - 1st a spirit of Benevolence & Veneration at the bottom of everything - a reference to it in everything - 2nd a pursuing \mp / & acting it out according to ~~your~~/the individual vocation -

~~You must be out of yourself, yet within call~~
 You a/A Medical Man must be absorbed, ~~if~~ in the operation ~~you are~~/he is performing that ~~you do not~~/ he does not hear the ~~screams~~/cries of pain & yet ~~you must~~ not be so taken up with that patient that ~~you~~/he neglects ~~your patient in the next room.~~ If a/another. A Man of Science, ~~you~~ must not be interrupting ~~your~~/his calculations to call up ~~your~~/his benevolence & yet a spirit of Benevolence must animate the whole - That is, ~~you~~/we must be wise & ~~you~~/we must be good - ~~You must be~~ wise in doing good *according to your calling* - vocation, & ~~you must be~~ good in following your vocation with a view to God's purpose, which is Benevolence - a purpose always connected with the Universe.

XII.

"The Church of England is a good human help,"
~~You say - That is intelligible - Well, then, let us see, /it is said,~~
 What does she offer as help? She has certain
 prayers taken from the Roman Catholic, which,
 if you find that they suit your feeling too, you
 may go & hear every Sunday - twice, if you like,
 in some places every day - & you may hear the
 Bible read, which, some say, you can do just
 as well at home - & you may hear a sermon
 preached by the best educated in the land,
 educated in Greek & Latin & classical
 training, Aristophanes & Cicero, & such
 theological learning as we can give - Few
~~men, I believe,~~ attend to the Sermon, but they
 may criticize it - Farther, you may be
 married, that is, have a form of words
 pronounced over you, which makes your mar=
 riage the law of the land - & you may be
 buried, or the feelings of your friends gratified
 by having certain words read over you - &
 when you are ill, you may send for the
 clergyman to read a Service by you - and
 you may receive the Sacrament once a month.

~~Christened, married & buried~~ -And you may be baptized - this is the
 help
 the Church offers, which you/we may take if you/we
 like it - ~~I should call it a hindrance."~~

"But ~~our~~/the Church of England may make discoveries -
 may make progress it is said. The R. Catholic Church
 cannot."

"The Church of England is no training for a discoverer

of/in religious truth - we might as well say that a mathematician is prepared to enter upon farming, as that a man trained in Latin & Greek & theological learning is prepared to find out ~~things~~/truth in religion - When ~~I go~~/we walk through the new House of Commons, those rooms do not look ~~to me~~ like the rooms of an assemblage of men straining to find out truth for a great country - political truth - or the good of a ~~great~~ nation - So the Church does not look ~~to me~~ like an assemblage of men fitted to find out religious truth " -

{in another hand *illeg*}

If it is asked/"~~But~~, are we capable of finding out truth?" it may be answered "What we *might* be is indicated by moments.

We are surprised to find the depths of feeling we are capable of - If life were organized so as to produce constantly what we are now conscious of at moments, "eye hath not seen" that which man might do - And, instead of talking about man being 'desperately wicked,' we should say, as we sometimes do say of great heroes, we ~~had~~/did not know of what man was capable.

Instead of that hideous hopeless ~~saying~~/repeating every day for year ~~that~~/of 'there is no health in us,' we should be living with a purpose, a purpose of moral improvement, which would be constantly realized till we were "perfect, even as God is perfect". ~~Oh!~~ w/What a difference there is between those thus living with a purpose & those who live with no purpose at all!

~~They~~/These take up a book, but not with any particular object to further ~~for which they are looking~~

We may see reasons for a less impressive character in this generation than among those whom we knew & heard of in the last - Religion is less real & less fervent - Prejudices are less deeply rooted, but so are attachments. ~~I am f~~/Far indeed should we be from wishing to bring back the past, but oh! that we ~~may~~/might feel the deep importance of the present! The senses, the taste are ~~being~~/now cultivated. Competition is keen. Novelties abound. A smattering of knowledge becomes common. Good people are trying to make it universal - ~~Oh~~ But strive after the knowledge of the intimate nature of God & Man, & let all other knowledge, all other acquirement be pursued with a sense of Man's nature & destination! Who thinks of one or the other now in what he does or learns?

"Thy kingdom come." If we seek Christ's most abiding, his uppermost thought, it was this - And what did Christ understand by "Thy Kingdom"?

~~I am always so glad that~~ He explained/s in those memorable words, "the kingdom of ~~Heaven~~ God is within" you" ~~I think t~~/There are no words of His which give more satisfaction & gladness

"How much is contained in them! Earth *may* be Heaven. But man is of the earth now, & there are so many good & pleasant things now rife in life that man is particularly liable to forget how great he might be, - to be satisfied with being an amused & amusing child. ~~Oh! that thou wouldst~~/Let him arouse ~~thy~~/himself to a consciousness of the Divine within in ~~thee~~/him. ~~I feel this,~~ as pleasant & cheerful days pass among those around ~~me~~/him. It was to the poor the Gospel was preached. And, if another Christ came to draw fresh supplies from the well of Truth which fails not, he would still speak to the poor. Truth is a *speculation* among the rich. Among the poor, there might be a few who would listen & care to find more truth in life than it now manifests. We must be patient, but never failing in fervour for God's work, ready to work - &, which is much harder, ready to wait. Then may some seed be sown in this world, & we may be learning for other spheres, when we cannot learn for this."

~~out something in that book.~~ They have no purpose but amusement.

~~I think~~ Our religion is too exclamatory to be religion. All our prayers begin with "O Lord", as if we were trying to excite in ourselves a feeling which we have not."

{in another hand: Tomks} (Insert XIII)

XIV

~~You say~~ It is said that Christ is God - ~~I want~~ But there is wanted a

higher God than Christ, a higher God than even Christ's God. Certainly Christ believed that He could work miracles. Can we believe that ~~that is~~ such would be a God whom we can feel veneration for, ~~illeg~~ whom we can trust in? The God of Law is surely a much higher God than this - The God who works miracles is not the Highest - We want the Most High - (a) (Insert ~~off~~ P. 92a.

When Christ says, Faith shall remove mountains, he appears to think that, if you can but believe it, God will break a law. For to remove a mountain in the way He implies would be to break a law - No doubt the expression was used merely as a strong & startling one - But he would not be a wise man who would *wish* to break a law of God. He would be the wise man who believes that God will *never* break His Laws, not that, if *he* believes that God will, ~~er~~ He will - Certainly Christ's was not the God of Law" (b) Insert 92b. {in the margin in another hand Tomks}

~~You thin that it is~~ Is it not of the very highest importance to find out God's character? Is not

~~I do indeed - I believe that~~ God's character ~~is~~ our only dependence for a future state?

f196v (opposite side of P. 92)

(a)

If we could but get it into our heads that to be accordant with Truth & Wisdom is the only reason for anything - the only reason why bodies fall through the air in a given time, the only reason why fluids press equally in all directions, the only reason why Gravitation is, why Dalton's Law is, - if we could see this, we should see it to be the only reason why eternal life is viz. that it is accordant with Truth & Wisdom, - & not ask *how* it can be nor why it ~~can~~/should be that, when the material frame is gone, the spiritual identity should remain - How can the human being be at all?

The ~~kernel~~/conclusion of the whole matter is to recognise One Cause & that an omnipotent righteous Will. A certain state of the optic nerve causes sight, it is frequently said. A certain state of the optic nerve invariably co-exists with sight, because such a co-existence is the Will of the Omnipotent - these co-existences being the means for Mankind to attain the knowledge *which is power*. But there is only one cause - Some philosophers finding the word "cause" frequently mis-used, say there is *no cause* - Do the phenomena of the Universe with which we are acquainted, justify this assertion?

By *cause* ~~±~~/we mean that which effects some mode of existence which was not"

f197

{in another hand: Dyke} ~~-92a-~~

(a) God's plan is to teach all from invariableness - See how opposed this is to miracles, which teach by variableness! And how are we ever to learn, when we cannot be sure of what is coming?

{in another hand: Dyke}

(b) ~~"But I do not~~/some think ~~that~~/that the theory of omnipotent & implacable Law is not more satisfactory than that of the benevolent Caprice, ~~which is~~ the recognised form of Deity. They

~~"I can understand that.~~ You think this is a miserable world. If you/they are to be very miserable, it does not signify to you/them whether you/they are very miserable in consequence of your/such misery being the Law, or whether you/they are very miserable in consequence of your/such misery being the caprice of the Superior Being. On the contrary, you/they would rather it were the caprice, because then there might be some hope that the caprice might change, whereas, if it were the law, there would be no hope - ~~It~~ [But it makes some difference *what* the Being is from whom emanates the Law - If the Law emanates from Juggernaut, ~~I would~~ certainly we would rather have caprice. But, if the Law springs from Wisdom & Goodness, had ~~I~~/we not rather have invariable Law? If it is wisdom & goodness that I & all the world should work out perfection, & that perfection cannot be worked out without ignorance & mistake & misery, does it not *then* make a difference to us whether we are governed by Law or Caprice?

We seem to think *that* a very poor dependence -
 But, if we could make out God's character from
 the things we see, should we not be able to make
 out the things we do not see from God's character?
 I do not feel the slightest doubt from knowing
 your character that you will not commit a
 murder. Cannot I feel the same certainty
 about God? What is the difference between His
 & your committing a murder? & what is killing
 one of us but committing a murder? Does the fact
 of being possessed of Omnipotence justify it? And
 why should we suspect *Him* of it? (a) Insert
 opposite side
 of P. 92

XIII/XV.

~~"I think I~~/It is a radical mistake to say that
 we are to remain in the position "in which
 God has pleased to call us," - fatal to all progress-
 Because the very object of all the teaching
 which we have from God is that we may
find out the "calling" to which we are called -

He leaves *us* to find it out - If he were
 to rub out the wrong figure in the sum & put
 in the right one Himself, would that be
 exercising our faculties ~~half as much as making~~/at all as it does to
 make
 us do it ourselves?

There is no idea now of organizing a life to act
 out our religion - We are to get on as well as
 we can *in our life* with our religion - What
 can we expect then other than what we do?
 We had better say at once, "I know that I shall do so
 all my life, but if you like, I will come & say
 so once a week" -

We think so much more about having done wrong than about doing right - We talk so much more about what we have done & our "desperate wickedness" than about doing otherwise - To ask God's pardon is the *main* part of our religion - perhaps ~~I may say~~ all the religion we have -

Now, ~~where~~ if I/we think that the very kernel of God's plan is that we *should* make mistakes, ~~to~~ -asking pardon for them instead of learning our lesson ~~from them~~ (His lesson) from them does indeed seem counteracting His plan & mistaking goodness for badness - ~~Oh!~~ w/What a difference it would make in our feelings towards each other if we could but get into our heads that this was God's purpose!

God's plan is that we should make mistakes, that the consequences should be definite & invariable, - then comes some Saviour, Christ or ~~some other/another~~, - not one Saviour but many - who learns for all the world by the consequences of those errors, ~~who~~ & "saves" us from them.

Instead of saying to ourselves, as we have so ~~many~~/often done, 'we will begin next Sunday & never do wrong any more', we ought to say, 'I know that I shall do wrong - there will be (not one ~~but man~~ "Fall", visited upon all Mankind, but) many falls. I know that I must make mistakes - It is part of God's plan - I will (not ask pardon farther but) take them in conformity with God's purpose, & strive to learn His purpose - The consequence of my falls indeed will be, ~~I know~~, upon the human race till a Saviour comes. May we each be Saviours in some way to humanity!

{in another hand: Illeg Conderly?}

"I yearn to be & to do right but, before I know what I was about in existence, the time was passed when I might have cultivated, have exercised capabilities, which I now no longer possess. Inefficiencies, ignorance of the way I should pursue, habit, all render powerless the wish I have to will aright. What shall I do? - I live on, strengthening much that I know to be wrong, though I desire, above all, the right, - though the only times, on which I look back with any pleasure, are those when circumstances *did* help me to a true & right feeling - I care for nothing that is called amusement, Ambition, as it is called, the externals of the world have not a charm left for me. But incapacity blights me. Not a day passes, not an hour, in which I do not feel myself mistaken - in the wrong, -either in thought, in feeling, or in doing - ~~Oh!~~h/How shall I find help?

~~I rejoice,~~a/At all events, that I am convinced that to beat down my already depressed spirits, to thicken the cloud of darkness by self-reproach for that which arises from the Laws of God would be untrue - I can point out to ~~you~~/myself many helps & consolations - I can assure myself that all *shall* be well, but I do not ask to live upon such assurance - No - Existence is made up of *presents* * each present is to be cared for. ~~It is very obvious to me that it is not intended that I/To live on the future (or on contemplation of any kind) should suffice/~~is obviously not intended to be sufficient to man.
In an imperfect state of things, in a life

modified by no comprehensive view of what they ~~those~~ are, & what they might be, who are to live it, it is difficult to exercise the nature aright - But, from day to day, I can see, helped by my own experience, means by which I may improve my course. And let me not think ~~not~~ that there can be anything selfish or wrong in striving for the healthy nature of a human being; because ~~it/~~that being is myself - The only question is, *will* my thought & care improve that being really? If it will, so ~~you/I~~ can really help ~~your/my~~=self or any human being to *be* better so ~~you/I~~ undoubtedly ~~are/~~am working with God & for Man.

I *wish* to avoid any course of thought, any talk which is deteriorating, but I have not the capability to lead, to devote myself or others; - Life takes its poor course; - with a sorrowful heart, I follow, unable to lead.

I never will offer to myself the false doctrine that I may be good & happy in any circumstances, *if I will*. Since God intends man to modify life into one righteous course, dissatisfaction with any other course is His admonition, teaching me that *this is not it*. Let me be thankful at all events that I am not dead or paralysed, so that this voice does not reach me. But helps I can have - I can look into the detail of my life. I can try for Wisdom to steer through it aright, *when I can*. I will not flatter myself

that I can enter upon an unbroken course of life, that I can say 'I have been always wrong, pardon me, O Lord, because I am conscious of it, & confess it. Now I will try never to be wrong again.' I ~~A~~/accept God's will that Mankind, & I as one of Mankind, am to learn, - to *work* my way. Let me awaken to see the nobility of such an existence, to see it in my own feebleness & ignorance, & in that from which I suffer, in others - Let me look how not to deteriorate, look even to the less rather than to the greater deterioration. If I cannot avoid what I feel deteriorating, there is a feeling with which this may be borne, which is elevating. The general run of moral books & of sermons are full of precepts which come home to nobody. How few can say practically that they have been better in consequence of them! To hear or read them is thought right in itself, but who says that they have helped him to be, to live better? Yet ~~oh!~~ how *one* may help *another*, when a true life shall become the object of Mankind! I heard yesterday a Concert of Instrumental Music, - how perfectly one fell in with another, - what harmony! Such harmony ~~shall~~/will there be in life, when man ~~shall~~/strives to find out what it ought to be, to make it such, to help man ~~with~~ /by means of man, each to take his part so as to harmonize with each other, engaged in the performance of the same piece.

{in another hand: *Swift*}

When I feel ~~low~~/low & poor & miserable in a drawing= room life, where I can do nothing, is not that His word to me, saying, 'Now you see that, in this life, human nature is not exercised to anything like the degree which it is capable of - you feel very uncomfortable - therefore change it as soon as you can - pick up everything you can from it, while you are in it - but find out the life, as soon as you can, which does call out all the Goodness & Wisdom of which human nature is capable'? Can He speak plainer than He does? Could it, if He spoke in words, be more ~~plainly~~/clearly His voice to me? (a) Insert 94a.

XIV XVI

~~Columba & Portia read the Life of St. Teresa together - they read Manning's Lectures on the Grounds of Faith. they read all kinds of Catholic Theology in every tongue - I used to hear their strange conversations - I never disturbed them, for it was no use - I felt it. I record these now, partly from a melancholy pleasure in their cleverness, partly to record/mark for the benefit of posterity their downward course.~~

People constantly say. ~~said Portia, in answer to some remark of/from Columba that God c/would not have left His children without a revelation,~~ "people always say, oh, would God have left us without a revelation of Himself - would he have left such an important question as Religion to the unassisted reason of His creatures?

(a)

But There is nothing about God in the lives we lead - we are to do what is *usual*. The visits we have to make, the people we are to ask to dinner - that which is "usual" determines all these things - We never ask, what is the nature of God? & what ~~is~~ His purpose for man? - what is the nature of man & what his destination? or if we do, we have only a Sunday answer.

It ~~does surprise me~~/is surprising that *what God is* is a question which interests no one. They take without enquiry what is set down in a book.

~~And yet I think~~ Dr. Arnold was right in ~~The people are wrong who blame him for~~ taking a country curacy, & letting enquiry alone when his mind was disturbed. Those who take the miraculous view & think that God has given a revelation to the world, must think that, if He has given one, He has adapted it to the normal state of that world - therefore, if any one doubts it, it must be owing to some defect ~~of mind in himself~~./in his own nature. What *he* has to do then, is (not to enquire, but) to improve his own ~~being~~/nature that he may be able to accept God's revelation.

±/We have long since done with the miraculous view. ±/We think God has entrusted it to the exercise of our own faculties to make the revelation - But, for those who hold ~~it~~/such view, ~~I think~~ Dr. Arnold's course was ~~perfectly right~~ & the only wise one, viz., to lay aside enquiry, adopt an active life, & try to improve

his being.

All that ~~I~~/we can say is, He has done it. ~~Oh!~~
~~b/But, you will say, they/~~it is said people might believe Xtianity
 if they liked it. ~~But c/~~Could those who lived
 before Xtianity, could ~~all~~ those now living
 who have never heard of Christianity believe
 in it, if they liked it? ~~Oh then, you say/~~It is said, this
~~that~~ is a mystery - ~~Well then all I can/may say, is~~
 Then He has done it - ~~You/~~People allow that ~~of~~ there are
 "doctrines upon which eternal life depends, &
 yet of these not a whisper was heard on
 earth until there came a revelation 4000
 years after the world began.' ~~I say the more~~
~~shame~~ - They do not see what a God they
 have made when they say this - they do
 notice ~~that~~ now they have been insulting
 Him - they do not see that they have repre=
 sented not a God but a Devil e - We who say
 that revelation has to be worked out by the
 exercise of man's faculties can readily believe
 (& thank God for it) that 4000 years &
 much more might pass before the revelation
 came - We can reverence & esteem God for it.
 We can even be in a "rapture," like St. Teresa,
 in contemplating the perfection of the scheme -
 But if the revelation was to be given by God,
 as these men say, all we can say is, the more
 shame that He did not give it sooner, - what
 reason could he have?"

~~"Then you believe in no Revelation," said~~
 Columba.

(a)

The struggle now going on between the Roman Catholic & Protestant appears to ~~me~~/be not at all a matter of religion. †/We hear the argument daily used by the Arnold school (the very names of which †/we reverence beyond most, the principles of which †/we are hardly able to ~~comprehend~~/understand) that men ought to stay in the church into which they are born - There is no religion in this - there is Reverence - but there is no religion, if religion be our tie to God - Surely the God who orders the R. Catholic Church must be a very different God from the God who orders the Protestant Church - & still more different from Him who orders the 'Church of the *future*.' If you believe that He does the things which the Roman Catholics say that He does, how can you stay worshipping Him in another church which says He does not? - there can be no religion, at least, in doing so - though plenty of something else, love of kindred, regard to duty &c.

{in another hand: Newton{

~~"There have been three parties, said Portia.~~
 "those who have said that there was a Revelation through the Book - those who have said that there was a Revelation through the Church, or through the Book & the church & those who have said that there was no Revelation at all. Now we say that there is a revelation to every body/one through the exercise of his own nature - that God is always revealing Himself."

~~"Then how come we to believe in so many what you will call false revelations?"~~

"The Church is necessary to maintain those beliefs - in the Atonement - the Incarnation - the Sacraments &c. which were the natural growth of minds in the times in which they sprung up - but which, in these times, in which they are not the intuitive effluence of our natures, could not be maintained without a Church - The Anglican Church has not authority enough to do this - & therefore she maintains them but very imperfectly - The Roman Catholic Church alone can do it - ~~I do believe it is a~~/As she says herself, ~~S~~/she is the only Church who can."

~~"And I~~/Is there any religion in this age in any Church but the Catholic? Portia?

~~"I do not think t~~/There can be no religion in the age which argues that you should stay in the Church in to which you were born - (a) Insert 95a And, indeed, can you go into an Anglican Church & think there is any devotion? You see no prostration
 of spirit,

no intensity of feeling, as among the Roman Catholics - you see people very nicely dressed - you see a great care to come in good time - you see a feeling of having accomplished a duty when it is over. ~~No, Columba, I think you are right. If you must belong to a Church, I would belong to the Roman Catholic Church."~~

~~"Yes, & n/~~No one can call the Church of England the Church of the Apostles. The Catholics may say that their Church is the Church of the Apostles - But we do not call our Church the Church of the Apostles, except in the Creed. We know that it is the Church of Henry VIII, not of the Apostles - And what a Church it is! The best thing that we can say of a clergyman in these days is that he does not *interfere* "a very good man - he never *interferes*" that is, he may interfere with the poor people, he may go & say, 'I did not see you at Church last Sunday - How was that? I think you might have managed to walk so far' But he must not say such a thing to ~~us/~~the "upper classes". That *would* be "interference."~~"~~

~~=====~~
{in another hand: Dyke}

~~"The fact is that you must expect t/~~The Church of England is expected to be an over=idle mother, who lets her children entirely alone, because those made her who had found the Church of Rome an over=busy mother. She imprisoned us - she read our letters - she penetrated our thoughts -

she regulated what we were to do every hour - she asked us what we had been doing & thinking - she burnt us if we had been thinking wrong. We found her an over=active mother & we made the Church of England, which does not "interfere" with her children at all."

"But, ~~Portia~~, if it is as you say that mankind can find God by the exercise of their own faculties, how does it happen that we have not long since found Him out, that we have not long since a Church dedicated to that search?"

"Hitherto all the efforts which have been made in religion, since Christ's time, have been either to cut off errors or to believe what you say you believe. The Catholics say, "Christ says, 'be poor like me - leave your family for my sake.' we are going to do it." And the religious orders are the consequence - The Evangelical party says, 'you tell us that Christ died on the Cross for us - this really makes a great impression upon us - we cannot go & laugh & dance as if He were not dead.' These are the efforts which have been made to act out what *was believed* - Luther & the Reformers were the men who cut off some monstrous errors - *Protestants* they rightly called themselves - for *to protest* was all their business - & there is nothing very high or noble in protesting. To search for truth has yet to be brought ~~in~~/forward as an object."

~~"But, Portia, it seems to me that you are always protesting - What else do you do but protest? You protest against every single doctrine of Christianity & religion."~~

{in another hand: illeg Cordingley?}

~~"Everything that you/we have now in religion, my darling, I believe we shall give/obtain more of - You want to believe that Christ "died" once for us - You want to believe that we "do nothing of ourselves" - We believe that God is in all of us - that we are, in fact, His activity. You want to believe in "Free Will" - We believe that God's whole purpose is that man should learn (of himself) to be God - You want to believe in a future state - we would teach you really to believe in one, - not in a future state which is to be given us, but in a future state which we are to create - You see, t/The mistake of all religions seems to me to have been, 'Let us renounce this world & all its vanities & look forward to a better' We say too, 'Let us renounce this world,' but 'let us create a better, let us show an example of a better.'~~
 there is no fault to be found with this *Earth* we have no reason to suppose that there is a better earth anywhere else - we have no reason to suppose that there *is* a 'better world,' unless we have created it - it will not be given us - let us then begin without delay to *make* one.' Again, you think Christ was "inspired," we don't well know how - we believe

all men to be inspired - to have God dwelling in them - All, excepting the Atonement, ~~I think~~, we shall have - Suffering *instead of* a person seems to ~~me~~/be without sense."

~~"With all that," said Columba, "I think, if I were you, Portia, I should have no religion at all. Without the belief in Miracles, in Prayer, in a man=God, oh how can you think you think that you will ever/it is said, we can never have that fervent conviction which Saint Teresa had."~~

~~"I so often think, said Portia, "of-/Remember these words, 'Lo, it is I, be not afraid.' If I were an/Some great artist, like you, Columba, I should like to paint a series of pictures, where man is passing through sorrow, & God says, 'It is I, be not afraid' - where he is passing through sin, even through sin, yes, most through sin, & God says, 'It is I, be not afraid.' I see God is so much more there than in His "walking on the sea' -which is, after all, but a/ very paltry miracle. Raphael paints Him performing the miracle of the fish, & he makes Him so divine that you lose sight of the absurd nature of the miracle. But, if he had painted Him saying to man in a state of sin & degradation, 'It is I, be not afraid,' how much more divine!~~

{in another hand: *Dyke*}

Saint Teresa was in a 'rapture,' ~~you say~~ & ~~I find that~~ we might be in a much greater rapture than ~~she was~~/hers - We have so much more to ~~be in a~~/give us "rapture" ~~about~~. For what ~~was she~~/made her in

a "rapture" ~~for?~~ ~~That~~ Because Christ had appeared to her with a crown upon His head & had told her that He would keep one door of her monastery & ~~h~~His ~~m~~/Mother the other. And what was her monastery for & the life she intended to live ~~for?~~ To live at other people's expense & pray all day. If she could be in a "rapture" about such things, it ~~only~~ shews the power of loving in her nature - And we, who have so much more to love, shall we not be in a much higher "rapture"? We, who see our God always, not with a crown upon His head occasionally, but *always*, acting out the perfect Law of Love & Wisdom in every thing? Saint Teresa did not know whether her "raptures" were from God or the Devil. It was a misery to her all through her life that she never could be quite certain of this - But we shall be quite certain that our 'raptures' come from God. Because ~~the~~/what we have to do *is* the searching out & finding what is consistent with Perfect Love & Goodness - ~~will be the cause~~ And this consistency will be the cause of our raptures. And therefore we shall have no doubt that they are not 'the Devil'. St. Teresa was never sure. ~~"I sometimes think that I cannot really/~~Did we really ~~"But what evidence you have in~~ believe in ~~g~~/God, ~~because, if I really did believe in Him, believed,~~ i.e. in a *Perfect* Being, whose scheme was that of ~~the~~ Perfection ~~a~~for *all* His creatures, ~~†~~ should we not be in a continual "rapture"?

{in another hand: *Swift*} ~~"But, Portia, I must return to it again.
What~~

evidence we have for miracles! is often said

~~"But no evidence would/could convince me/us of them. You wish to believe in them because you think you find your God there - I should lose my God, if I were to believe in them /find Him performing miracles - That is the difference"~~

~~"But Portia you see how/how is it with/ the Roman Catholics They have not lost their God. love the God whom they believe in & what He enables them to perform./ They are perhaps the only people who have found~~

Him - who

are one with Him.

~~"You see t/The Roman Catholics, do it is true, believe in such a God that we should find it impossible to love Him, if we did believe in Him. But then they have an organization ready for their truly religious people to step into - to act out their religion - They have a life. I believe that, Like them, it would become impossible & disgusting for us to do anything which was not one with Him, if we organized a life of which unity with Him was the purpose & end.~~

~~Oh! for the time w/When all Mankind shall have one purpose, then will there be real Unity. And what a world that will be! all pursuing the same purpose, though with different means - "~~

~~"But, about miracles, Portia?"~~

~~"People make such a point of having the evidence of eye-witnesses to a miracle. But here I/we have the evidence of St. Teresa that she saw two little devils round a priest's neck - I/We have the evidence of St. Paul, I believe, that he saw a light in the sky & heard a voice - I am as certain of their honesty, I am as certain that they believed it when they said they saw the devils & the light, as I am that I believe it when I say I see an ink-stand on the table. I have~~

f214

~~-103-~~

no more idea of an imposture in the case of St. Paul than in that of St. Teresa. But that the devils were not there & that the voice was not there, I am equally certain. Therefore what is the "evidence" of an "eye-witness"? Wherever miracles have been believed, they have been seen - I am as certain that St. Teresa believed she saw the miracle as that she did not see it. There is no difference in my certainty.

f215

~~-104-~~

{in another hand: Cockhead Meyou} ~~Book III~~
XVII

~~I come now to the great sorrow of my old age life My third daughter, my little Columba, the fairest jewel, the morning-star of my old age, the gentle dove who nestled in my bosom (I have hardly mentioned her as yet, I thought her a mere child in her father's arms) she became, at seventeen, a Roman Catholic, & far worse, a nun, I seem doomed to disappointment. I, the most common-place of mortals, addicted to common-sense, above all things, was obliged to 'put up' with every phase & every possible shew of folly & eccentricity in my children.~~

~~—The first inkling I had of this misfortune was a vehement attack from Columba, the sweetest child, as I have said, who ever shrank from contest & dispute, upon the poor old Church.~~

~~"The Church of England," she said, " has (for men) bishoprics, archbishoprics & a little work - (good men make a great deal for themselves) She has for women - what? I had/Most have no taste, dear father, like Portia, for theological discoveries. I/They would have given her my/their heads, my/their hearts, my/their hands - She/They told me/have nothing to do but to go back & do "crochet" in my/their mother's drawing-room - or, if I were tired of that, to marry & look well at the head of my/their husband's table - You may go to the Sunday School, if you~~

like it, she ~~said/says~~ - But she ~~gave me/gives~~ no training even for that. She ~~gave me/gives~~ neither work to do for her, nor education to do it, if ~~I~~/she had it. ~~I who/Many~~ women would ~~so~~ willingly ~~have~~ given her ~~my/their~~ life's work.† Luther gave us "faith" - justification by faith, as he calls it. And the Church of Rome gives us "works". But the Church of England gives us neither faith nor works - She tells us neither what to believe nor what to do -"

"No, it is said ~~I,~~" she has wisely refrained from telling ~~you/us~~ what to believe. She does not wish to make slaves of our intellects but to let each man judge for himself - ~~You/We~~ do not wish to believe, ~~do you?~~ all the dogmatic absurdities of Xtian Churches- to have an Inquisition forcing ~~you/us~~ to believe." Does

~~"As for instance, said Portia~~

~~"Do you suppose," said I, "that any educated man, now, for instance, really believes in the Incarnation?"~~

~~"I believe," said Columba, "that t/There has been perhaps more of feeling excited by the Incarnation than by anything else - People are/were tired of hearing about the beauties of nature & how clever God is - & about their "creation, preservation" & all that - But the idea of a God dying for their sins has awakened much of feeling for religion."~~

~~"Yes," said Portia, "& p/People must make a God till they can find one - It has always happened that some have made such a God as could be imagined by them, & others have taken Him from them - Few, ~~I believe~~ have looked about to find the true God. Indeed, it is~~

hardly likely that they should - If we are to make a God for savages - or for men living in a false state of refinement - ~~that~~/this is not finding God as He is -

~~"And how are you to find God without prayer? And "what is religion without prayer?" as/says Gerbet. says "said Columba~~

~~"And only think/Rather what is prayer?" answered Portia - "I remember. Mrs. A. S. saying when she lost her daughter said, "I prayed that she might die without pain, & my prayer was heard." Only t/Think of that/ a sweet gentle innocent creature whom you would not have hurt for the world and that He/God should have given her pain! & for no reason!! b/Because He gave it/left off, up, when the mother asked Him not - It could have been for no good reason, because He left off, as soon as she had prayed. It could/can only be have been according to this, because the mothers did/do~~

not ask

Him that He ~~would have~~/does not given the children pain. And this is the God ~~which~~/made by our theory of prayer ~~makes~~ - Well may it be said that we are idolaters & have not found the true God -"

~~"But Portia" said Columba "I cannot bear the want of/It is said that the Protestant religion give no discipline to the~~ character, ~~the absence~~ of the/~~no feeling of duty which are manifested now by the Protestant religion -"~~

~~"Well" said Portia "t/There are these three things - selfish indulgence - necessity of duty & accordance with right. We have got out~~

of the second phase (~~of~~ duty) - & we have not got into the third phase (~~of~~ right). Therefore we have fallen back, ~~I acknowledge~~, into selfish indulgence - formerly, there was much more of conscientiousness - It was all laid down what we were to do - & we did it - People did not think of what they liked, but of what they ought to do - Now duty is so difficult, it is so little known what it is - that we only think of what we like - We have not come to "accord=ance with right."

But "Right" ~~said Columba,~~ "is the voice of God. ~~And I think I/It so/is~~ natural that people should say, "I can't hear what He says - I can't hear distinctly. I want a man to speak to me & tell me plainly what he says & what I am to do - a man or a Church". In the Catholic Orders, it is the Superior who speaks with the voice of God. But the Protestants are *between* heaven & earth. They have neither an earthly superior nor a heavenly one - They doubt whether God speaks, unless indeed they open the Bible & find some text which tells them . (But then they find contradictory things ~~there~~.) They will not allow a man to speak, which they call interfering with religious liberty. But we *might* have," ~~said Portia,~~ "the same certainty about God's purpose which the Roman Catholics have - Only we must have it through the exercise of our own nature."

"And sometimes ~~it~~/His voice whispers & sometimes it does not speak plain."

"But ~~I am sure I don't~~/can we wish to hear it

except through the exercise of ~~my~~/our own & others' nature? ~~Think I~~/If God did tell us things - a little detail here & a little detail there - what a confusion it would be! Supposing we were to ask Him how to make the Steam Engine - and He were to tell us!

Two enquiring spirits among the Operative Class (a man & a woman) have at different times told me that they had asked Him to tell them *if He was* & when He did not, they concluded that either He was not, or that He did not care to have it known to us - ~~But that~~/This is as if Galileo were to ask Him to tell us that the sun stood still in the middle - & to conclude, if He did not, that either it was not so, or that He did not care to have it known - These earnest spirits were exactly Lord Herbert of Cherbury over again, expecting a voice from heaven.

~~You say, dear Columba,~~/It is indeed said, what is religion without prayer? ~~I should think~~ But is it not impiety to ask Him to give ~~me~~/us any thing, ~~Him~~/He who is always giving, & who regulates everything by Wisdom, Righteousness, Goodness, - who *is* Goodness?

When we can hear ~~h~~/His voice plain, we shall hear Him saying, 'Do not regret anything that is past - It is all right - *I did it* - Do not be anxious about anything to come. It is all under my Laws - in accordance with my Nature! We should have perfect trust.

~~'But do you think/we should doubt that He exists, said/it is said Columba, in a low voice - "I should, if I/we did not recognize Him in revelation, in answers to prayer."~~

~~"Do I/Can we ever doubt that He exists? It seems to me like ingratitude to do so - (as if I/we were to doubt the goodness of my mother & aunt - from /the kindest friend whom I have received so much/after such proofs as I/we have had of His goodness."~~

XVIII

~~I heard Columba explaining one day to Portia her reasons for becoming a Sister of Charity.~~

~~There does not appear to be now the least relation to God now in anything we do- any/no reference to Him in any of our modes of life. Among the rich the reference is to how much of material enjoyment they can crowd in - among the poor, how they can live - I met a young lady riding out with a servant behind her - Now only t/Think what that is! she is riding on the top of a horse, looking about her - and a man, a noble thing like a man, who ought to have the objects & pursuits of a man, is employed - in what? in riding behind her? Is there any reference to God in that/this?"~~

~~"But, my dear child," said I,/it is said people must be young, must have some pleasure & amusement - Do you think/Does not God does not intend His children to be happy?"~~

~~"I am not surprised at it" she continued,~~

a

In furnishing our rooms, in choosing our dress, our dinner, in laying out our occupations, is there any reference to God's purpose, to God's nature? is not the only reference, how much of enjoyment we can provide?

It is not surprising in people who live merely to amuse themselves, in young people, who enjoy what they do, so much that they can think of nothing else.

But, ~~I know~~/there are many people who think of nothing but their duty - who look to duty from morning till night - ~~Well, w~~/When ~~they~~/these wrote down in their visiting=book whom they have to visit, is there any reference to God in ~~that?~~"/it?

~~"I do not see"~~ said Portia at last "h/How can ~~any~~ life be organized on any other principle than the nature of the Author of life - the *purpose* of the Author of life? How can we tell what life should be without ~~that?~~/this? Life, to be well organized, to be worth having, must be in harmony with His purpose, whatever that is - ~~And there can be no other principle in organizing it.~~ But who thinks of ~~that?~~/this? ~~I agree with Columba.~~ The principle upon which it is organized among the rich is, how high they can live in the conventional mode to which their fortune entitles them - the principle among the poor is how they can live at all - a Insert opposite page 6a

We have laughed ~~so much~~ at people coming back every Sunday to say the same thing. But they *must* say the same thing. There are the shopmen ~~at Lewis & Allenby's~~/behind the counters They go to church, &, if it is a "faithful" preacher,

he tells them to 'have God in all their thoughts,' to 'do everything to His glory' &c. Then they go back to their gowns & silks & laces - How can God be never out of their thoughts? How can He ~~be~~ ever be in their thoughts? The natural thing for them is to come back the next Sunday & say "We have forgotten God, the author of all our benefits, all the week - we have forgotten all you told us, & we are miserable sinners." We have actually made it into a *form of Prayer* - but, if it were not, it ~~seems to me~~ is the natural thing to say. {in another hand: *Thomas*}

If you were preaching to the New Zealanders & preached to them to 'live to the Lord & not unto men,' to 'do all to the glory of God' - & then sent them back to all their old way of life, you might prophesy that they would come back next week &, if they were honest, they would say, 'We have done all that we ought not to have done, & there is no health in us' - &, if they were to go back week after week, you would prophesy that, week after week, they would want to say the same thing, & you would make it into a 'form' of confession.

~~They~~/We preach to the lawyers to love God - the lawyers go back to their way of life - And how can they have God in all their thoughts? - ~~They~~/We preach to the tradesmen

to love their neighbours as themselves - But the tradesmen must hate their neighbours - For they must buy in the cheapest market, & prevent their neighbours by concealment from buying there too, & they must sell in the dearest market. And how can they love their neighbours as themselves?

But we must live.

~~We have two things to do.~~

~~"But we must live," said I.~~

~~"We have two things to do." answered Portia.~~

(1) We must live, & (2) we must be in accordance with God. If we are in accordance with God, it seems, we cannot live - & if we live, we cannot be in accordance with God - Is that it?"

{in another hand: H.G.} ~~"It seems to me" said Columba, "that n/None of the~~

great

reformers, have ever taken ~~took~~ the way of life into account - Wesley - how much in earnest he was! - he preached & people were ~~so~~ glad to hear. But did he say to the people, "Now, while you are washing, can you be in accordance with God?"

~~"You see" said Colum/Portia, t/There must be washing & ironing & building, the earth must be cultivated, we must have food, & drink & shelter. How can these occupations be organized so as to be in accordance with God's purpose, instead of separating us from it?"~~

~~But n/Now," said Columba, "it seems to me, we have not an idea of being in accordance~~

(a)

~~Why, t/The whole of c/Conventional life consists of/in this, of/in saying, 'I am so sorry,' I hope you are coming when you/we are not 'sorry' & you/we do not 'hope'. of/in saying the "proper" thing without feeling it. This the first step in conventional life is to say what is 'right' without feeling it - knowing very well that you feel something else - The next step is when you/we actually do not know whether you don't/we feel it or do not. And the last is when you/we have said what is right to say/"proper" till you/we do not know that you/we do not feel it - when you/we really think you/we feel a thing because you/we have said it. One of my grandmothers really thought she had felt a thing when she had said it.~~

~~Now I want to lead I wonder whether we ever s/~~ Shall we ever lead a life where we shall really sympathize with those with whom we live & live with those we sympathize with - where we shall not speak these 'idle words,' but say that which we mean & mean that which we say?

with God's purpose. We put a great deal of food upon the table, but there is not an idea of its being wholesome, there is no calculation of what will give us most strength & vigour to do God's work."

~~"But is there not?" said I.~~

~~"On the contrary, said Portia, "if we send for a physician, we know that he will put us on a 'regimen' & give us something quite different. The same as to dress - There is no thought of God's purpose - The same as to occupation."~~

~~"Then what does direct us?" said I.~~

~~"Fashion directs us - i.e. w/that which is conventional in our order - (a) said Portia./Insert opposite page 8a.~~

~~"The Roman Catholics" said Columba, "have had some idea of being always in accordance with God. They have made a few little attempts. They told Madame de Longueville to wear a hair-shirt under her ball-gown - & to keep up the thought of God by an abrasion on her skin. They tell the washerwoman to repeat, while she is washing, so many Aves & so many Paters & to say her Rosary - They have organized Convents, where the way of life is meant to bring the person into constant harmony with God's purpose.~~

But we, what organization have we for the purpose? How is it possible to hold a conversation with God when we are holding

such a different conversation with men?

~~I think I~~/It is so very natural to have recourse to penance & fasting, as a manifestation to oneself that one is living for God's sake, after one has been eating for one's own sake, without any reference to Him. -"

~~"Well," said Portia, "I think our~~/A true scheme for Mankind would differ from all others in regard to this, that we ~~would/should~~ organize a *life* by which it would be possible for him to live in harmony with God's purpose - But now, if we have been with Him in our "closet", we cease to be with Him, as soon as we are at our work or with man - instead of being *more* with Him when at our work, because it is *His* work, & it is more in accordance with His purpose to work than to meditate. But ~~I admit, it seems to me that~~/there is now no purpose of this kind in any of the organizations or religions of nations - We have it set down in our minds that nations are to rise & fall - with a little vague talk about 'civilization' & 'luxury' - But ~~I~~/it is not set down in our minds that a nation living in disregard of God's purpose, when it comes to civilization & the enjoyment of civilization, must fall into selfish indulgence, thence into luxury, thence into decline & ruin.

"What shall I do to be saved?" they said to Christ. "~~here put in Columba.~~"

"And Christ said, 'Sell all that thou hast & give to the poor & follow me' - part of which answer we must think to have been a mistake. 'What shall I do to be saved?' they said to Paul, "Repent & believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," he said."

"Now, if we were to say, "What shall I do to be saved?" ~~said I, "what should you say?"~~/we must ~~"I should say,~~ 'I really can't exactly tell you'. ~~said Portia.~~ "Mankind must discover the organization, by which mankind can live in harmony with God's purpose."

~~"But what did Socrates tell the people to do?"~~

Socrates ~~"He~~ does not seem to have suggested ~~to them~~ any way of living in sympathy with the truth he so much prized - He made Plato, & Plato made the Academy, & Plato is said to have 'left his impress on the world.' Plato's Republic, ~~I suppose,~~ was apparently *his* ideal of an organization which would have enabled the world to ~~do their~~ live in accordance with his Truth.

In Christ's days, preaching was the great thing - & he said, 'Follow me' - He formed a school to do as He did, to follow Him & preach - And then came the persecution, & his followers were obliged to live in Catacombs - & then came the Conversion of the Emperor & splendour - & the Church began - But there

seems to have been no organization of circumstances to enable man to live as ~~if~~ it was preached to them that they should live."

~~"But surely" said I, i/It is said that the Church is an organization to tell us how we should live -- how we should serve God."~~

~~"God has His day to Himself," she answered.~~
 "We are told to go to church twice a day, which we can't do - we are, at all events, told to go to church twice on Sunday - we go perhaps once - "And the rest of the week ~~I don't see that~~ our occupations have any/no reference to Him - He has a little prayer said to Him at night. ~~I know~~ There are doubtless very good people & very religious people, who make a great point of going to church & being sorry for their sins. But ~~I don't see that~~ is there any relation between their religion & their *life*? God & Sunday are a thing apart ~~"No, I can't but say that I agree with Columba."~~

~~"You will ruin her" whispered I "I was in hopes you would have kept her straight - But you will are enough to make her a Catholic."~~

{f228 is blank}

{in another hand: Chft}

XIX

~~"Duty is so difficult now. said poor Columba to me one day."~~ Formerly it was quite certain what there was to be done - People were to go to church, & teach their children the Catechism & the Creed - & give away flannel petticoats & broth, which was called "doing good" There was no doubt about it - But now ~~you hear/~~it is truly said of ~~people say/~~many women, "She has been trying all her life to do a little good & has done a great deal of harm." People know that giving away is not doing good - & they don't yet know what to do in its place - Even such a school as King's Somborne is not doing unmixed good . ~~Then n/~~No more do ~~they/~~people know what to teach their children. Even the Atheists among the Operatives cannot bear teaching them that there is no God - & yet they do not know ~~concerning- what~~ God to teach them. ~~Duty, about which there used to be no doubt, is such a difficult thing now~~ My mother was a/A religious woman - ~~she/~~used to go ~~went~~ to church on Sundays & ~~said/say~~ her prayers - that was her religion - Her goodness was to be careful of the poor, & to do little kind things by every body & further to make society for ~~me/~~her children. About all these things there was no doubt - But now?

~~I felt so hopeless of convincing her & bringing her to Common Sense that I did not say much, & she went on to speak to~~

~~Portia again about prayer -- how she could have a religion without prayer -- "Are you not afraid of/Good people often say that they are afraid of all these~~

~~new=fangled doctrines destroying spiritual feeling, she said, "of cutting off the communication with God.?"~~

~~But Portia, more dauntless than I, probably because she was more convinced, answered, "Am I afraid of destroying spiritual feelings? But what have they now? what communication have men, have gentlemen, with God? You know a good many gentlemen, father. Do they have much communication with God? They go to church because their wives make them, & criticize the sermon a great deal - & they have prayers with the servants in the morning, because their wives wish it. But no one never thinks of this religion as a religion for men, but as one for women & children - Do you suppose that/Has the House of Commons plays at prayers much?, although they are read/much communication with God?~~

every day, it is true.

It reads its prayers

~~But, Portia, I/It is said that we could have no comfort in my/our religion, if I/we did not think my/our prayers were heard & answered."~~

Surely ~~"But I think that~~ that is the most uncomfortable part of it. You say your prayers & you don't know whether God has heard you or not, whether He will answer you or not, nor why He has heard you, nor how to make/bring Him to answer you. Some people/few feel, from the sensation of comfort & satisfaction in themselves

that He has answered them -other few are miserable, because no such feeling in themselves gives them a conviction that He has heard them - The greater part go their way, having done their duty in 'saying their prayers' & never look for any result at all"

~~"But you say that there never is any reason that He never does answer us."~~

~~"I believe that God is always speaking to us - expressing something to us - If intention & means taken makes up expression, He always intends to say something to us - "~~

~~"Then why do we not always hear?"~~

~~"Only s/See what different words the same thing says to different natures. A storm says nothing to the boorish farmer but "it will lay the crops." It says to the poet something sublime To the religious man it speaks of the power of God. Is it wonderful, then, that we should hear *different* things, & sometimes not hear God plain, according to the different exercise of our natures? The morning air speaks to some people of work to be done, to others of coming amusement, to others of God's returning goodness. Along the wires of the Electric Telegraph are flying words by which nations are governed, by which commerce is carried on, yet to us they remain only wires - but those to whom the message comes understand & act."~~

~~Columba had been discovering one day about/~~Such attention has been excited both in devotion & derision by the the/ Rimini miracle. ~~We had been to Rimini a few months before - & I confess I was myself struck with t/~~The beauty of the picture which people call the "winking Madonna" - ~~It/~~& which was 40 years in that small Church unobserved is striking - The expression of purity, holiness, devotion & melancholy in those upturned eyes exceeds ~~in beauty~~ that of any Madonna ~~I have ever seen,~~ excepting perhaps the Dresden Raphael - & ~~I cannot myself, I acknowledge,~~ prevents one from speaking of the Rimini picture as the Madonna who "winked at the Austrian officers."

But ~~Columba was describing to Portia how~~ the decaying faith of the town ~~had/~~has revived - ~~how~~ the besetting sin, swearing, ~~had/~~has disappeared & many conversions, ~~had/~~have taken place - "It may be the effect of colour, " has been said ~~she,~~ "but to my mind, is it ~~is/~~not equally God's way of calling & awakening souls that He, after a lapse of 40 years, ~~He~~ should cause the effect to be seen, with such results? ~~I can/~~Must we not ~~but~~ look with deep reverence on the instrument, through which He has worked ~~the/~~such a change?"

~~"Well, t/~~The most striking part of ~~that/~~this story ~~which you tell me about Rimini" said Portia, after a long pause -~~ is the state of the people which it shews - The picture had been there 40 years, ~~you say,~~ & had remained unnoticed. the 'purity, holiness & devotion' said nothing to them - ~~This/~~The beauty of virtue, ~~you say,~~

had no effect. *This* did not appear to them to be God speaking to them - But it is most affecting how ready they were to listen directly, as soon as they thought that they heard God's voice in His "winking" at them. That which impresses ~~me~~/one the most strongly in all this story is this state of the people - They do not see God in the expression of "purity & holiness" ~~in the/ which you describe in this picture,~~ but they see Him when the picture shuts its eyes. God, acting by a law of goodness & righteousness which *never* fails, is really more worthy of reverence than God 'winking' at us occasionally - or ~~God making~~/turning water into wine or into blood or anything else - ~~I think i~~/It is a most curious fact that a picture, making faces, should have cured swearing & a most touching one that the swearers should have been so willing to listen as soon as they could hear. But that which it ~~seems~~ ~~to me to~~ tells most loudly is that this people must be raised & educated till they can hear God's voice in His law of perfect righteousness, hear it in every thing, that "still small voice," rather than hear it only in a "tour de force." It ~~does seem to me such~~/is a very remarkable thing that people should be convicted by seeing a picture move. ~~I don't perceive~~/What is the connection? "But Portia," said Columba, "I really don't see the difference between this & many things which we do believe. Why do we pray at all? Is not every answer to prayer, it is ~~said~~/often asked,

a departure from what God would have done otherwise - a departure from ~~what you call His law?~~ "You see, t/The Protestants, answered Portia, " have done here what they have done in everything else - left *principles* as they were - & only taken away something of which the absurdity has struck them - The Church service is one appeal for a miracle - It is not really more absurd to expect God to carry about houses in the night, as ~~you tell me~~ He ~~did~~/is said to have done at Loretto, than to ask Him to cure a sick man

- "My father began to grow better from the moment he was prayed for in church." a lady said to me the other day. This is concluding that a miracle has taken place just as much as those did who believed in the 'winking Madonna' - The Protestants have left the principle just where it was - the principle of *expecting* miracles - The whole theory of prayer is to expect a miracle - They have only struck out something here & there which they thought the extreme of absurdity. God acting by law, the law of goodness, the law which never needs to be remedied by a miracle - this was just as much out of *their* thoughts as out of the R. Catholics -"

We do not want/~~But I should like, dear Portia, to go over with you the evidence of some of them~~ to miracles - I wonder if any Protestant philosopher has ever written upon it - ~~has ever overthrown the~~ "Catholic testimonies" to their "truth."

~~"I dare say you/Many wish to be able to believe in the miracle of Loretto - to find out that it is true - Now I/we should above all things dread to find out that it was true/be convinced of that, or of any miracle, if any evidence could~~

convince us. Because I/we

could not reverence a God who broke His own law - who carried about houses in the night, in opposition to His own Law, (which, we know, is founded on the plans of perfect goodness, is perfect goodness, in fact) - the law that "houses shall stand & not fly." Do you/we see God more in the breach than/or in the observance of His own Law? Surely the one God is more worthy of reverence than the other."

~~"But, dear Portia, you do so misunderstand the Catholic miracles. What is there wonderful, it is said, in God working a moral change by means of a special interposition? He did so in the first century - Why should he not in the 19th?"~~

~~"That the 'expression of purity, holiness & devotion' should have been there forty years without producing any change, & that then the change should have been wrought by the picture moving its eyes does appear to me very remarkable. People think that they hear God's voice in a miracle, now & then - They don't think they hear it in the daily & everlasting expression of His goodness - in the beauty of Holiness - in His Laws which are never broken - this is very remarkable."~~

~~"But what you are saying now/this tells equally against all miracles -"~~

~~"Indeed it does."~~

~~How it is/these are the such things which you object to in the Catholic religion, dear Portia, & not the prevailing/you do not share misconceptions that the Catholics place the Blessed Virgin first &"~~

{in another hand: illeg Poniff?}

~~"I dare say their/The Madonna of the Romanists is first in one sense - Her gentleness, her goodness is first in their minds - Just as among the Evangelical sect, Jesus Christ is first - If you were to say to x them, 'You worship Christ much more than God' - they would say, "Oh! no, I/we don't." But they think of Christ as saving them a great deal more than they do of God."~~

~~"Christ as our Intercessor - the Blessed Virgin as interceding too for us. This is how we think of them."~~

~~"But What an idea does Intercession? what an idea it presents, of God! That God should not give us what we ought to have, (in order to fulfil His plan of/for our perfection) of His own goodness, but only because Christ asks Him - & that Christ should have no better way of spending His time than in asking, nor God than in listening - What a Being it supposes Him to be! Why He had better not, they had better not exist at all - than exist in that way!"~~

~~"But do you not think, on the whole, that/it is said there is more religion in Italy than in England, more feeling produced by these beliefs in miracles - in intercession, - in saint-worship & the like, than here?"~~

~~"Yes, I do, This is true. Why is it that we meet with this power of reverence in Italy only? It is very affecting - I suppose There is something of the spirit of fear in it - the fear of hell - the hope~~

of gaining a reward. But doubtless there is a great deal of the true spirit of veneration also - Only, *what* is it that ~~they~~/we venerate? A God who breaks His own Law or who keeps it - Should ~~you~~/we expect to find God keeping His Law or breaking it, His Law which he had made in the spirit of perfect goodness?"

~~"But, Portia, your/This theory would do away with all/some of our most universal forms of thought - not to mention modes & of expression - I was going to tell you of/Whenever an accident happens, we hear which we had on that journey - Papa & Fulgentia & I - such a curious accident - "Thank God we were not more hurt! Fulgentia's/A's face only was scratched" -~~

~~"And you/we do not say, 'Why, Lord, did you scratch Fulgentia's/A's face?' People are so good, that they never say that" We say it was for A's~~

~~"But, Portia, was it not for Fulgentia's/good that her/his face was scratched.?"~~

~~"It was for her/his good that those laws were, through which her/his was scratched. She/He would not have been so well off, if those laws had not been."~~

~~"But another person has the good of those laws without & has not a face scratched. Was there any particular good accruing to Fulgentia/A from having her/his face scratched?"~~

~~"I believe so/Yes, But it is alarming to think how completely we are destitute of the first principles of knowledge of/with regard to God's nature & His plans with men, His manner of acting - As, till Bacon's time, people were ignorant of the~~

first principle of Philosophy, so we want a Bacon for the science of God. The Crane on Cologne Cathedral stands there a monument of man's ignorance of the ways of God. It was taken down & there was a thunder storm. They thought God was offended & put it up again."

"~~But my dear Portia,~~ it is said, it is only the most ignorant who can have so absurd a superstition as ~~that?~~" this.

"~~But I/~~Is it a whit more absurd than the expecting an 'answer to prayer,' which is expecting that God will alter His laws, His good Laws, in conformity with our advice - when all is as certain as an Eclipse? If we prayed that the eclipse (~~which I find in my set down in our Almanacs pr set down for the 29th November~~) should not take place, would ~~that/~~this be more absurd than praying that one of God's moral laws should ~~not~~ be altered? Is the Crane at Cologne a whit more absurd than the theory of forgiveness & absolution? I remember, ~~when I was at a Water=Cure Establishment once at Umberslade,~~ finding some of the patients ate/eating cake & drinking wine in their rooms -"

"~~Oh how/~~This immediately strikes us as foolish+ as hindering their own cure! ~~Why,~~ what were they there for?"

"~~Why,~~ t/The Doctor was there to give them "absolution," you know - It was just like the theory of forgiveness - ~~Dear Fulgentia/ Columba,~~ what you said just now, & what half the

~~world would think it right to say, "Thank God we were not more hurt" is not really, forgive me, a lesser ignorance of God than the Crane at Cologne! ?"~~

~~Yes, I knew you would say that. That was the reason why I did not tell you of our accident."~~

XXI

~~I/We find two things in the Roman Catholic orders Portia, which I/we find nowhere else. began poor Columba again one day.~~

~~"And what are those, dearest child?"~~

~~"One is, an attempt to organize life so as to enable them/men to act out their belief - And the other is, a carrying-out of what Christ & the Apostles say - really - as a mode of life."~~

~~"And do you find that/this nowhere else, dear child?"~~

~~"No, I really don't. People have nothing to do with God in their work. The most curious thing is that they should go to church once a week & say those things to Him, lauding Him in such terms, & begging Him so often to have mercy upon them - & then - the whole of the rest of the week should have nothing at all to do with Him, no reference to Him in their work."~~

~~"But I do not think that is quite true."~~

~~"They work to get their families on, not for the sake of God - Our Church says that we are to follow the words of Christ, but~~

does not attend to ~~it the least in the world/~~them. They, (the Roman Catholic Orders, ~~I mean,~~) organize their *life* according to their belief. They say, 'attend to the words of Christ' & they do it- they sell all & give to the poor, & arrange their life with services &c, so as to have God always in their thoughts. ~~Only think what a help that is!~~ If people have no particular belief, they may be satisfied, (as ~~all those~~ people round ~~the/a~~ dinner-table ~~at dinner~~ are), to do as they see their neighbours do, that is, to go to church once a week,, to say grace, to keep the Sunday &c - & they feel no want - But if you have a belief, & a strong one, & cannot organize your life in accordance with it, ~~only think how distressing that is!~~ ~~T~~/the consequence of it is what ~~we do you say~~ we do - viz., that we are always sinning & repenting - that we have to go, ~~as you say,~~ once a week & say that we have done everything that is wrong, without the least expectation of making any alteration. We make no exertion to conform our lives to the words of Christ. ~~As far as I know,~~ the Catholic Orders are the only system which has ever organized the *life* to correspond with the belief. ~~They have really followed out the words of Christ & the Apostles literally."~~

~~"I agree."~~

~~"Then they make the purification of their consciences their business."~~

~~"Yes, but I don't think that the 'purification of our conscience' is best done by self-examination, as the Catholics do but by doing the work of God."~~

{in another hand: Guppy}

~~"The Orders do that too --- by a life of self-denial rather than a life in the midst of riches & pleasures."~~

The Catholics say/recommend "a life of self-denial." Now I should like But that/this ought to be really a life of self-indulgence- "Let him deny himself, his better self, rather more than by leading a life "in the midst of riches & pleasures." There are "pleasures" & "pleasures". ~~I should wish that I/It be/should~~ be a *greater pleasure* to do the work of God than to have the "riches of this life" - & ~~that~~ it should be "denying" yourself, your real self, to live in these, in preference to going wherever He ~~should/~~ calls you - ~~I should wish it to/It should~~ be your own will, (*not a denial* of your own will, to be in accordance with His."

~~"The Catholics wish you to have no will, no preference, with regard to health or sickness or any other thing, but to have a perfect indifference to all things which are sent you by God."~~

~~"With regard to health or sickness, I cannot look upon those/these as being/are not "sent" to try us - but rather as being are the result of keeping, or not keeping, the laws of God - & therefore it seems to me that it would be "conformable to the will of God" to keep His laws, so that you would have health."~~

"The member of a religious order makes his own "sanctification" his aim."

~~"I know it - But with regard to our own sanctification, I think that is best accomplished by doing the work of God - not by making it an aim."~~

"The object of the Catholic is, by clearing away our love of praise & our self=love, & substituting for them an actual love of contempt & pleasure in self=mortification, to release us from the slavery, (in which Christ find us) slavery to a little comfort, to a little praise, & set us free to serve Him in any way ~~He calls us~~ to which He shall call us."

~~"The three things, I think," said Portia, "which prevent us from thinking of ourselves are - interest in the work we are doing, - devotion to God or devotion to our neighbours - And I believe that any one of these three things would prevent us from taking pleasure in praise, And that This would be a healthier & more real state of mind than "loving contempt," as the Catholic has is. We should not think about contempt in that/this case. And this I believe to be is more in accordance with the thought of God than to "love contempt" -~~

~~"Yes Christ says, it is true, "If any man hate not his own life &c he cannot be my disciple" & "blessed are ye when men shall revile you &c."~~

~~"I am sure that I/It is a much easier thing for some of us to hate ~~their~~/our lives than to love~~

them - Yet ~~I believe that~~ it is more the thought of God (and what is the thought of God? ~~that is/should~~ be the question in every thing) that we should love our lives than that we should "hate them."

"The Catholics say that we should *prefer* the lowest office - ~~& indeed I think that~~ this rests upon what Christ said, "to take the lowest place."

~~"I believe that w/~~We shall fill that office best for which God has fitted us, & for which we feel the most attraction - The direction of the Divine Will, ~~I believe,~~ is shewn by the fitness we discover for an office, not by our *dislike* to it. A duty will not be laborious & painful to our nature which we can do well. And this fitness is ~~theref~~ what we should look out for more than for the "lowest office."

"Entire indifference" as to all the goods & evils of this life is what the religious orders strive to attain - ~~And only think, dear Portia, what a blessed state of mind to reach~~ so that, as they express it, "he is as if he were a dead body, which may be carried about & turned on every side & which bears all manner of usage" and "lets himself be moved & governed by Divine Providence.""

"To be indifferent to all the goods & evils of this life" ~~it~~ depends upon what we think good & evils. To a well=constituted, well=developed nature the "riches & pleasures of this life" are not goods - & ~~his/its~~ inclination is not against what are called "evils.'" "

~~"It is very evident, I think," said Columba,~~
 "that Christ did mean everybody who believed in
 Him to renounce all that they had in property.
 We say (in the Catechism) that we renounce the
 pomps & vanities of this world - But who ever
 thinks of those words again? what earthly
 difference do they make to us? does any one
 ever think of renouncing *anything*, ~~the~~ (pomps
 or vanities or anything else), because they have
 said those words? have ~~they~~/these any meaning at
 all to us?"

~~"No, I admit that they have none."~~

~~"And do you think, Portia, that you could~~
 we suffer for your God as the Catholics do for
 theirs?"

~~"I think that w/We could suffer more for~~
 our God than they for theirs - because ~~I think~~
 He is more worthy of being "suffered for".

~~"But you/we do not think He wants you/us?" to~~
~~suffer?"~~

"He wants us so much that He can do nothing
 without us - With regard to suffering, ~~I find~~
 there is the utmost difference between suffering
 heartily for, acquiescing cordially with my God,
 & doing a thing merely because I cannot help
 it - If I get up in the morning because, if
 I don't, I shall be late & people will notice it -
 or, if I get up to do His work, ~~it~~ makes all
 the difference ~~in the world~~/possible. If, when I go to have
 a tooth out, & the instrument is in my mouth,

I think "it is God," if I take the *initiative*, as it were, & go forth to acquiesce cordially in His plans, *not submit* - or if I do it merely because I must submit & it cannot be otherwise, *it* makes all the difference possible. It is not obedience that God wants. It is to be one with Him, one with Him in purpose, action, everything. Now the God who likes human beings to suffer, ~~as you tell me He does~~, - I cannot conceive suffering for Him with any zest. But our God, - we know that His purpose can only be obtained thro' our suffering, can only be obtained by us, that *He* suffers with us - can we not suffer for Him, as well as or far better than the R. Catholics suffer for their God, who, they think, likes their suffering for its own sake? Hardly anybody knows this. Can we suffer to make Him known?"

"The Catholics say that we can only "know Him, know His will, through a Superior."

"How man does always want a Leader, whom he can venerate, & follow, & trust in, & love, & act with entirely! How it ~~always does~~ elevates him, when he finds such an one - elevates the led perhaps ~~even more than~~/as much as it does the leader - how it inspires man to obey that leader entirely. Now ~~it seems to me that~~ that Leader can only be God - a God who may be trusted in & obeyed entirely. To obey & to command - man must do both - He may be a leader to other men in individual things, & his leader in all must be God."

{in another hand: Thomns}

~~"But Portia, m/~~Men will be ~~so/so~~ "shocked" at what ~~you/we~~ say of God that they will have neither Him nor ~~you/us~~ for a "leader."

~~"I/But~~ it is for us to be shocked - not for others to be shocked at us - shocked that you can believe a God to be good who organizes "ever-lasting punishment" - who requires to be "interceded with" ~~all day~~ by Jesus Christ to do that which is good. ~~Why, t/~~This is a Devil, not God - &, if men were to examine the God whom they suffer for, they would find that He was more a Devil than God - But they don't examine -they only examine the grounds of the authority upon which they believe - they never examine their belief itself - But let us examine the God whom we love - & the more we examine, the more we shall find Him perfectly venerable & worthy to be trusted in - & the more we shall suffer for Him willingly to carry out His purposes."

~~"But, Portia, you/~~We don't ~~then~~ object to the theory, which generally ~~so~~ shocks a Protestant, of perfect obedience to a Superior - of looking upon the will of the Superior as the expression of the Divine Will & Providence - seeing God in the person of the Superior."

"All great things have been done by obedience - In a ship=wreck, what wonderful feats have been accomplished by obedience to the Commander! Had every man thought

that he knew better, he might have saved two or three- But the same result would not have been brought about. St. Peter's was built by ~~the~~/all (masons, workmen & men), all working in obedience to the one master-plan of Michael Angelo. Had each mason thought he knew a better plan, St. Peter's would never have been built. At the Philharmonic Concerts, the effect is produced by two or three hundred men all acting in perfect obedience to the *bâton* of the ~~Director~~ Conductor, & ~~Leader~~. One may think that the time should be taken a little slower - *another* a little faster but the effect is produced by entire "obedience".

~~"Then you admit that/~~The Religious Orders say that "obedience is the very source from whence the whole religious life takes its spring" ~~a that we may yield~~ "a blind obedience," "putting aside our own will & judgment," that so every command of the Superior may be fulfilled as tho' it were the command of God Himself - & "at the voice of the Superior, as if our Lord Himself had spoken, all ~~may~~/must be quick to do his bidding.'" "

~~"I think i/~~In one particular thing, this perfect obedience must be & ought to be, in order to produce any great result. In nursing, if you put yourself under the direction of a Superior, that Superior must

have perfect obedience yielded - & I should think that I was obeying God in that Superior, because I should think it was wise to give that perfect obedience, & therefore I was obeying the Spirit of Wisdom, which is God. But it is different in giving up one's whole being ~~-I doubt whether I/~~It is not the thought of God that any one should give up his *whole* being to the direction of a Superior - only that he should yield perfect obedience in any department where a great work is to be performed, & where, though he may sometimes know better himself, he recognises it as wise that there should be one directing mind, in order that it may be "one work."

"Obedience to man", according to the Catholics, "is obedience to God, for ~~w~~/Whose sake they render obedience to man" - "adapting their will & judgment altogether to that of their Superior," in order thereby "better to obey the will of God."

~~I can understand~~ Obedience to man is ~~better~~/more intelligible than obedience to God. Obedience to God is not natural. Because ~~I~~/we know that what God wishes is always good - better than any=thing else - the best of all for ~~me~~/us - & therefore it must be perfect *oneness* with God, perfect & entire conformity, or nothing, if ~~I~~/we think at all - ~~And~~ Obedience to God has therefore no meaning ~~to me~~. But obedience to man ~~I can understand~~/is a true word. Man is not always wise. Sometimes he makes mistakes - God cannot

make mistakes - With Him ~~Therefore~~ I must be always one. ~~But w/With man, I see that I~~ cannot always accord with his opinions & desires, but, I can see that, on the whole, it is best to obey, to obey one Leader - just as soldiers obey one command=er, otherwise no battle ever could be fought. So, if we were really soldiers of God, in order to accomplish any great campaign in His service, we should obey a man, a leader, - even though we sometimes felt that we knew better than he."

~~"But I should like to know, if Protestants can tell me, which None of the practices (I don't/we are not say/speaking of the doctrines) of the Catholic orders is not/but are founded on some words of Christ. Oh!~~ "But Christ did not mean that, He meant some thing else," say the Protestants. ~~"Well then, I say, I/If you/they who profess to found everything on the Bible, reject some things - why may not others be rejected? If an inhabitant of Arabia were to set himself to meditate on what would be the life which would grow out of Christ's words, were they all of them carried out to the full, would it not be a life very much like that of the best Catholic Orders?~~

~~"I think it would~~ - Even the begging Orders are really a following=up of Christ's words."

~~"And the Contemplative Orders? What nonsense are the words we say! We pray to "have God in all our thoughts" - we know that we shall go down stairs into the drawing room~~

next minute, & talk about our neighbours & our clothes & our amusements, & that it is physically impossible to keep God in our thoughts there, He won't/will not stay there - ~~It is said that God is very where, & I don't think He is in the drawing-room at least we can't find Him there.~~ To see everything that is worth seeing & to invite others to do the same, not because there is any particular object for which this is to be done, but because it is "so improving" ~~to do this -~~ this is the avowed object of life of ~~Lady S. & of Aunt A, /Mrs. A & of Miss B., & of so many others - & I used, myself, to think myself~~ people are thought very stupid who ~~did/do~~ not do this - Now, is it possible to keep "God in all our thoughts" while living this kind of life? And therefore it comes to ~~that/this,~~ that we shall say every Sunday "we have done everything that is wrong," & shall be always "sinning & repenting," always dissatisfied with ourselves, without an plan for anything different - The Contemplative Orders, ~~appear to me so/be very/arise~~ naturally. They are an attempt whether ~~you/we~~ "eat or drink, or whatsoever ~~you/we~~ do, to do all to His glory" - to keep the holy fire, like the Vestal of old, "always burning."

~~"But I think they have not yet seized the thought of God."~~

~~"In this humility, self-abasement, compunction, contempt of the goods of this world, they surely have."~~
 {in another hand: illeg Murphy?}

The question is *what* the goods of this world are which we are to "despise" . ~~I should say that t/~~"The goods of this world" ~~were/~~are to be one with God - & these goods we are not to "despise" - ~~And a/~~As to "self-abasement," ~~I think~~ there is something better or truer than abasement. Abasement is to be induced by the exercise of our nature in crushing ourselves - but the exercise of our nature upon worthy objects *out of* ourselves would have the same effect in taking us out of ourselves, in causing us to forget ourselves which the direct exercise of "abasing" self has - & in a far healthier & truer manner - ~~I think t/~~There is something better than "compunction". Compunction exhausts the nature - Oneness with God, *resignation to Him* & to His laws raises it."

~~"Resignation to sin?"~~

~~"Certainly~~ - What is sin? It is imperfection of nature & ignorance of truth, ~~is it not?~~ Then ~~I would rather say,~~ instead of saying, "defiled by sin," we should say *ignorant* of a truth whether of feeling, or of intellect, & be resigned for the present to ~~my/~~our ignorance, sure that it will not last. Now all Theology ~~comes to~~ /consists in raising God & depressing ourselves - The most we come to is "He is so good & I am so bad"- We ought to come to "I am

~~"And you think you are not bad."~~

~~"I think I am /want to come to bad because He is good."~~
 i.e., His good laws have made me what I am.

-His laws will help me through to perfection.
~~I don't want to~~/Why make such an immense
 distance between me & God? Homage is not
 the thing He wants - Unity, not homage is
 "His thought."

"The ~~little children who~~/childhood which, Christ says, shall
 enter heaven, points to the reverence with
 which little children look upon a superior."

"But we so seldom find a Superior -Man
 does so little for us - Our Superior then must
 be God - & we must work for & with Him,
 as little children follow & work with their
 "superior."

~~"You admit, Portia, that, I~~/If Christ's words
 are fully acted out, the Catholic Orders
 result - Protestants say they abide by the
 Bible - But they do no such thing. "Sell all
 thou hast & give to the poor"- The Catholics do
 this - Christ's whole life almost was a war
 upon the family - So is the Catholic nun's -
 "Call no man your father &c". But Protestants
 take some words of Christ & not others. The
 Quakers will not call any man "Master" nor
 say Mr. ___ (but they will say "Lord" ___)
 But ~~I never heard any~~/no one ever takes up that
 remarkable saying, "Call no man your father
 upon earth" - holding God in place of your "Father."

~~"It is very curious~~ It is ~~perhaps more~~/most
 curious ~~still~~ that, at this moment, ~~we may~~
~~say~~ there is possibly not in all England one

heart which is warm & satisfied & joyful in the filial or maternal relation - ~~This is however by the bye.~~"

~~"You, Portia, who feel so deeply the unsatisfactoriness of the family, as it is now, are not likely to quarrel with the celibacy of the Catholic clergy."~~

~~"There may be other reasons, dear Columba, against it - But, a/As family is now, it does seem necessary that, if men are to be set apart for the study of religion, they should be unmarried, because family engrosses a whole man, as it is now."~~

~~"It is so evident too that Christ discouraged family life."~~

~~—"Yes, even to the degree of saying that we were to 'hate our father & mother & for His sake,' which, of course, I conceive to have been a mistake."~~

~~"A propos, though this is quite beside the mark, I wonder, Portia, what truth there is in calling a man Lord ---- Lord means Master one in authority. Is there any true foundation in a man being hereditarily 'master' over those who may be far superior to himself, & who may be really his master - but who are to be nominally & hereditarily inferior to him? Is there any truth in a man, such a great & noble thing as a man, (the Duke of Wellington, for instance,) finding any pleasure~~

in hearing himself called 'Lord'?"

~~"You little republican! I thought we were discussing the religious Orders".~~

~~"So we are - And I want to ask you, if so you then see no truth in 'renouncing the world,' in 'self-renunciation,' in 'despising praise'?"~~

~~"I don't quite understand what the Catholics mean - nor indeed what our Catechism means by ["renouncing the world," because that means/would mean renouncing the great majority of mankind, of our fellow-men, do is it not? Now mankind (or the world) is what we have to work upon, is not it? Again, as we have said, I think, there is a higher thing than "self-renunciation," which/& that is - self-indulgence - the indulgence of the higher parts of yourself - I don't think t/That we ought to seek the offices which we dislike most. I think/has no truth in it. Those who have an attraction, a fitness (and I am sure these are many) for cooking & sweeping ought to be sent to do it, not those who have a dislike to it. To "forget themselves & to despise the praises of men" the Catholics say. But I think the way to "forget yourself," (which is certainly of the first importance) is to be so very much interested in some object out of yourself as that you can't remember yourself - If you are fully occupied, all your faculties in full & interesting exercise, you won't think about the praise of men, I believe."~~

~~Columba-~~

~~"But Napoleon thought about the praise of men, & his faculties were all in full & interesting exercise -"~~

~~Portia~~

~~"yes, I should rather have said, in/It must be full exercise for the work of God & mankind - The/To wish for reproach & contempt seems to me is an unnatural state. But not to think about it a very natural & healthy one" - You call Columba, I/It is the "livery" which Christ's servants wear. And you/we put on purple for your Bishops' servants' livery - that is the "livery of Christ" with you/us" - Portia, I admit your rebuke & return to my subject. I think, I/In "mortifying" ourselves to gain blessedness, in the "humbling ourselves that we may be exalted," (though this is certainly founded on the words of Christ,) that there is a good deal of the spirit of doing things for the sake of reward, & this, of course, is untrue & unhealthy."~~

~~Columba - "But don't you think there are many useful rules among the R. Catholic Orders?"~~

~~Portia - "Most useful - For instance in England It is a most useful rule, that of the religious orders, which forbids all that gossip, whether by pen or word. In England, one's whole time is taken up by letter-writing to one's friends & kindred."~~

~~Columba "But you don't agree with them about humility." -~~

~~"You see I think t/~~The Catholic Orders do get rid of their self=love & attain humility by dint of a very active, useful & interesting life, & they think they attain it by "self=examination," "compunction" & direct onsets upon themselves. The thing is to gain a virtue, not to root out a fault, nor to "root out" themselves, as they call it - and this ~~I think~~ they do, but not in the way they think - Also ~~I believe that~~ the rooting out of Individualism is not in the thought of God - ~~Also t/~~They say that they are leaving the "pleasures of the world" when they are serving the sick - Now ~~I say that~~ they are finding the "pleasures of the world".

~~"But what you find the most fault with, is my 'Thank God, we were not more hurt.' This however is peculiar neither to Catholics nor Protestants."~~

~~"I cannot think w/~~What do people do, nor how can they live, who think that most of our affairs are conducted by mankind, but that Providence interferes a little here & there to save them? ~~This is manifest by your language/~~The words "thank God we were not more hurt" implies this. ~~They/~~We have a vague kind of belief that "all is for the best," ~~they/we~~ don't exactly now why. But ~~I/we~~ should like to prove & to make real ~~the/~~this belief by shewing that every - the smallest thing happens by the "interposition" of Providence - that to wish one had done otherwise is downright impiety - for to wish anything different is

to wish that the whole Universe shall not be so happy as it is to be - ~~& then,~~ And even if I have wrecked my whole life & usefulness - by some mistake or fault of my own - still ~~it/~~this is true - ~~Then/~~If we could believe this, we should thank God for every *thing-*

for being so much hurt or for not being more hurt - we should believe that every thing happens by His Laws - This is not saying that nothing is to be otherwise for the future - For His Laws are for ~~that/~~the very purpose of enabling us to learn to do otherwise - It certainly is very remarkable how Christ always spoke as if everything came from God - But now the prevailing Theology is that God puts in His oar now & then to do some little particular thing - the rest? nobody knows who does the rest - man does as he wills ~~"I believe"~~, is the prevailing opinion, ~~"I believe."~~

~~"But, Portia, I want to come to your foundation for belief -"~~ Then, Foundation for belief it is said unless you

lay claim

to a particular inspiration, must be the 'individual' or the 'collective' reason ~~-I mean/~~i.e. the reason of each man for himself, or the accumulated reason of Christians taken together - Now, ~~you/~~it is said, we can hardly have such an unbounded confidence in your own reason as to substitute it for the "collective" reason of "the many."

"But, if the collective reason be collective error, then we only get an accumulation of errors from mankind, instead of an accumulation

of truth. If the life of mankind ~~were~~/is so organized as to make a collection of idiots, or a collection of Voltaires, then accumulated reason does not give accumulated truth but accumulated error. If, on the other hand, there are laws to secure a right constitution for man, & his life may be so organized as to improve that constitution, then you may expect 'right reason' from such constitutions, & from a collection of *such men*, *would* come collective truth. But no one seems to think of this. No one seems to think of a right constitution as necessary, by which to come at "truth."

~~"And that,~~/This is the reason why we go to the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church founds its faith, not upon private judgment but upon that which was believed "at all times, everywhere & by all men." The "historical tradition of the Church is the intellectual agreement of the Saints of God, the illuminated reason of those that believe."? "The Church in Councils is the judge which declares the tradition of the faith."

~~"I think t,~~/There is a vagueness even in the Catholic Church - Does the Catholic Church in Councils judge by the exercise of its own faculties? is it men coming together to judge by making the utmost use they can of their own understandings/ - ~~which~~/This is a comprehensible principle?~~o~~/Or does it come together, because God will so tell them by His Spirit what to

believe? If so, ~~I do not understand~~ why will He
~~will~~ not tell me by himself as well as all in
 Council? Why must they meet/ But ~~you~~
~~will say~~ the "promise" it is said, is only to the Church -
 not to one by himself - ~~It does not seem~~
~~to me however that it is w/~~What is believed
 "semper et ubique et ab omnibus" - is not however what is pressed upon
 us

by the Church - it is

what is believed by the Pope & the Cardinals &
 the priests, a number of men set apart to
 receive the "Spirit."

~~"But, Portia, the presumption of setting
 yourself against the belief of the world! If you
 are right, you had better leave people in
 their faith & not disturb it - And if you are
 wrong, why, Heaven help you!"~~

"People say often, 'how can you set yourself
 against the belief of the world?' But *why*
 do most of us believe? Because St. Paul
 believed - not from any real living belief
 in ourselves - It is no testimony to the truth
 of Astronomy that a number of us believe
 what Copernicus & Galileo have discovered.
~~& believed.~~ We have not examined. We only
 believe because they believed - ~~That/~~This is no
 testimony at all - The testimony is when
 people believe, in consequence of the working
 of their own faculties - It is often said, 'Why,
 all the world believes this' But if 'all the
 world believes it, only because St. Paul believed
 it, or ~~Galileo/~~Aristotle believed it, their belief adds
 no weight to the testimony of St. Paul or of

Aristotle which remains what it was before - It is reasoning in a circle -

do you believe this ~~Because Galileo/Aristotle would/what Aristotle~~ Why
believed?
believed?

~~believed it - And why does all the world believe it? Because Aristotle believe it. And why do you believe it because Aristotle believed it? Because all the world believes in him/it - And why does all the world believe it? Because Aristotle believed it. So the belief of a number, by reason only of its being a number adds nothing to the weight of a testimony - Do you suppose that/Was Galileo's certainty was strengthened by the after=belief of many? Do you suppose that Did he felt/feel at all less certain that the sun did not move before others believed in him/it, or more certain after they did? Do you suppose that/Did this it added/add anything to his conviction? And is there not moral proof/evidence as strong as Galileo's proof/evidence?~~

There was a time when one man alone believed that the sun stood still - ~~I do not suppose t/The assent of numbers added any/nothing to his certainty - or that- their dissent took anything/nothing from it -~~

~~It/Will it not be so with religious certainties?~~

{in another hand: Roy} XXII

"The end of the society," ~~said Columba, reading~~
~~out of /as the Rule of a Religious/certain Roman Catholic Order one~~
~~day/~~

states,

"is, ~~Portia,~~ 'to promote the sanctification of its
 members, & to exercise every work of charity,
 especially those which regard our neighbour's
 eternal welfare" Is the end of our "Society" with us to
 "promote the sanctification of its members & to
 exercise every work of charity, - especially those
 which regard our neighbour's eternal welfare?"

When we have a party what is the 'end'? ~~"is amusement/to be amused~~
~~"The end "is to be amused" said Portia, & comfort & to avoid doing/is~~
 to

be amused & to be comfortable

& to avoid doing anything which is unusual
 or inappropriate - having a bad dinner, for
 instance - or no fish - ~~that/this~~ would be most
 inappropriate." ~~"If there were any "end" in~~
~~Society, such as my book/the "Rule" mentions, said Columba,~~ "we should
 when the party was over, examine in order to
 see if we had made progress in the purpose,
 of which the express type was in our minds
 as the "end" of that party, - But why do we have "Society?" But
 t/There is

an

idea set down in people's minds, ~~"said Portia"~~ just as it
 is set down that one is to have a "good acquaint=
 ance," that to have "good, & clever & agreeable"
 people in one's house is "improving."

"But the "end" of ~~"good, & clever & agreeable"/~~ "Society"
~~people in Social life, is not I suppose," said I,~~
~~really to promote~~ "the sanctification of their neighbours/its
 members"

~~especially their eternal welfare -The words {illeg}~~
~~in such illeg words./especially not that "which regards their eternal~~
 welfare."

~~"No, it is not that~~ is a thing apart - ~~that~~
 is to be done on Sundays by going to church - &

some kneel down every night & confess their sins in order to do it. But the organization of Society has nothing to do with *that*. It is for something quite different - For "good, & clever & agreeable people" to meet together in a party to do the work of God, of course the words are absurd!

~~"Then w/What do they meet together for?"~~

~~"You may gain some information, if you like it but not for any express purpose. If one of the party is known to have a particular object, you would never think of taking him aside for an hour in the drawing-room in the evening & saying, 'Col Jebb, 'w/Would you tell me exactly how you organized your school?" that would be called "shop" or "spoiling the party" - or, if you did so, it would be felt to require an apology - Now, if the improvement of its members were the end of society, would it require any apology? But, "sentire della Speziera so that, if a man is famous for having successfully studied some special subject, you may allude to it, but you must {illeg} you must not "tire the rest of the company" by dwelling upon it - if you are very intimate with a person, you might do it, upon {illeg} by yourself/ in your own way, you would never think of doing it in 'Society' at a party." Columba~~

~~"Then the end of Society," said Portia, "is not the sanctification of its members, especially not that which regards their eternal welfare."~~

"But why do not "good, & clever & agreeable" people meeting together promote each other's ~~this/~~ "welfare"?, without making it a stiff & formal rule?" ~~said I.~~

"Because they meet for no object - for no express purpose - Even if they do talk together ~~for~~ upon interesting subjects, it is not with the intention of doing anything - it is with no "end" purpose - I heard a very "good, & clever & agreeable" man ~~say the other day,~~ who keeps a magnificent & most entertaining house for the reception of his friends, ~~say the other day,~~ "I like to be a suburban-~~I like to have~~ then my friends ~~down~~ come to see me from London - ~~& then because then they~~ & don't stay long enough for them ~~for them to tire me nor for me to tire~~ /to get tired of me nor for me to

get tired of them.'

If people had an object together, if they met for a purpose, if they ~~had a~~/met out of some sympathy for each other, this could not be the case - But saying this very thing proves, ~~does it not?~~ that ~~they~~ it is not so that they meet for no particular object but amusement - otherwise, the longer they were together, the more they would be interested - not the less -"

"But improvement forms no part in the business of Society, ~~said Columba,~~ "we go to be amused, not to further our objects. And yet we say that we "strive day by day after righteousness"? Do we, day by day, improve in it? Do ~~you suppose that~~ Mr. & Mrs. _____ improve every day?

~~"No, I should rather think,~~ ~~said Portia,~~ /Perhaps we should rather say that each person deteriorates a little day by day

The having to be interested about so many things which have no interest - the having no express type for the day or, if you have one, the not knowing whether you are realizing it or not, these things produce necessarily, as it appears to me, a slight deterioration daily."

~~"Then you would lay as great a stress upon self-examination, as St. Ignatius did?" said Columba~~

~~"Not I/In the present state of things, I should not say to "examine yourself" every day is not wise. Because so much of our life is, & must be, now spent in wailing now, that the effect, I think, would be depressing & discouraging, if, every evening, you were to be obliged to say, 'I have come no farther.' God does takes such as long time in/to teaching us our lessons. But every month & every year to examine whether we have advanced in the purpose for which we live, is simply the indispensable & natural consequence of that purpose."~~

~~"But would it not be better it is said to do that this every day? Bad habits grow so fast."~~

~~"If I were leading a very active life, as the R. Catholic orders do, if I were a physician, a man of business, then I think I could/we might do as S. Ignatius Loyola tells us, & "examine myself/ourselves twice a day", with great profit. But not in the life women we at present lead."~~

~~I should like to say to men, I/It is no use~~
 talking of salvation, unless you ask, "what shall
 I do to be saved?" ~~And then~~
 comes in - ~~But really w/What feeling does the "blood of Christ" that~~
 excite now among ~~such~~ educated men? ~~Do you~~
~~suppose/~~Are the historians, the men of science, the
 statesmen & legislators of the present day ~~are~~
 much influenced by the "blood of Christ"?

~~I should like to say to men! Now really, w/What~~
 expectation have you that in one year, that in
 five years from this time, you will have made
 progress towards perfection, that you will no
 longer be obliged to say that you have done
 nothing that is right & all that is wrong; - have
 you any prospect of being no more compelled
 to say this? - If not, would it not be possible
 to organize a life which will put you into
 circumstances in which you may expect, at
 the end of five years or ten years to have made
 some step towards perfection - "Be ye perfect,"
 Christ says - But who thinks of it?

Stationariness ~~seems to me/~~is the very essence
 of the Church of England - For she sets it down
 as a *principle* that we are to make no
 progress - Suppose those services, ~~which/~~as no
 doubt she intends, were to last for 500 years,
 (she intends them to last as long as the world
 lasts) then she expects that 500 years hence

(a)

~~Why n/~~Man is what God has made him -
 But, when we make mistakes, we pray & we
 beg God to "forgive" us, & say that it is a
 "mystery" & think about the Atonement we
 do not see that our mistakes are part of
 God's plan, & no "mystery" at all.

men are to be as sinful as they are now -
Indeed she sets it down as a dogma" -

~~"But is it not so, Portia? Is not the heart of
man's 'depravity' wicked? Can we expect life to
be ever much better than it is? "Lord, what is man?" that
thou are mindful of him?"~~

Insert 49a (a) ~~It does seem so curious/~~It is so strange that life
should

be

the only thing which we begin, without having a
type in our minds of what we mean it to be.
We don't even build a house, without seeing
exactly before us that which we intend it
should be, when it is finished - we don't begin
a drawing without knowing exactly what we
mean to make it - And *life*, which one
should think the most important, is the only
thing which people begin, without any type or
purpose at all before them.

And the Church is made rather to *prevent*
~~their~~/our having any. Because the Church is there
for us to obtain forgiveness for our sins & ~~thank~~
praise God & pray to Him - & nobody thinks
therefore of organizing a life which shall raise
us, so that we shall not sin any more. ~~She~~
~~rather prevents our doing that.~~

We live to make money for our families -
that is the only definite type. Those, who have
not *this*, live to amuse themselves. We don't live
to do the work of God. Going to church is to do
that - The Catholic Orders ~~do seem to me to have~~

f266v

50a

(a) ~~"The Church of England - not the Church of the Apostles - & what a real Church of England it is - so like John Bullish - so business=like - so brief & terse, I mean, & like a man of business. Have you done all that is wrong? well then, say that you are sorry, & we will absolve you - we have no time to hear what for."~~ like a matter of business - instead of all the ~~bother~~/trouble which the Church of Rome ~~makes~~/gives about sins - & about being sorry for them & saying them over one by one - & instead of ascertaining whether you are sorry before you are absolved."

~~"But what do you mean by calling the Church of England like~~

~~"He/John Bull will have plenty for his money - He will have his services long till he is quite tired - that he may have his money's worth - just like his concerts - plenty in them - no cheating - till he goes home yawning - So he has his confession, "lumping" all his praise, & then - his litany, asking for every imaginable thing, & ending with asking God for all men, for "mercy upon all men, lest he should have left out anything till there does not remain to God the smallest choice or judgment - & then his service, a good long one - three services in one that he may not have put on his best clothes nor paid all his tithes for nothing - "Let me or by have my money's worth" he says.~~

f267

50b

But ~~I think that~~ our indifference to what we have said/~~say~~ & pray/& asked for is really extraordinary. That we really should not know nor care whether all those prayers which we have made will be answered or not! That we should not think, what a God this must be who does these things only because we suggest them to Him! It shews such a want of care about religion that we should never look to see the result of ~~our~~/these prayers - (for we are always ~~almost~~ surprised when they are answered) We have done our duty in praying for people - that is enough - we cannot stay to see whether ~~we are answered~~ they ~~get it receive~~ "get anything in consequence" by it."

been perhaps the only system (excepting perhaps/indeed the Moravians) for the purpose of organizing the life according to the religious belief) ~~And they made a great many mistakes.~~

And now, while life is organized so as to quench very much any religious feeling or belief, or, at least, not at all in reference to it - we say that the "heart of man is desperately wicked" - poor "Man"!

"But some do try, while leading the usual life, to introduce their religious belief into every part of it. ~~The Evangelicals/ism does this - and the Puseyites/ism. with their~~

~~Which I have no doubt~~ The daily services do no doubt introduce God into their lives. But, ~~as far as I know,~~ none excepting the Moravians & the Religious Orders, have organized life upon the model of their religious belief - have set as its purpose to do the work of God & of the world."

"But what is all this immense body, this organization, which we call the Established Church?"
Insert 50a (a) When ~~I~~/one sees a spire or a church=tower, ~~I~~/one asks ~~my~~/oneself, "how ~~came~~/got it there"? did the spirit of Devotion place it there? ~~It does not seem to me so - It seems to me/Was it not rather that the spirit of Order, of Propriety, of Duty? placed it there"~~

"If religion is that which bears fruits in the life ~~is there, Portia,~~ is there any religion now? ~~I mean,~~ should we be in any way different from what we are now, if we had no religion? Religion

is that which makes us, ~~as you say,~~ go to church, which makes us say grace - &c. But does religion make any difference in our lives? ~~I mean,~~ if it were all swept off tomorrow, would there be any difference in us?"
 {in another hand: illeg Gully?}

"Religion is a feeling towards a good Being - You see, ~~I think that w/We~~ have believed that Power gave rights & we have worshipped a Being with power but not with goodness. Should we call fear of a Deity a religion? ~~I can hardly/~~Can we call Calvin's a religion? A God who, for no other reason than His own "good pleasure," pre-doomed/s some beings to happiness for eternity & some to misery for eternity - or a God who ~~should~~ destroys some of His children for the benefit of others - ~~to such a God I should hardly call our 'tie' a religion."~~

~~"You think a religion must be towards goodness in power."~~

"It is the ~~old~~/common mistake that Might makes Right. The clay must not say to the potter, ~~we are told,~~'Why didst thou make me so?' But the conscious intelligence may & ought to question its Maker's ways & say if they are according to Right. Because He is more powerful than we are, is that a reason why He should do according to His fancy? It is an old confusion between Might & Right. At first, some power greater than human was all that was recognized, then almighty power - & it was thought that that power gave the Powerful the right to do anything

He pleased & that the clay, the vessel must not question it. 'Shall the clay say to him that fashioned it, What makest thou?' It was not perceived that He has the power to do everything which is *according to* Wisdom & Goodness, He being Goodness & Wisdom Himself.

~~"Then you think the 'potter' is Goodness Wisdom & the clay is to examine whether it is made according to wisdom & goodness."~~

~~"I think that w/We are to understand the nature of God & that we can make no progress without such understanding - I think t/The whole doctrine of a future state depends upon it & all our capability of perfection."~~

~~"I do not believe that f/It is hardly an acknowledged principle that mankind is to make progress - In politics, in the Church, as you say, is it their principle? Is it the principle of the statesmen at the head of affairs? if you were to ask him? His principle is to keep in office - to keep the party in good humour &c."~~

~~"But we cannot doubt can we? that it is God's thought that man shall progress towards perfection - And, if we are asked what means God has given to/for us to accomplish His thought? God has given Himself~~

& His Laws."

~~"But, Portia, I want to know what you mean when you say that belief in a future state depends upon the 'clay' questioning the~~

~~potter's ways, upon getting rid of the old belief that Might makes Right & understanding the nature of God?"~~

"The old belief was that a God was a being a little more powerful than ourselves; does this authorize him to commit murder & robbery? does the possession of any degree of power - of almighty power, - justify a being in murdering/killing & stealing? ~~I believe that it might be proved that, I/If God lets us die, this is could be murder" -~~

~~"But, If our/my experience benefits a whole generation to come, may I/we not be content that they should have my experience, without my being perpetuated in life?"~~

~~"I believe t/This would be stealing robbery - stealing my experience in order to benefit my/man=kind. If you rob me in order to give to others, it is not the less stealing - If God, too, kills a Be/being whom he has called into life, that it is worse than murder, it is infanticide/a father killing his child. And what should we think of a parent killing one of his children for the sake of the rest?"~~

~~"But we do die"~~

~~"I believe w/We never die at I don't believe we die at all - But oh! the/What a waste it seems to me/would be not to have a future state! And God never wastes - there is a human being with all this depth of thought & feeling, which~~

(a)

If we admit these four things, viz that

- (1) human will is regulated by law
- that (2) there is a perfect Being
- that (3) a perfect Being could not ~~to~~ will one
to suffer for the good of the rest
- that (4) there must be human existences not worth
having by His Law

it would seem that a future state follows.

But there is absolute childish ignorance about all these subjects. We have not yet determined whether will is regulated by law, like other things- or whether it regulates itself & is without law.

⊕/In all other subjects, we are advancing rapidly.

In Moral Philosophy alone, the most important of all, we are like children - Nay worse, we are like those judges who shut up Galileo for saying that the earth moved - If we could but

admit ~~the~~/is one truth that will is regulated by law, ~~think~~ what a difference it would

make in our feelings towards each other - what a difference it would make in Criminal

Jurisprudence! Serjeant Adams would be no more giving his two months' to juvenile criminals.

Ragged schools would be done away with, & means would be taken ~~illeg~~/for reformation.

he can never work out here, never even communicate to any ~~one~~ body else, with all these plans, these riches of affection, this ripening wisdom, all crushed out at once - & God sits up there, the spectator of all this play-acting - He is the only one to profit by it. We are to have no good of all this, which we have been acting merely as a drama for His benefit. How unlike God! *He is to watch us perfecting things for His amusement.*"

"But is He to take care to provide an eternity for every poor creature which ~~a~~/any man & woman who choose to ~~marry~~/come together, bring upon His hands? This is the question the Materialists ask." ~~& justly, it seems to me.~~"

"And ~~I~~/we answer, yes, He is, if you acknowledge that it is by His Laws that these men & women ~~marry~~/come together & that these poor creatures come into the world. (a) Insert 54 a.

~~"Well, Portia, you need not trouble yourself to prove.~~ It is said ~~for~~ every body believes in ~~one~~ a future state whether proved or not.?"

~~"But do they? I should/We say that nobody believes in one - that ~~I~~/we hardly know anyone who really thinks there will be a future state. I always think of my/A dear Aunt/old friend of mine - the most affectionate of human beings - ~~There she is,~~ speaks/~~ing~~ of her sister whom she lost 58 years ago with the same emotion as if it were an hour ago - though, according to her cries,~~

she ought to believe that she will see her again in a year or two. And ~~only think~~ if it were discovered that this sister had not died, that she were now alive, ~~I can fancy her/cannot you/my~~ old friend would riseing

from

her paralytic bed & walking to meet her, if she thought that she were really going to see her! But ~~a future state how little it is/hardly~~ anything can be less believed

in! ~~It cannot be less~~ than a future state.

~~"Well, Portia, we have diverged about the future state - Let us return to what you were saying.~~

~~"Oh w/What a thing/blessing it would be if we could believe in a future state!/ "eternal life"! But that is a parenthesis And the belief in a future state But this belief depends, too, upon our belief in a capability of progress & perfection - So, Portia, let us return to what you/we were saying about this- and who believes in this?"~~

~~"Well I do believe that your r/Religious Orders may really "perform every day better & better the duties of their state" But do we? do we ever think of anything else but confessing that we do not? have we any type before us at all in performing them?"~~

~~"But surely, t/The main idea, of/ it is said in most people's lives is that of duty. Most of us go into society because we think it right."~~

~~"But have we any type or purpose when there? to make it a service to God? † would not say a service, but a-/to make it in conformity with God. Supposing I were to announce to day at dinner that the 'end of society' is to 'promote~~

the spiritual advancement of the brotherhood, how people would wonder & none more so than ~~that good/the~~ clergyman! - It is said that God is everywhere - But ~~I don't think~~ He is not in Society - or, at least, if He is, we can't find Him there "

"But does ~~that good/the~~ clergyman do nothing of our 'spiritual advancement'?"

"Well, I really don't know what our clergyman does for us - I believe that, a/As there are physicians for the body, so probably will there always be physicians for the soul. The Roman Catholic priest does make some attempt at regulating the life of his patients - But the ~~Protestant priest, I don't know what he does -~~ He/Anglican clergyman - he makes no effort to alter or improve the organization of life = He has to preach the Atonement - ~~He makes-~~ not any systematic arrangement for our committing no more sins - On the contrary, he has to represent the committing of sins as the normal state - &/he offers no hope that it ever will be otherwise. He has to say the form once or twice a week proclaiming that we never expect it to be otherwise, & it is no use hoping for it confessing that it is all wrong - He has not to think of any organization/ing of life, so that *life* shall put us in the way of perfection - he has to confess the sins for us when they are done; - in a form - shewing how little we expect a change."

"But does not Christ praise the man who said "God be merciful to me sinner'?"

~~"No doubt, that Lord have mercy upon us' is founded upon 'God be merciful to me a sinner' Almost~~

all our practices are not doubt based upon words of Christ's- He says that that man went home 'justified'- & no doubt we think that, by saying 'Lord, have mercy upon us' so many times, we shall be "justified" - that we have done something to justify us, to please God to find favour with Him."

~~"Not to find favour with Him, but to obtain the love of God in ourselves"~~

~~"But is do you think praying for the love of God is the way to attain it?"~~

~~"If two of you shall agree" in prayer, "it shall be done for them," what remarkable words those are! "And how odd/How strange that Protestants should never have laid hold of that text! Catholics have their Novenas & their praying Orders. But I don't see that Protestants act as if they believed it at all/not."~~

‡ Should we not be miserable if ‡/we were to think that ~~my/our poor mother's~~/friend's suffering had been a *dispensation*, as it is called, of Providence, sent by Him - or, on the other hand, that ‡/we could, by praying, have saved her from it. The Catholics, who follow everything logically out to its extreme, have whole societies who spend their lives on their knees - And indeed, how unkind it does seem, if you can save a person by praying, not to be constantly doing it, how unkind it seems ever to be doing anything else!

But it cannot be right & wise that she

should recover, for then God would do it *without* our asking for it. If it is right & wise that she should be spared this suffering, will not Wisdom & Righteousness do it & not wait for us to tell Him?

~~I do think I~~/It is so curious that people should have common sense about ordering a gown & should not have common sense about such great subjects! They pray & they don't enquire whether they will be answered or not. Miss S. Says ~~to me~~ that her father was prayed for at church, & that he was a little better - all the time he was being "prayed for". The poor old man became worse again immediately afterwards & died. ~~all the same.~~ Now ~~that~~/this is such a way for God to do His affairs! If it were wise & right that the old man should be better, what a thing to make it depend upon their prayers!

They say that a religion without miracles must be dull, & ~~I can conceive that~~ Saint Teresa's belief in miracles certainly made her happy. It has a cheerful effect to have a miracle worked every week, & to be expecting a miracles, - like Miss S., every day - only that it makes God look like a juggler - But those *old* miracles, ~~I do not believe that they~~ have they any effect now at all? ~~Do you think that~~/Is any body is, or has any body ever been, in the least surprised by them? and yet a miracle, ~~one would think,~~ *ought* to be surprising - Does not this shew that they do not believe them? ~~Do you suppose~~

~~that~~ Does the House of Commons believes that Christ made water into wine, or that he raised Lazarus? - It *thinks* it does - And yet it ought to be surprised that a dead man rose up - ~~Do you think/~~Has this ~~has~~ any effect upon them as a surprising instance of God's power?

~~I don't think that/~~Would a religion without miracles ~~would~~ be dull, ~~because~~ if people ~~don't seem/~~are not now in the least surprised or impressed when they hear them read in church, nor can ~~they~~ ever remember a time when they were surprised or impressed? & yet there must have been a first time when they heard them. But ~~do you suppose~~ have they the least effect upon them any way? Then/~~Therefore~~ ~~I cannot think that~~ would religion be dull if they were taken away? Surely the invariableness & goodness of God's law is much more sublime & awful than just asking for a thing & not knowing whether you will ~~get/~~have it or not, &/but thinking that God will *perhaps* be directed by you.

In all physical things, God's law is invariable. We know that, if we eat night=shade, we shall perish. We take means that our children shall not eat night=shade. we dig it out of our gardens - We don't pray that it may *not* take effect.

We know that certain organizations in certain circumstances will become criminal - The law is invariable - Why do we not take

means as in the former case? - why do we, instead of this, think that God will alter His righteous law, His invariable law, - by the invariableness only of which we can learn - for our prayer?

To think that, in 15000 churches this morning, ~~they~~/people are hearing about Balaam - & to think that learned men & good men can ~~think~~/consider so little as that they can go to church to praise God & tell Him that that is goodness which would be badness, if it were at all, & that that is Wisdom which is folly! They say that, when a man has committed a murder, - tho' the consequences of that murder remain the same & must remain the same in him by the laws of God - yet, if he will but believe in a Saviour's "blood," he is free from them - And then they praise God for His wonderful works! It is like irony!

~~"Oh! Portia, how you will shock people!"~~

~~"I think you will find that n/Nobody does believe the things, which ~~they~~/people will be most shocked at you for saying you don't believe Nobody does really believe, though ~~they~~/people think they do, the Miracles, the Atonement, or any of the things which they would be most shocked at your disbelieving - (On the contrary, I/we believe many things which they don't believe. an eternal life - the goodness of God - though they say they do)~~

{in another hand: Cliff} XX/VIII

~~"Well, Portia, on the whole I think you think that the Catholic Orders are the only pl/means to 'turn away from evil' on our road to perfection, & to 'cleanse the soul from iniquity.'~~

"Turning away from evil" ~~I hardly think to be/is~~ not the means for good - but running after good - "Cleansing the soul from iniquity" ~~I don't think/~~ does not answer but rather taking every means to feel & think & do what is good. If ~~I/we~~ are thinking of "self-mortification," ~~you/we~~ are thinking of ~~yourself/ourselves,~~ ~~yourself~~ whom ~~you/we~~ had better forget - It ~~seems to me,~~ is in itself a kind of self-seeking - And ~~I cannot but think that~~ the end is attained much better by going out of ~~yourself/ourselves~~ than by stamping upon ~~yourself/ourselves~~."

~~"But do not you think that l/Luxury indeed enslaves the soul & prevents it her from being/renders her un=fit for charity? Is not a/All history is an example to us how nations decline when given up to ease, & seated in their easy chairs.?"~~— Soft chairs & luxuries are an impediment

to love & charity. But ~~do you believe that,~~ if ~~you/we~~ were to put such nations upon hard chairs, ~~that~~ would they do anything for the world?"

~~"Then, Portia, t/~~There is so little of the "spirit of understanding" now. "One great duty which we owe to God is faith in His Providence, which is made known to us by external circumstances, well considered by the light of reason & divine grace" ~~Now what part of this do we obey?/say~~ the Roman Catholics.

~~"I would not say that w/~~We do not owe it ~~is/~~as a *duty* to God to have faith in His Providence - But, if we rightly understood His Providence, as it is "made known to us by external circumstances, considered by the light of reason" & of feeling, we *must* have, we cannot but have faith in it. "I know in whom I have believed" are ~~such~~ pregnant words. But how few *do* "know"! - To "do things *considerately*"- How few ever do any thing with consideration! And yet ~~I suppose~~ the least thing would be better done, if done with consideration."

"Doing all things with consideration & disregarding all human feelings & inclinations," is the Catholic precept.

~~I would not say/~~It is not disregarding ~~y/~~our natural feelings & inclinations - but endeavouring that ~~y/~~our *nature* shall be such that ~~y/~~our *natural* feelings will be those ~~that/~~which ~~you/~~we can follow - that is the wise course - ~~You~~

The Roman Catholic says that I am "not to seek my own interest, but to be intent solely upon the work of God & upon the benefit of my neighbour." It should ~~wish~~ ~~it to be my own~~ interest, the greatest interest I have, to do the work of God & the world. "To benefit my brethren" would then be to "seek my own interest."

~~"But can we ever expect that t/~~The Law of Love ~~is/~~& that of our own feelings & inclinations ~~will/~~may be the same?" ~~"I should think they may~~ How many ~~things/~~laws have now become the strongest impulse of our own feelings which were formerly not even acknowledged to be laws?

Take a ~~most~~ glaring instance - It seems of the most civilized nations of antiquity, the marriage of a brother & sister was not only tolerated, but was almost enjoined, as in the case of the Ptolemies. ~~It is now ill~~ Experience proved such marriages to be fatal to a race - ~~illeg~~/They are now illegal - & what is more, the ~~very~~ strongest feelings, ~~of~~ which exist in our nature are enlisted against them - they are become not illegitimate but, simply impossible - a crime we ~~can~~/may not even think of -

~~I should like a~~/All moral laws ~~to~~/should be thus unmistakably ~~the off~~ supported by our warmest impulses, as this physical law is by our - instinct, we should say, were it not that we see (by history) it is not instinct, but - experience- Here we say, it is not duty, ~~but~~/it is *nature* - such a crime is *unnatural*, ~~we say~~, we do not say, "disregard your *natural* feelings & inclinations." So ~~I should like~~ it should be our object to create in ~~us~~/ourselves such a nature that the seeking our selfish interest would be *unnatural*, & that the *not* doing God's work would be "disregar=
ding our *natural* feelings & inclinations."

The mistake is in considering man a selfish animal - If ~~you~~/we mean by 'selfish,' one constituted by God to follow His highest satisfaction, man *is* a selfish animal - But well constituted & well developed man is a generous, a devoted animal, devoted to God & mankind - And devotion to God & mankind *is* his highest satisfaction - his greatest self=
ishness.

The Roman Catholics talk about "abnegation of will" Abnegation of will is the exercise of the highest will - the will, that is, of the highest part of us - "Mortification" is not the highest pursuit of the soul - To "mortify ourselves" is to think of ourselves. To do the work of God & mankind is the highest work. And ~~you~~/we could trust more, if ~~you~~/we could do this work, enjoying the feast which God has carefully prepared for us, yet able to leave it instantly *for His work* - than if ~~you~~/we make ~~yourself~~/ourselves uncomfortable, for fear ~~you~~/we should not be able to leave your comforts--"

"It is the rule of the Catholic Orders "to seek zealously greater denial of self in all things & as much as possible continual mortification"

~~I must say I think~~ it gives them far greater liberty of spirit & much more freedom to serve God. It sets them free from all those little "*recherches*" which perplex & enslave us - & particularly damage those who make "a God of their belly."

~~Well~~/But it is not a very high pursuit to make oneself uncomfortable - though it is a higher pursuit, ~~I acknowledge~~/certainly, than making oneself comfortable. But ~~it seems to me that~~ we may embrace & welcome what *comes* in the way of making us uncomfortable, instead of shrinking from it - as wishing to be one with God - & this without putting ourselves in the way of it - Oneness with God, benevolence towards

man, & interest in the exercise of one's faculties
~~seem as if they~~ ought to be the "end of Society" -
 & if they were so, we should take with thankfulness
 the comfort & with thankfulness the discomfort -
 as being one with God -

~~You see t/~~The Roman Catholics always take the
 bull by the horns. They say, 'for fear I should
 not be able to leave my comforts, I will ~~be always~~
~~making/make~~ myself always uncomfortable - for fear I should
 prefer *anything* to God's work, I will prefer to have
nothing' But ~~I think you/we~~ are in a higher state,
 if ~~you/we~~ leave, for instance, ~~y/our~~ warm bed or ~~y/our~~
 good dinner ~~fo~~ at God's call for something which
 would be to you a higher gratification, something
 for God or for man, than if ~~you were to keep y/we~~ make our
 bed cold or no bed at all, & ~~y/our~~ dinner distasteful
 or no dinner at all, for fear ~~you/we~~ should not be
 able to leave them at such a call."

~~"But what do those expressions mean about
 being 'buried with Him, the/our old man being crucified
 with Him?"~~

{in another hand: Moss} ~~"I don't think I/It~~ would not be found
 necessary to

"bury" the "old man" - ~~I think you would find a/A~~
 new man would spring up directly in a life organized
 to call out the religious feeling - instead of
 being organized to depress it."

~~"Yes, but the Religious Orders have it already for a
 rule, 'only 'to give ear to discourse only tending to
 good.'"~~

~~"Why, w/~~What discourse "tends to good" now?

If we ~~only~~ "gave ear" to such only, to what discourse
 should we give ear? To "live apart" from men, ~~as~~
~~your friends call it,~~ is now perhaps wise -

there is so little to be gained from men but,
 if we were all in progress towards perfection, we
 should gain by living together - In order to make this possible, the
 Catholic

Orders lay down certain rules - They are "to keep
 nothing hidden from their Superior" & to be glad
 when their defects are told by others to the Superior -
 They are to feel an "equal love for all men" - to
 give up their own opinion & judgment for that of
 another - to wish to be accounted fools - to esteem every man superior
 to

themselves - ~~Another~~ They are to strive that "holy obedience" may be
 perfect in all its parts, in the outward action, in
 the will & in the understanding - They are "to hate the things
 which the world loves & cherishes, &/to cultivate the
 spirit of mortification, &/to choose always the poorest & worse
 things of the house." If we did not look upon fault as blame,
 if we really wished to do the work of God & to
 improve *in order to* do it, if our Master or
 Leader or Superior were really our spiritual
 physician, we too should wish our faults to be told
 to him, we too would not feel humiliated by it, (just
 as we are, ~~much obliged~~ when ill, grateful to any one who will
 explain our symptoms to our Doctor) not for the
 sake of "mortifying" ourself, but for the sake of
 true improvement.

~~I see the entirely the/~~There is a necessity ~~of/~~for perfect
 "obedience"

in good works & in learning individual things -
 But ~~I don't see how~~ the whole being ~~can/~~is not to be
 given up - for ~~I see/~~there is no one who has the power
 to conduct the whole being.

God the "Superior=General". For each great
 work & department a human "Superior", under
 whose guidance ~~you implicitly~~ we place ~~yourself/~~ourselves, &

in whom ~~you do~~/we really recognise the voice of God - because if we were to listen to His voice in *everything* that He says, we could not hear - He is speaking in everything all day long. We cannot, each of us, listen to all. Each had better listen in his or her peculiar department & communicate to the others - Then we should be truly said to be listening to the voice of God, when listening to these. This is not rendering up the whole being to any one - It is each man hearing the voice of God as well as he can in the one thing for the rest - Each is the Superior in one thing. We cannot be supposed to listen to the voice of God in Astronomy, in Chemistry, in Theology, in Natural History - In all these things ~~& in~~ there must be leaders ~~to~~/for each.

Obedience frees the mind, (which is ~~such~~ a great help) from 'Shall I do this little thing or that?' And for the Superior to be freed from the consideration, 'Shall I be obeyed or not?' is ~~quite~~ necessary - Without these things, no great work can be done -

"Let us do instantly whatever we have to do, without even staying to finish the letter we are making," ~~as~~ the Roman Catholics say "For it is the voice of God that calls." It is the Spirit of Order or Punctuality or Duty, & that is the ~~voice~~/spirit of God.

But ~~I don't think~~ it is *not* the thought of God that we should be like a "dead body" - surrendering up the whole being to the Superior.

~~What are the other things that/which you/they say?~~
~~I don't know that I/We cannot "feel an equal love for~~
~~all men." It seems to me that o/Our interest for~~
~~them must be in proportion to how much we~~
~~know them.~~

~~I do not see h/How can you "give up your~~
~~own opinion for that of another"? Because I/It is~~
~~yours - It is like saying that you can become~~
~~another person - that you can see that that blue~~
~~is green.~~

To "esteem every one superior to ourselves"
 would, if pushed to its ultimate practical
 consequences, become folly & untruth. Then
 would a Galileo be seen giving up his opinion
 to any ignoramus.

To "wish to be accounted a fool" when you
 are not a fool is to wish that some one should
 make a mistake, an error in judgment.

There may be a pride even in humility,
 a self-seeking in suffering "abjection" (all pride
 is, ~~I suppose,~~ the effect of a narrowness of view)
 & therefore it ~~appears to me/is~~ far safer not to
 be thinking about ~~yourself/ourselves~~ than to be seeking
 for "mortification" - Besides, ~~I rather think~~
 it is ungrateful to God when he is seeking to
 give you pleasure, always to take the worst -
not that some one else may have the best but
only for the sake of mortifying yourself - &
especially, if you do this for the sake of having
the best in another world, as Christ's words
~~almost lead you to do -~~

To "renounce worldly enjoyment" ~~you/they say/~~implies a mistake -
~~as I/we have said, I should wish it to/It should be my/our~~
 enjoyment to do the world's work -

~~I don't find that it/It does not helps me, do you?/us, to~~
 "hate" any thing - ~~I am sure that o/One might~~
 easily excite oneself to hate all these luxuries -
 But ~~I don't think it does me any/us no good"~~

"The Catholics say that, "through love of
 Christ's poverty, the religious man should be
 glad when he has the poorest & worst things"
 in the house"

~~We must think that Christ made/ It is/Surely it is a~~
 mistake in/to recommending poverty. Surely it is
 a higher pursuit to have property, in order
 that we may devote it to Him & do His work
 with it."

~~I never know, Portia, what you think of~~
 Christ. I could not speak of Him as you do."

~~I think that He /Christ was perhaps the most spiritual~~
 {illeg}/being
 that/who has ever lived - But ~~I think that/surely he made~~
 mistakes. He is ~~always/generally considered either as~~
 God or as an impostor - Now ~~I believe that~~
 much progress cannot be made unless we admit
 that he made mistakes, & we, Protestants, who
 profess to be the upholders of the Bible, do
 admit it practically - though we assert theore=
 tically that He was plenarily inspired, a man=God ~~What~~
~~do we we Protestants for instance/we~~ what do we Boards
 of Guardians make for instance of this his counsels of "poverty"?
~~I believe, also, that t/Those who do not admit~~
 His wonderful spirituality cannot make much
 progress either. He was not ~~reasoning/a~~ reasoner certainly.
 For sometimes he speaks of leaving father & mother
 & lands as a sacrifice, & offers compensation
 elsewhere. And sometimes he tells us to hate them
 & then it cannot be a sacrifice. He certainly was

so indignant with the lukewarm spirit of the times which was always making excuses - that he spoke in very strong words, 'Let the dead bury their dead' - 'Hate your father & your mother.' 'Who is my mother & my brethren?'"

{In another hand: illeg Murphy?} ~~"But what is the truth of the matter practically?"~~

~~"The truth of the matter I believe to be /is probably that the attraction between husband & wife, & between all other friends should be this that those two can do the work of God better together than apart - & then you/there would have/be no occasion to "leave them for His name's sake," but the contrary - When you have taken a wife & undertaken the responsibility of children without any such attraction, I don't see/certainly there is how you can/no right in leave/leaving them - With regard to leaving brothers & sisters & father & mother, you have undertaken no charge with regard to them, & we believe, I think, that these should be left anyhow for God's work."~~

~~"You see Christ spoke "with such authority" it is said That had such a wonderful effect "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God" "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thy self."~~

~~"But I do not see that that does any good, He said, 'Thou shall love the Lord thy God' but I do not think that/But the command does not elicit the feeling - We do not say, Thou shalt love thy husband or thy dearest friend. The thing is to shew God to be such a Being as one can love - as one must love I do not think that Christ's God was not such Oh! What a Gospel there is to proclaim - the~~

"good news" of a *Perfect Being*. ~~That~~/This *is* a Gospel & which has never yet been preached - We have much more to do than Christ had.

~~"But it is we who made God."~~

"It is said that we make God - make Him after our own image - But surely we can trace the existence of a Spirit of Righteousness, of Wisdom & Goodness, *not ourselves*. ~~I expect that we shall be able to~~/We can go further & ~~prove~~/shew that *all would be as it is*, if there were a Spirit of perfect Goodness & Wisdom - & would not this be evidence/~~all the proof we can desire~~ that such a Spirit *is*?

~~I expect that t~~/There are depths of intense bliss, yet unknown in the perfect trust & reverence, the untold happiness which to live consciously in the presence of such a Being must be. St. Paul felt it. Perhaps that "eye hath not seen nor ear heard neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him." And yet *his* God was far inferior to our God.

Luther left *his* God just as he found Him He only swept some absurdities. All he did was negative - But think what, if we did realize what He is - (not *all* that He is - for truly *is* it said that He is incomprehensible) but if we did realize Him, - not thro' *special* Providences, but thro' *all* His Providences, think what it would be to live in His Presence, devoted to Him!

Think what the gratitude would be! Now we have such queer gratitude - We are grateful to Him for having broken one arm & not two - but if we could be grateful to Him for His laws, those essences of perfect Goodness & Wisdom, what

gratitude that would be!

There are three phases of Theology - the miraculous, the supernatural, & the "positive" Theology (to borrow Comte's word) At first, ~~I think~~ it is quite natural (in an infant state) that infants should think God works by miracles, & should see Him in miracles & not in Law - then that they should see Him in special Providences, which is really almost the same thing as the first - that is the supernatural Theology - Lastly, we see Him in Law. But Law is still a Theology & the finest x

We love that which is loveable & surely we must love the god of the perfect Laws."

"But how silent God is! Through all this difficulty & suffering, when just to hear His voice would inspirit us to do anything, He remains silent."

~~I think that t/~~That silence is so speaking - We could not resist the temptation, ~~I am sure, to speak~~ which, humanly speaking, to so loving a Father it must be to speak. But He does - Because, if He speaks at all, He must speak always - & then we should be machines - We must be either interfered with occasionally - or passive recipients of perfection, which if we could see it, we should feel to be a contradiction."

~~But, Portia, I don't see that you/~~This belief will makes no martyrs it is said. ~~I see/~~There are none martyrs now - And ~~I think it is from that~~ this belief in the God of "Law" will make none."

~~You see, I/~~In former days, the Christians thought that they had nothing to do but to testify to God -

x Comte says that there are three Phases - the Theological, - the Metaphysical & the Positive - as if the theory of Law were not the finest

Theology of all.

f290v

(a)

Their way was easy, compared to ours - For Christ had to prepare ~~f~~ men for death, not life - & His followers had to hear their testimony, & if they were made martyrs, so much the better."

It did not matter whether their truth were received or not - If it were not, they would still be martyrs, & would go straight to God - It did not matter that their persecutors would be then in the farthest possible state from receiving the truth, in the very opposite of the state in which they *wished* them to be, ~~we may suppose,~~ when proclaiming that truth -

But we have now no truth which we are sure of, which we wish to proclaim, which we feel any thing at all about. It is therefore no wonder that we have not the zeal of the martyrs.

But, having a truth, we may have a wisdom in choosing how & when to speak, which they had not, because they were thinking of a crown for themselves - Let us, with more wisdom, have the same or a higher zeal. Insert a) 70a opposite page

"What zeal does he experience for the attainment of perfection? is one of the questions the Catholic orders ask" -

"And were that question asked of anybody here, do you suppose that *they* feel *any*?"

"The Catholics say that "everything is to be preserved for the honour of our Lord alone, & therefore held sacred, that nothing be wasted - thus all actions, even the most common & trifling, will be sanctified!"

"We cannot say to our servants "This is God's - you must not waste it" but "this is mine - you must not waste it" & that makes all the difference"--

"Not to be curious about trifles' is another rule."

~~"I am sure that is a good one — b/But indeed, in
"Society," what else is there but trifles?" — I should~~

~~"The Religious Orders insist upon the *intention*,
that every action may be done to God, thro' the best
& purest motive."~~

~~"I should like, too, /We ought always to know the moment ~~my~~/our
intention is wrong - ~~I think i~~/It is possible to know
directly whether one's intention is with God or not,
just as one is conscious one is cold, even though one
should not be able to alter it directly."~~

~~We are the *activity* of God. — I believe that
is His thought. — He can do nothing but by us."~~

~~— "But He does not want us."~~

~~— "He wants us so much that He can do
nothing without us, & we are to work out His
thought~~

~~"I cannot understand," said Fulgentia one day, I cannot understand, Portia, the revival of Roman Catholicism in England. They say that one half the Roman Catholics at this moment in England are converts."~~

{in another hand: illeg Shaieer}

"Wesley was the first man who brought about the renewal of Roman Catholicism in England. For he first shook the Church of England. People had never thought of enquiring before. The Church of England ~~says/said~~, 'don't use your own judgment' & she remained unquestioned - But *then* people began to see that, in the Church, some maintained the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, & some did not - among the Wesleyans some held Calvinism & some did not - & they began to look about for what they were to believe - Only one church could offer them "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God" - The Church of England now said, 'Use your own judgment - but only so far as to see that the Church of Rome is wrong.' she said, 'Look at the Bible' - but people looked to the Bible & the Bible said ~~that~~/"one Lord &c" & ~~that~~/this once admitted, authority once admitted, the Church of Rome must follow - The Church of England, again says, 'don't use your own judgment, or at least you will be damned if you do', vide Athanasian Creed - Dr. Arnold led the way to Puseyism - he urged an earnest religion - an earnest religion in authority - ~~he did not say, think for yourselves, he only said, be earnest,~~ - & Puseyism naturally followed. So Wesley strengthened the hands of the Church - he diminished their members, but moralized their

(a)

~~"Don't you think it is rather/It is said that the persecution of the Catholics which has led to their increase?"~~

~~"I don't believe that t/There is a/no Law which makes persecution favourable to development. A perse=~~
cution which weakens or paralyzes the organi=
zation, (& a slow system of disabilities, the depri=
ving us of education & privileges tends to this) such
persecution destroys. The Emancipation Act
gave an immense impulse to Roman Catholicism,
in England just as its worst enemies said it would. But
any persecution which tends to make a thing
conspicuous, to attract attention of any kind, to
bring it forward, & which does not tend to
enfeeble, such as the persecution of the early
Christians, - the murders, tortures, blood which
made their faith notable, - which made people
ask, What is this which enables them to bear
so much?- such persecution gives to the persecuted
power, it is true - But, in England, since the
Catholic Emancipation Act, converts have
increased."

lives - & thus the Church was really strengthened, namely by the increased morality of their clergy, So Luther moralized the Church of Rome. We ~~always~~/often do what we don't intend, while at the same time doing what we do intend. Dr. Arnold urged earnestness in religion, without saying "think for yourselves" - & by his influence he produced a great feeling in religion - but then his pupils began to want authority - if "to believe" was of great importance to them, they wanted to know what they should believe. The Church of England did not tell them, or at least it told them different & contradictory things - & they had recourse to a stricter authority. In the same way, the moralization of the Church of England led to the Church of Rome - Insert (a)

opposite page
145a.

~~"But, Portia, you must use your judgment to enter the Church of Rome."~~

"The Roman Catholics say, the Church shall think for me. "I can't understand, but I will believe, ~~a far finer~~ because the Church tells me so." - a far finer spirit. The Protestants *protest* - that is the meaning of the word - they protest against any one thinking for them - but they don't think for themselves - They say, "I am far too busy to think out these things for myself - but you shall not think for me." They like to be told what to think in fact, they pay ~~I don't~~ ~~know how~~ many thousands a year to fifteen thousand people ~~for/to~~ do this - they say, "our *teachers* shall all think so & so - they shall tell us so & so - whether we believe it or not is our affair - we 'protest' against being *made* to believe it."

They don't read the 39 Articles - Not, at least, unless there is

~~"But do you think they don't?"~~

~~"Unless there is some/some thing to be got by them- then they read them."~~

~~"But I have read them."~~

~~"We have~~ Some read them, because ~~we/they~~ don't believe them - But ~~do you suppose that~~ are they read by those who call themselves Church of England? They say 'our teachers shall believe the 39 Articles' - But ~~they~~ don't believe them themselves unless, ~~as I said,~~ there is something to be had by them."

~~I never see t/The heap of Reviews on an English table, without thinking that that~~ is exactly the Protestant spirit." ~~reading a review is being~~

~~"How do you mean?"~~

~~"Reading a Review is being told what you/we are to think, is it not? we are not bound to think it. That/This is just what we do with our religion. We go to church - the clergyman is to tell us what we are to think - we go armed to criticize what he says, what he thinks, what the service is like - we say, ¶/we have no time to think for ourselves, we must be told what the Church thinks, provided we are not obliged to think it." It is all a contradiction & a mystification - Whereas the Roman Catholic never thinks of criticizing, he says, "I can't understand, but I can believe - 'credo, quia impossibile est'"~~

~~"But how came people to believe in the Church of England at all?"~~

"As long as the Church of England enforced by penalties & laws, by hanging people who did not belong to her, & punishing those who did not come to church, she did very well - But when she became moral, when she said, No, I don't think it right to compel & to punish, when she rested her claim not on her authority but on her morality - then she lost ground. Wesley's secession made people think she was not infallible - & then they looked about them & found that there were contradictions in her teaching."

~~"But the church/Look at the doctrines which she teaches, forgiveness of sins, for instance."~~

~~"Really, if you were to say to me, Abra-~~
~~cadabra, I should have as little an idea of~~
~~what was/is meant as when you say the word~~
~~'Forgiveness'? People forgive, I know, but I don't~~
~~know how do they do it? I suppose/Probably they think of~~
~~something else - If a man knocks me down~~
~~& if I feel that he is the greatest sufferer,~~
~~because he is farther from the way of right or~~
~~happiness by the act of knocking me down than I~~
~~by the act of being knocked down, & if I feel~~
~~that by the laws of the Universe he could not~~
~~have done otherwise than he did, I can - not~~
~~forgive but - feel no resentment, for he could~~
~~not have done otherwise. But if I am told that~~
~~I am to forgive another because God forgives me,~~
~~- what have I to do? I must think that that~~
~~man has been very wrong - but then I have been~~

~~much~~ very wrong~~er~~/too against God & he has forgiven me - & if I don't forgive this man, perhaps another time ~~He won't~~/God will not forgive me. What does that mean? It means that I think of something else, of God's wrath & my sins against Him, & so I ~~suppose~~ I forget what has been done against me - ~~I cannot attach~~/Can any other meaning be attached to the Theory of Forgiveness?

~~But surely, Forgiveness is a right state of mind & therefore a logical one, both in God & man."~~

"Forgiveness is certainly a *step* beyond Revenge. In the first state of Society, it was considered right to revenge our injuries, in the next state, it was considered right to forgive them-though how they do it ~~I don't~~/we do not know. Still ~~that~~/this is ~~already~~ a step in advance. ~~The~~/This is already a 'future state' to the first. In the next 'future state', it will be considered that there is nothing to forgive - ~~But the Philoso~~ And that will be a doctrine as much a higher & truer than a ~~doctrine to that~~/this of forgiveness, as ~~that~~/this of forgiveness is higher than that of revenge. But the Philosophy of the Will must be first understood."

~~"But you believe in God's forgiveness."~~

"With regard to forgiveness in the Creator, ~~I do not understand~~ the theory ~~any better~~/is no more intelligible "God cannot forgive" ~~I once heard in a Sermon~~/is true - & it is curious how people ~~sometimes~~ lay hold of a little bit of a truth. *God cannot forgive*. His laws have assigned consequences ~~perfectly &~~ entirely definite to every antecedent - do ~~you~~/we pray that he will prevent oxygen from uniting

with hydrogen in the proportion of 8 to 1 to form water? Neither can you/we pray that He will alter the laws of Perfect Goodness & Wisdom with regard to spiritual things - He would not be perfect Goodness & Wisdom if He did. But the theory of Forgiveness, as the Anglican Church holds it, is, besides, ~~such~~ a *hugger=mugger* one - What sign have we that we are forgiven? How do we know when we are forgiven? ~~I rarely think that t/The Roman Catholic way is the most/more sensible - where you/who takes your/his beads & says so many Paternosters for every sin, as your/his confessor orders. "We don't know how to pray" he says "therefore we take our Saviour's form of prayer, which is much better than anything we can say & we take each sin in succession & say, 'Forgive us our trespasses &c' & then say 'That sin is forgiven,' now on to the next." I suppose that Is not this the theory of the Rosary when used in union with our Saviour's sufferings? Among t/The Roman Catholics, we do/does think of our/his sins enough to tell them each & individually to a priest who is the Intermediary, & who tells us/him whether we are/he is sorry enough, & if we are/he is, gives us/him Absolution - though what takes place when we are absolved, I don't/we do not know - But the Protestants have such a "slovenly unhandsome" way of doing the business, we will not even take the trouble of enumerating our sins but we say, in order to save ourselves that trouble, 'We have done every thing that is wrong, in order to include every thing - & then "bang" comes the Absolution, as I once heard a Bishop of the Church of England say~~

without more ado - But what

takes place when we are forgiven? Is it a change in God or in man? what is it? ~~I really/We know no~~

x "Taking his/a clergyman's duty"? the very words are so significant it is a *duty* to pray to God - & when the clergyman wants to do something else, he gets somebody to "take his duty." ~~Cannot you fancy It is like paying your court to some great Don & getting somebody else now & then to relieve you? We do it in the most lazy way we can - we get one man to say it all for us - (while we sit by) -to say that we have done everything wrong - & then we say to God, Are not you satisfied now? won't you forgive us all?~~

more than if you were to speak a word of Chinese to me - (x Insert 150a) The doctrine of forgiveness, though ~~so great~~ an advance upon that of Revenge, ~~I cannot but consider~~ still the great mistake with regard to God's character, ~~to~~ the character of the Perfect, of Perfect Wisdom & Goodness."

~~"But then you must consider t/The parable to Simon of the two debtors as a great mistake."~~

~~"I cannot but think it so -~~ He says, He who sins against me most I shall have to forgive most- & he will love me most. This ~~really~~ is the substance of it. "Can this man have power to forgive sins?" The Jews once asked. Here they were right. But they did not go farther & ask, Can God have power to forgive sins? what does forgiveness mean? & if it means anything, is it not a contradiction? - In the case of the blind man, they asked - "Who did sin, this man, or his parents?" & ~~He~~/Christ did not say, Blindness is not the consequence of sin at all, but of some physical law - He said "That the works of God should be made manifest." He was so filled with the idea of impressing the people with the power of God that he really seemed to imply that the man had been made blind on purpose. Or, rather, he did not turn his attention to these subjects at all - his feeling was perfect & he came to save from ill=feeling not from bad Moral Philosophy - & when a man feels very intensely on one subject, it is no ~~so~~ rare ~~a thing~~ that he should overlook another. ~~He~~/Christ certainly did believe that sin was visited with ill=health, & that, if the sin were forgiven, the ill=health would be removed. ~~for I~~/In the case of the man with the palsy, he ~~said~~/implied, 'If I say, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or say, Arise & walk,

what does it matter? in either case the man would be cured.

But what a character his was! When he talks about the baptism & the fire he has to go through, how expressive those words are! A baptism of fire He might well have called it - Every person must be baptized with fire who would do anything which is not usually done in the conventional walk of his life, which is not provided for in the ordinary course of things. Every person must have a baptism of fire who is not satisfied with the world as it is & who would fain help it out of its rut. "And how am I straitened till it be accomplished!"

But there are many things he said which were very beautiful & yet were not true. When they brought the woman taken in adultery before him, & he turned aside & wrote in an absent mood on the ground & then said, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her - that beautiful tender spirit said truly - But still there is a right & a wrong, ~~I suppose~~, about Adultery. This would be putting an end to all Law & Justice. If no one is to execute the law unless he be perfectly pure himself, the Lord Chief Justice & the Chief Baron must vacate their seats on the Bench & all the police disband themselves, & the Criminal Jurisprudence of a country come to an end -

And when he said, Do like the lilies of the field, is that absolute truth?

Supposing one were to come now into the Courts of Law & say, Woe unto you, Judges & Clergy, we should say, He was a fanatic.

And ~~when~~/what he tells the Samaritan woman of the 'living water,' ~~it~~ is very beautiful, but when

she does not understand, he seems to make no effort to explain to her. He was so filled & absorbed with his own thought that he seems to have spoken absently & not to have cared whether she understood nor not. He even sometimes says "that seeing they may see & not perceive, & hearing they may hear & not understand." Might not the people have said, If you are to teach us, would it not be better to say something that we can understand?

What a point he seems to have made about faith, believing that ~~you~~/we can do a thing! "Faith can remove mountains" Now it is very true that very often ~~you~~/we do not believe ~~you~~/we can do a thing, which, if ~~you~~/we did believe it, ~~you~~/we could do. But ~~you~~/we may believe ~~you~~/we can do a thing which you can't - A great many, from ignorance of the laws of God, have done so. Believing does not make ~~you~~/us able to do it - does not make the law of God by which to do it. He seems to have known the first fact & to have confused the second with it.

But what have we made of Christ in these vulgar times? We have daubed him all over with bright colours, so that we can hardly see through to the original beautiful form underneath. The Churches have made him a God & said What, do you think you are like Christ? while they are preaching to you to imitate him. The Unitarians have made him a perfect man preaching that of which you see a great deal is not true. ~~Oh!~~ If we could but see him in his original form! ~~The Church does excite some feeling for him.~~ The idea of a Divine Being dying to save you from another Being does excite some feeling. But to tell you to listen to preaching which is perfect, &

which you see is imperfect, & all of which you cannot believe, excites no feeling at all. If he is to be merely a teacher or merely a God, he is nothing.

We have such a curious idea of our God - "If we don't forgive, perhaps He will punish us more." ~~as my dear Aunt~~ My/A mother used to say, when she/who lost her little boy said ~~that we~~ "she must be resigned, or a worse thing might be sent." If we believed in/that God putting/puts in His hand now & then in ~~that way,~~ we might/may believe ~~this &~~ that he says - "another worse lesson must be yours, if you don't learn the first." But it is worse - it is like a great child/boy who says to a little one, I will hit you harder if you cry." No wonder we love Christ for having come to save us from him."

"But, ~~Portia,~~ have the moral & physical laws no connection with each other?

"Yes, ~~I~~/It is all planned from the beginning to bring Imperfection to Perfection. Unless the Perfect One wished to make the imperfect perfect, there would be a contradiction, & therefore it may be asserted with certainty that, if there is a Spirit of Perfection, ~~that~~/this is His plan."

"But how do we know that there is a Spirit of Perfection?"

"We see signs that there is. ~~I~~/We do not assert ~~that there is~~/it - It is evident that, in some stages of ~~his~~/our development, it is impossible for man to conceive even of a Spirit of Perfection - the more he advances, the more he finds reason to believe that there is - But all ~~I~~/we assert is that, if there is a Spirit of Perfection, it ~~may be~~/is

f302v

154a

(a) God knew perfectly well that B would not sympathize any more for A's death - He did not require to be told of ~~that~~/this. He was not trying experiments ~~upon her.~~ But ~~i~~/It was all in His scheme -

proved a contradiction to say that such was not his plan."

"~~Then you think that t/~~There is some rough truth in the superstition, A died for the good of B, A was drowned ~~be~~ in order to teach B sympathy.?"

"~~Yes, I think I/~~It is all a vast scheme for bringing the Imperfect to Perfection."

"And if B had had more sympathy, the water would not have risen & drowned A?"

"You cannot say, if A had had more sympathy, - nothing could have been different, all the laws of God would have been different & the Imperfect would not have been progressing to Perfection. To write history with if's is pure unmeaning Insert (a) 154a nonsense"

"~~Then why don't I/we~~ not sit still & do nothing?"

"The laws of God knock ~~you~~/us about till ~~you don't~~ You/we do something. We may try the experiment - ~~you~~/we may sit still, if ~~you~~/we like - But God's laws will never cease molesting ~~you~~/us till ~~you~~/we don't. His laws have provided that it shall be impossible to ~~you~~/us, that your nature is such, your desires, energies, inclinations such that ~~you~~/we can't. To say, ~~oh~~ "if B had been otherwise, if B & C had been confiding & affectionate, how happy I should have been!" - to wish that it had been otherwise is to wish that the Imperfect should not be on its way to Perfection, is pure nonsense. In ~~this~~/many cases, I/we can see that it is much better for ~~me~~/us that it should not be so. It has put

(B) ~~"Portia, I think you believe in/~~But with regard to "special Providence"

~~"I/if there were any special,~~ there would be no general Providence."

~~"But you see to think that p/~~Particular things are indeed brought about by Providence."

~~"I believe that,/If when we/I came/come to London & went/go into Oxford St. & found/I find Mrs. C at home, that God had it before His thought that we/I should make something of her."~~

~~"And if we do not>"~~

~~"If we/I do not, I shall think that I am mistaken— and that God had something else in his head— Or, if she had not been at home, I should have thought so — When we learn to know the {illeg} at the God took me there/us in. Do you not suppose that God always has it before Him in His thought what the whole plan is & what He intends shall come of it — that he had the whole plan of Mrs. C before Him, when we went to London."~~

me/us on a much truer ground. If we/I had been thinking how much we/I liked ~~them, their/B & C's~~ B & C's company, we/I should never have come at the truth. It has made me/us independent of them - not independent of sympathy, that is impossible, but willing to go without it, if it is not to be had - But to say ~~Or~~ "if it had but been otherwise!" is using words without meaning."— Insert(B) 155 b

~~"But, Portia, if you are so sure of these opinions, why don't you make them known?"~~

~~"My dear child, n/Now nobody reasons - There is good feeling & good conscience - but it is reasoning power which is most wanting in the world. The Church does not reason. But Society reasons still less - How worse than of no use it is talking to any body/one about religion! But, c/Can you/we expect anything else when people go on paying morning visits to each other, although they know that both sides will be glad if they are not at home? And The B.'s, you know, said they left London so that nobody might say any more, "There now we have done the B's," when they had been invited ~~them out~~ to a dinner, to a dinner too to which they did not wish to go."~~

~~"Well, Portia, you complain a great deal about Conventionality. But I think every body is allowed to have pretty much what opinions they like."~~ said I. Much is said now about the tolerance of society.

~~I/We may have it is true any opinions I/we like about Gothic Architecture, Italian pictures - because that is only amusing - that/it involves no change - I am/We are not likely to be pulling down York Minster in consequence. But if I/we have any opinions which require a change in Society or in any thing else, even if they are seen to be true, that "it won't do" - You must only have fancy opinions, dilettante ideas, not working opinions."~~

{in another hand: Thomas}

XXV

~~LII XLVI XIX~~

~~"My dear child,~~ We are such martinets about the truth of our words - & we ~~never~~/seldom think about having true feelings, which is of much more consequence - If I think of a person differently today from what I did yesterday, especially if it is on account of some act &, more especially, of some act towards myself, while all the while his character is the same, I have an untrue feeling but nobody thinks whether their feelings are untrue or not - Yet if they are, it matters very little whether ~~my~~/their words are true or not.

Now it is very possible that a person may be in a very high & noble mood of feeling while acting very unreasonably - it is proved to be perfectly possible ~~that~~ for feeling to be quite independent of reason. If then I suffer from his unreasonable conduct, & do not take into account the whole of his character, but feel to him ~~only~~ on account of his unreasonableness only, I am in a state of untrue feeling towards him.

The first step is, to reason well ourselves - then we become discontented with others for not doing so too - The next step is to be satisfied that others should not be able to reason, to see that it cannot be otherwise, that we must not expect it any more than that every body should have seven=leagued boots, like Peter Schlemihl. They will see it some day in a [Schlemiel "future state", & ~~then you will say to them, when they are expressing this, I did~~/it is true that they are not to blame you, it was not your/their fault, it was God's fault or rather it was His Wisdom - you/they could not help it - you/they could not do otherwise -

There will be no sorrow in a "future state."

for then everybody will see that to blame them= selves is as untrue as to blame others. If the laws of God had been different, which made them what they were, Imperfection would not have been on the way to Perfection.

Then all that energy which is expended now on remorse, & wishing "it had been otherwise," & blame of others, will be turned to considering our position as it is, as we should consider it if it were another's ~~person's~~ & to making the most we can out of it.

"Love your enemies" appears to ~~me~~/be unmeaning - we cannot love a person for injuring us & making us unhappy - we love that which is loveable - but we can love that in them which is good intention - we can love the absolute good in them which they show to others - ~~people~~ we can feel truly, in short, to them.

~~LI~~ XVI

"It is ~~so~~ very important to know what we don't believe & what we do - So few ~~people~~ know what they believe - they *think* they believe & yet we see how different would be their conduct if they *did* believe the things which they think they do. For instance, people would be indignant & distressed if you were to say that they did not believe in a future state - & yet ~~you see that they don't, because you see~~ for how differently they would act, ~~if they did.~~ & feel, if they did (a) Insert opposite page.

I am afraid to say that I believe in a God though I have a consciousness that I do - & though I feel as much hurt at the doubt as if you were to say, 'I whom you have known so many years, whom you have loved & sympathized with so much,

f305v

(a)

How vague we are in what we believe & say - we think we believe & don't - we think we don't believe & do - till something comes & reveals to us all at once that we did not believe what we have said we believed all our lives -

who have done so much for you, & now you don't believe in my existence.' I feel the same pain at the question as to whether I believe in God's existence. And yet I think that, if I did believe in it as I do in yours, & if I had a comprehensive view of His whole character, as I *think* I believe Him to be ~~that~~ I should be in a continual 'rapture', much greater than St. Teresa's, because ~~I think~~ my God is so much more worthy of exciting "rapture" than hers was - ~~And therefore, as I am not, I fear, that I do not believe what I think that I do -~~

But how seldom it is that we have a comprehensive view of the *whole* characters, even of ~~each~~/one other! Do we not generally judge each other by the accidental behaviour, & the behaviour to ourselves, of each moment? God only, ~~I believe,~~ always thinks of us the same, & as we are - Most of us do not even make an attempt to do so - For instance, although I know that you are ~~very~~ kind & affectionate, yet a word, a look, & that generally to myself, will alter my impression of your character - although, if any one were to ask me if you were changed, I should certainly say that you were not - Almost every body's *feeling* judges unconsciously by the moment, ~~I believe I don't pretend to say that, w/When I see my dear mother child very~~ cross, very unreasonable, I ~~don't~~ feel differently ~~towards her~~ to what I do when I see ~~her~~/him all that is generous & affectionate - though I know that there is no real

difference in her character

Therefore we may say (of *each other* as well as of God) that we do not always believe in his real existence - we have not always a comprehensive view either of God's character or of each other's - Unless we can see all the Present, all the Past & all the Future indeed, how can we? We see only a strip. We may therefore perceive that, occasionally we don't believe in one another's whole existence any more than we do in God's - For our opinions of one another alter, even where confessedly there is no alteration in the character - We do not profess to have made any new discovery. And we hardly even struggle against it/~~them~~ - There are very few of us, who try always to have the same & a true view of one another's real characters, uninfluenced by their passing conduct to ourselves - Most of us hardly profess not to be acted upon by the moment."

‡IV

XXVII

{in another hand: Guppy}

"The opinions ~~which I have~~ given in conversation on people's lives & characters, concerning which ‡/we had some thoughts & experience - the opinions ~~which I hear~~ given in conversation on the few subjects on which ‡/we have worked, seem to ~~me~~/us, as ‡/we should expect, ~~my~~/our own to seem to others, if ‡/we gave ~~my~~/our opinion on draining or fencing, on the management of horses or cattle -

We hear much of the benefits of conversation

& reading to quicken mankind - It is true that there is more intelligence among social than among solitary workmen - If people were conscious where they are ignorant, if they proposed queries to themselves & others, till they had good ground for making assertions, social life might quicken truth more than error. At present, it seems as often to quicken the latter as the former. All goes vaguely, sometimes according to our individual inclinations as idiosyncratic, but, in the main according to our inclination to follow the ~~mode~~/fashion established - ~~Mode~~/Fashion of dress, ~~mode~~/fashion of life & spring from we know not whom, but it is easier to follow ~~it~~/them than to look for an absolute true & right.

I go to Sheffield one year, I hear of extreme distress - "trade so bad". I go another year, I hear of great prosperity, - "trade so good" - What is the difference? In the one case, I hear of Chartism, discovery of plots, instruments of maiming & wounding, &c. In the other case, I hear of drinking & dress - Of course there are good exceptions, but these are, in each case, signs of the times. If there were but a type of life, after which man ~~was~~/were working, we might improve out of each variation of the circumstances which we should be trying to direct, so as to forward the realization of that type - Ireland is emptying itself into America. There is, ~~I suppose~~, some

good in this, but what a vague uncertain prospect of good, unless the Irish, whether in Ireland or America, have some type to work after, are endeavouring to modify circumstances to a *right* purpose. It is God's purpose, ~~I entirely believe,~~ that Man shall modify life & circumstances so that the outer world shall help the inner being to be one with God. Is man intent upon thus modifying circumstances? Till he is, ~~without risk~~ ~~progress to Mankind~~ trace may rise or fall, mines of gold lie hidden beneath the ground or millions lie scattered on its surface, there will be changes, without real progress, to Mankind.

According to Laws, not fathomed by us, Nations will rise & fall. We shall vaguely ask the question "is England come to its culminating point? as if there were a law that each nation was to rise & fall - not in accordance with any specific laws but merely ~~that~~/because the law was Rise & Decline.

The religion of Mankind is *without*, outside of them, making them discontented with themselves & their ~~lives~~/life, whenever they think of it, but not helping them to improve their lives by themselves, themselves by their lives. "When I hear the sermons telling me to be good," ~~says~~/said ~~my~~/a sensible cook, "I think I will, but I'm just the same when I get into the kitchen" - ~~or~~ to this purport at least spoke that observant personage - The only remedy

for sins which we know we shall commit, which we pledge ourselves to commit, which, if we knew more than we do of God's laws, we should know it would be impossible for us not to commit in these lives, is absolution. How naturally arose these paradoxical remedies of the Atonement of blood, of Intercession, of Forgiveness of sins, when Man feared a Higher Power, so clearly discernible in existence, - found himself always sinning - but never thought of the simple device of trying whether life might be modified so that he would not sin. When his body is sick, he goes - not to a priest to forgive him, but - to a doctor to try to cure him - He himself tries change of air, of food -

The mistakes concerning *the w/Will* of God & of Man cause this confusion - Till the will is recognised to spring from the whole nature, which nature is recognised to be modified by circumstances which Man can modify, there is no essential improvement to be hoped for mankind. Oh Mankind, "*Grand Etre*" indeed, how little dost thou know thy power, how little conceive what thou mightest realize! Oh *God in the flesh*, rouse thyself from thy inanities, know thyself, unite thyself as one with All-comprehending Thought, accept thy high office to work out, to manifest that thought, phase after phase, now & for ever! Thou also shalt rise, *each & all*, to the all-comprehensive glance & will for ~~its~~/thine eternal course, & then work on in its realization - But not, till thou dost include in thy present existence a conc[*eption*] of its nature & object.

{in another hand: Macdonald}

IV XVIII

How can society go well, if its principles are wrong at the core? - If it is believed, if the *feeling* is, that the self-indulgent man is "receiving his good things here," when the truth is that he is in a state of privation - &/If it is believed that the wrong, which is in characters, might be changed by what is called "an act of the Will," - (these being words without meaning, & a change of influences being necessary to effect a change of will) - If it is believed that a man, who feels & does what is wrong, is in himself guilty, because he feels & does wrong, ~~when~~/whereas he might, if he would, feel & do right - when, in reality, he is the *greatest* of sufferers through God's righteous Law] Evil feeling, evil nature is in itself the worst of evil, & in addition to being so, it has no compassion from mankind, as physical suffering has - It has condemnation & for the most part no pity, no means taken to improve it - Or, if means are taken, the subject has been so imperfectly studied that they are generally inefficient. ~~You know~~ Some benevolent and conscientious men say "Make a prison for criminals as wretched as possible, in order to deter them from committing acts, which will bring them back to it-" But ~~you~~/they make ~~them~~/these criminals in themselves no better, & what are they to do with themselves in their wickedness? Is this ~~all~~ true or not?

At all events, ~~Fulgentia, while, at present,~~
~~it is permitted to me to think only in inactivity,~~
~~I will~~/Let us try to feel, as ~~I~~/we believe to be consistent with

truth in regard to ~~my~~/our own faults & those of others - And ~~I do feel~~ something of the sharpness of the sting is taken out by such a view, in ~~the~~ suffering from ~~my~~/our own incapability in those around me, which has so often depressed ~~me~~/us, lowered ~~me~~/us in ~~my~~/our own eyes - ~~I~~/We can ~~now~~/then, in some degree, acknowledge ~~my~~/our own incapability to ~~myself~~/ourselves, yet be conscious that it arises out of God's righteous laws, - that ~~I~~/we have no reason to be ashamed of it - that God will respect ~~me~~/us for bearing, in a true spirit, with the privations to which it subjects ~~me~~/us, that ~~I~~/we have His sympathy - that the evil, which ~~I~~/we bring to others from ~~my~~/our incapability, arises also from His righteous Law, - that all will unfold to good, - that ~~I~~/we may stand upright before God, while endeavouring truly to appreciate ~~my~~/our own failings - And ~~I~~/we may think of the failings of others also without bitterness, may trace them to ~~my~~/our own without sinking of heart, may recognise the hidden mines of goodness in others & in ~~myself~~/ourselves, prevented though they be from outward manifestation - Thus may ~~I~~/we do justice to others, to ~~myself~~/ourselves, & to the Source of all that is.

'A wounded Spirit who shall bear?' And, for such wounds, the only healing is a true & comprehensive view of the nature & purpose of Him who calls us into being - i.e. Trust, (not in books nor in words, called Faith, but meaning often we know not what but) Trust in the nature of all that exists which is revealed to us by the revelation of the nature of the Universal Source of Being, which is revealed by the activity of our own nature."⁴

“How is it likely that social or individual life can be well carried on with so little knowledge or feeling as we have of human nature, or of the nature from Whose Will spring the Laws, in consequence of which we are. in consequence of which we are exactly what we are, - & by a certain mode of keeping which we might attain the happiness of mankind - (it being in the power of Mankind to learn what is this mode, to attain to desire & relish this mode, to attain to keep this mode)-

Mankind, meanwhile, are regulating themselves by a mode of Life liked or approved by a few - and for this let us not blame Mankind. It is not in the nature & constitution of Mankind that each man shall think out for himself what ought to be the organization, the regularly established circumstances of Life, any more than that each should think out for himself the truths of Religion - All are not adapted for such thinking, for such searching into truth, any more than all are adapted to search into any other peculiar line of truth-

The nature of these truths is, however, by far the most important of all, and concerns every mode of truth more intimately, more fundamentally than any other - Yet these truths are least enquired into - There is no regular, earnest study of them going on among Mankind, as there is of other sciences - As to the nature of God, it is taken for granted that what we can know of it we know from the

f315

~~-167-~~

-101-

Bible or the Church. Thus we hear read chapters of the wars of Agag &c to teach us the nature of God - though we do ~~hear~~ indeed hear also out of the Bible conceptions of the Nature of God, which ~~I believe will be found to be~~ are absolute truth. Yet even these are presented to us ~~so~~ confusedly & mixed up with what is not true, - & the true & untrue are repeated till interest ceases - {in another hand: Chet?}

Men have it in their power to regulate circumstances. Circumstances regulate that which, within certain limits established by the laws of God, the constitution of Man & the development of that constitution shall be. But how little do Men go to the foundation for their circumstances, how little do they enquire *what* circumstances will call forth the character adapted to fulfil the type of mankind in the purpose of God, the type of greatest well-being? They exercise some power over circumstances certainly. But what are their objects, when they exercise this power? - To live as the highest class, to which the money they possess enables them to belong, live - They exercise the power of choosing one school or another, one governess or another, one profession or another. But it seems taken for granted that these modes of life are right, are eternal. No enquiry is made whether they are in harmony with God's nature & Man's nature. Some aims at improvement go on indeed, but nothing fundamental. Drawing is now taught from the Cast instead of from copies, & women draw infinitely better than they used to do in consequence. But no enquiry is made into the real object of

f316

~~-168-~~

drawing, how the exercise of it shall affect the character & life, so as to render ~~illeg~~/these in harmony with the nature & purpose of God and enable them to fulfil the work of Man."

f316v {written sideways:} Miss Spottiswoode

~~Fulgentia want - "I am going" she said to Portia, in one of her last letters, "to ask a question of the Church of England, which she will not answer - If she is silent, if she does not answer, I shall go elsewhere not to the Roman Catholic Church, as people think, but to the infidels & atheists, as they are called. From the time of Christ down to that of Wesley, all successful religions have begun with the very poor, with the "refuse" of "society"~~

~~I do not believe that it is possible to engraft what we wish to do upon Protes-~~
~~tantism - I think that Protestantism does not admit of it. Catholicism makes the love to Christ or, as I/we should call it, love to God, & to y/our fellow=man the first - Protestantism makes love to y/our own belongings, to y/our family the first. "Charity begins at home." "Take care of your own people & if every body does this, every body will be well cared for," are its favourite proverbs - Your own home, your own hearth is to be your first object - not, devotion to God & your neighbour - But devotion to your own home is devotion to your God, we are told - family love is "love to your neighbour."~~

f318

~~-170-~~

-104-

Family love, ~~it appears to me,~~ is generally but a re=~~duplication of~~/multiplied form of selfishness - Magnificent exceptions there are, it is true - But what a man wants is that his wife ~~should~~/shall be "his" not that she ~~should~~/shall be God's - a woman's selfishness/~~with her~~/if she have twelve children ~~has~~/is a twelve=~~fold selfishness, for them~~- for them.

~~Agoo~~ And the family tie would be so much better & ~~fairer~~ finer, if it were not so narrow - If there were an independent occupation for each, how much sweeter the return, how much closer the tie!

Again, ~~I hardly know a single~~/there is seldom a family in ~~my own~~/the "higher class" class of life, (there being in it more than one unmarried daughter), where there is not one invalid, "my invalid daughter" Does not this point ~~at~~/out something very wrong in the family? And the medical man almost always says, "if she had been a boy at school, this would not have happened."

~~The~~ Protestants, in their horror of ~~the~~ Catholics, have "in emptying the tub, emptied out the child" with it. With their well=~~grounded~~ detestation of the Romanist forms of charity, they have ~~annihilated~~/emptied out the spirit of charity too.

To the woman, Protestantism offers nothing but marriage - She may leave home to marry, but for nothing else - she may marry, however selfishly & have the blessing & the good word of all her family. If she do any thing else, she will have what? she will be

f319

~~-170-~~

-105-

called 'unnatural' her character will be suspected, she will be supposed to be 'crossed in love,' 'unhappy in her own family,' a 'bad temper' To justify herself, she must take a husband."

{ff320, 21, 22 are blank}

f322v

30 Old Burlington St

W.

Feb 24/60

Add Mss 45839, 288 folios, sections on women's novel; notes from 45839e and 45839; photocopies very poor; Adam Matthew microfilm reel 52

ff1-196 science parts, philosophical

ff197-234 is sermons:

f198 Sermon IV "Lord, I believe, Help thou my unbelief." Mark IX.24

f226 Sermon VI "We love him because he first loved us." 1 John IV 19

f228 Sermon VIII "God is Love." 1 John IV.16, Sugg 2:

ff236-88 is Cassandra, Sugg 2:374-410;

check f175 then?

essay, ff1-10, pen

f1

30 Old Burlington St XI PRACTICAL DEDUCTIONS

March 15/60

~~"If any man will do His will
he shall know of the doctrine"~~

~~John VII 17~~

{in another hand ~~Go over~~}

I

No science has been so unfairly treated as religion. From the awe which it has inspired, it has never been allowed to be on the same footing as any other part of our knowledge. Emotion, Imagination & Self-interest have been its main sources. Up to a certain period in the development of Mankind, it is well that it should be so. It is well that Emotion & Imagination should keep up in Man a sense of a higher power than his own, before he is able to reason upon it. But is there, or is there not what may be called a science of Religion, as of other subjects of our knowledge?

~~As a preliminary question to this, let us ask/What is the meaning of the word 'Religion'? We understand by it/Is it not the tie, the *binding* or connection between the Perfect and the imperfect, the Eternal & the temporal, the Infinite & the finite, the Universal & the individual?~~

Here, as ~~is remarkable~~ in many instances, the derivation of the word show its import, such as suits with ~~the/our~~ meaning, ~~which we now could attach to it,~~ though ~~we can~~ scarcely ~~believe~~ does that meaning seem to have been attached to it, when originally so derived -

{in another hand 3 a}

Religion includes a knowledge of the universe & particular, the general & individual, the perfect & imperfect natures which are within our ken, as well as a knowledge of the connection between them - Indeed it is obvious that this connection can only be correctly appreciated, in proportion as we understand the natures so connected.

The primary fact in religion seems to be the existence of an Omnipotent Spirit of Love & Wisdom - ~~WE call it~~ the *primary* fact, because it is the explanation of every other.

~~In asserting this fact, we have~~ /This gives 4 words to explain, each of which is open to great misconception, & has been greatly misconceived - viz. Omnipotent - Spirit - Love - Wisdom -

By *Omnipotence* we understand a Power which effects whatever would not contradict its own nature & will.

By a *Spirit* we understand a living thought, feeling & purpose, residing in a conscious Being.

By *Love* we understand the feeling which seeks for its satisfaction the greatest degree & the best kind of well-being in others than itself -

By *Wisdom* we understand the thought by which this satisfaction is obtained-

But, first, ~~we would distinctly make out whether~~ is Religion is a subject ~~which is~~ to be logically treated,- or ~~whether~~ is there any
{in another hand 2}

truth in the feeling of deprecating, as irreverent, the sifting of what is true, as to religious belief, by the aid of the Science of Logic?

~~We see that,~~ If Religion is to depend upon evidence, not upon intuition or consciousness, - a more comprehensive evidence is required than is necessary for any other subject - More faculties must be exercised for this purpose than are required in seeking after truth on any other subject - If a man is seeking truth on Physical Astronomy, the perceptive faculties alone will enable him to draw his inferences. ~~We do not say that thus~~ But he will not know thus all that is to be known about Astronomy, or the most important part of what is to be known about Astronomy - for that most important part is its relation with Religion.

{in another hand Done}

If a man is seeking evidence concerning a Nature which is Love, his evidence must partly depend on his own Nature being in some degree - ~~and only~~ Love - and, in as far only as it is love, can he judge of Love in another Being -

A London lady, speaking of a cousin who, on returning from the East, had remained some week in a foreign institution for training Deaconesses, said, "It is rumoured in London that Miss _____ remained on the Continent for the purpose of recovering her complexion before her return to England." Thirty years' acquaintance

{in another hand 3}

with that cousin had not enabled her to draw any inference with regard to her nature - This is a homely instance of our meaning with regard to the study of the nature of God.

Is it an intuition when a child feels a consciousness of love in another being, & gives love in return? ~~We believe it is - we believe~~ Certainly - ~~that~~ Awe, Admiration or Fear may exist intuitively in a human being towards a superhuman power, manifesting itself in nature or the events of life - But ~~we do not find that~~ Love or Trust towards this superhuman Power can have ~~any~~/no true or firm foundation, except from inference -

The nature & purpose of God is a subject immediately connected - bound up with every subject of possible human enquiry. Truly therefore may we express by the word 'religion,' enquiries concerning the nature & purpose of God -

~~We believe, then, that a~~ /All that comes by intuition (of that which is true in religion) is an emotion or sentiment of Awe or Admiration -

~~We believe that~~ Reasoning will reveal the existence of a Spirit of Love & Wisdom to a loving & wise spirit, but cannot do so to any other mode of being. Consequently, the evidence for religion requires the exercise of parts of man's nature, which are not necessarily exercised upon evidence for more physical facts.

{in another hand 4}

{in another hand: Farriday)

The confusion, in which men are as to the nature & true sources of a real belief in religion greatly impedes its existence. ~~We believe that~~ Few, even of thinking & feeling men, have any true estimation of the present state of religious belief & religious feeling among mankind. Numbers are thinking *they believe* what they do not believe. Numbers have feelings towards Beings of their *own imaginations*, or taught to them from the imaginations of other men -

This deplorable ignorance on the subject which is connected with every possible interest & question, which can present ~~themselves/itself~~ to man's heart or mind, will remain till Mankind are aware of it, & till they know & feel how to make *some advance towards removing it* - we say, *advance towards removing it*. No man, no number of men *living in any age can remove it*. All men through all ages of human existence must unite to learn & to feel more & more (and yet not fully comprehend or appreciate) that universal Spirit. To learn & feel Him perfectly requires Perfection - Man & Mankind are essentially imperfect, but they are to be workers towards Perfection, towards that which, ~~we believe~~, in the view of the All=Comprehending, is the only true Perfection, - that which has been attained by exercise -

~~We wish now to separate the questions before us from those other questions, - viz. religion has generally been considered to be, of what are the foundations of that which it has generally been considered to be -~~

{in another hand 5}

Let the questions now before us ~~are~~, be, what *is* religion & what the ground of ~~a~~ belief in it?

~~We have defined~~ Religion is ~~to be~~ the tie between the Perfect & the imperfect -

~~When we speak of~~ By *the Perfect*, we mean the perfectly *right* thought, feeling & purpose. Concerning *right* we can only say this - It is that thought, feeling & purpose, which produces, in the course of Eternity, the most happy being ~~which is~~ possible, without entertaining the supposition of any contradiction.

~~We have defined~~ The primary fact in religion ~~to be~~ is the existence of an Omnipotent Spirit of Goodness & Wisdom, whence spring all other modes of existence & all connections between them.

One proof of this existence is ~~the following~~ the consciousness & the experience in man of Goodness & Wisdom in himself & his kind - the observing certain phenomena of the same nature as those which spring from human thought & feeling - from purpose to promote human welfare - but which do not spring from human nature - which would spring from human nature, if it had the power to call into existence such phenomena - the inference that other thought & feeling, more powerful for effecting its purpose than man's, calls these phenomena into existence -

Thought, feeling, purpose for other welfare than *that* of the individual who thinks, feels & purposes we

{in another hand 6}

recognise as *benevolence*, (or wish for the well-being of others) ~~Such Will~~

The pursuing an right end by the means adopted to attain it we call Wisdom

The existence, then, of a Spirit of Wisdom & Benevolence, ~~it would seem~~, may, be ~~proved~~/inferred in this way - we trace the operation of a benevolent & wise Will by the existence of the same *kind* of effects as spring from a benevolent & wise will in man, by effects which the benevolent & wise man would produce, if he could.

The aim of the benevolent & wise man will be to help his fellow-men, by the improvement & exercise of their natures, to attain well-being.

Experience proves well-being to be attainable only in this way.

Thought, feeling, reflection, experience agree that, in no other way, without some contradiction, can well-being exist.

In this way, observation & experience will shew ever-increasing evidence that a Power superior to Man's is ever promoting Man's welfare -

Looking into the nature of human existence, questions arise as to the source or sources of the phenomena which we discern, some leading apparently to man's welfare, others to his suffering - Thence have arisen the questions, do these phenomena spring from a variety of wills? from no will at all? or from one will?

{in another hand 7}

~~We believe that~~ Inference, arising out of conscious experience, may be found, tending to prove that, (in proportion as we improve in being & increase in knowledge), we shall discern that present evil & suffering, as well as present good & enjoyment essentially spring from one source, the Omnipotent Spirit of Benevolence & Wisdom, - which is thus effecting human welfare, human progress towards the Divine, through the improvement and exercise of the capabilities of Mankind - these capabilities & this exercise arising from what we may designate divine Laws - divine Laws, that is, certain invariable & ~~unconditional~~ co-existences & successions springing from the omnipotent Spirit of Benevolence & Wisdom, which would have no existence, were anything other than it is, has been, & is to be. In accordance with His righteous thought ~~it is that~~ there is a way in which every Law is susceptible of being kept, which will ensure humans' welfare, i.e. human advance towards the Divine - Human nature is, through Law, constituted capable of discerning these Laws, how they ought to be kept, how to incline human will to keep them -

To attain this, ~~we would suggest~~, is the problem which the Omnipotent Spirit of Benevolence & Wisdom sets before humanity - supplying humanity with the means by which to attain it -

{in another hand 8}

~~We must carry to the utmost our conception of the definiteness of God's Law is absolutely definite. One of its~~

purposes

seems to be to educate a divine capability into a divine existence by the exercise of the capability of the individual & the race. Does not this purpose come home to our conviction as worthy of consistent with the Divine nature? - The definiteness of the means by which this is effected is complete & entire. If our comprehension could penetrate through the whole, we should be conscious that not the bending of a leaf this way or that, not the resting of a grain of sand in one place & not in another ~~takes place~~, is without a purpose as part of the whole. All is connected with all so intimately that the most minute difference in any part would alter the whole. In some minds there is a sort of struggle against this definiteness, as if it implied some necessity, i.e. some yielding to need. But that would be to imply that some=thing, ~~which~~ it were to be wished, had been otherwise, whereas of nothing can it be truly wished that it had been otherwise, for all has accorded with right.

The two great objects of a wise Benevolence are secured.

I that man works for himself & his kind - he is not worked for, he being in a state of passivity, but he lives in the midst of the Means & inducement which make him or which ~~will~~/shall make him active -

II that it is the eternal, the omnipotent Spirit of Righteousness, who is the spring of the means &

{in another hand 9}

f10

~~10-10-~~

inducement which will assuredly set in movement the springs of active Will in each human being, so that he attain unto righteousness & knowledge. No satisfaction could there have been in being moved like a machine - no satisfaction in the ignorant & finite man being left without full guidance. All the suffering, all the privation in human existence is because it is the education of Mankind which is going on so that his Will shall attain to be right. not that he shall ~~not~~ be driven at the Will of another, his own being passive -
{in another hand 10}

f11

II

What is this age, ~~father~~? In a sister country ~~you tell me~~ it is said to be the age of Atheism & Despair. In ours, is it not a time of Indifference & Unbelief? We do not believe in a type of perfection into which each man is to be developed - we do not believe in social progress - we do not believe in religious progress - we do not believe in God - Least of all do we believe in women. I don't myself. Men dare

f12

not express their beliefs or their unbeliefs,
if they have any, to their wives - parents
keep their daughters in subjection, lest they
should "become like men" - Our *political* progress
is the only thing which we do believe in - but, as to
any ~~improvement~~/development of our church, any ~~develop~~/improve=
ment in society which shall modify the two
great extremes of luxury & poverty, we do
not so much as imagine it - In the last
300 years, much has been gained politically -
but what has been done for religion? We have
retrenched a good deal, but we have put
nothing in the place of it - It has been all
denying & no replacing - ~~The Roman Catholic~~
~~Church loved the Father & the son & the Holy~~
~~Ghost~~ {the rest of the page has a large X drawn through it} & the
Virgin Mary & the Saints. The
Protestant Church does not love the Virgin
Mary & the Saints - & I don't see that they
love God & Jesus Christ & the Holy Ghost the
better for it - The Unitarians cut off the Son
& the Holy Ghost - ~~without loving~~ /& they don't love God the
better ~~either~~ I believe - It is all negation and no
compensation-"

III

You may be sure I did not let this
nonsense pass - I wrote her a long letter
about the benefits of the Reformation, ~~which~~
~~every body knows~~ /& the corruptions of the Roman Catholic religion & I
asked her whether
she thought she could give us a new religion
~~to replace of the Church of England~~

f13

(II)

III. We call ourselves Christians -- If the word mean, "followers of Christ,". there appears ~~to me~~ to be scarcely anything in England now, which bears any resemblance to Christ - which would not surprise him as something he had never thought of - Call us something else but ~~don't~~/do not call us Christians.

It appears ~~to me~~ to be a mistake to call ~~the/a Bishop of London~~ a Christian. Because we are very sure that he is not what Christ intended, which is, ~~I suppose~~/no doubt, being a Christian. You may be one in the spirit or in the letter. ~~The/A Bishop of London~~ might be so in the spirit, without being so in the letter. Christ might not have fixed the colour of his liveries that it should be purple - & yet

f14

he might be a Christian in the spirit. But ~~do you think that/~~ is there any thing like Christ in Christianity? ~~Don't~~/If there is not let us not call it Christianity, let us call it something else.

Surely the Roman Catholic Orders are exactly Christians - i.e. they follow exactly, word for word what Christ said & did -- therefore either the Roman Catholic Orders are right - or Christ was mistaken in some things.

~~But~~ We can wonder that this world is such a poor world as it is? that it does not seem worth the trouble, certainly, at present that God should have created it? that Europe. Asia, Africa & America should be so ~~in such a state~~/miserable a thing? when (1)nobody is interested in the one vital interest which runs through all other interests - & (2) nobody is set free to pursue it. There is good fat Mr. A. on the one hand, he thinks a little for his amusement - in his Library - Others, on the other hand ~~don't~~/do not think at all, - they believe that they are to take their thoughts out of a Book or a Church -

~~I could have so~~/How much better to worshipped the Goddess of Wisdom than the God of the Church of England, whom we hear about in church! We should not have liked, it is true, many things which that Goddess of Wisdom did, but a *really* wise God - what a conception!

f15

Umlaut The Greeks & Romans divided the evil among all their Gods - ~~Now~~ the Persians heaped it all upon Arimanes - & ~~that~~/this strikes one ~~much~~ the better place - because it purifies the One Good Spirit. The motive of all religions is to account for what men saw - The Greeks seemed hardly to have cared to suppose their Gods perfect. It ~~can scarcely~~/is not to be supposed that they could have called the things good which their Gods did. They were simply the explanations, after the Greek fashion, of the phenomena believed to be observed. But, since that time, in all *so-called* Christian religions, the God, ~~I believe~~ has been supposed to be a perfect man . His {illeg trinity?} ~~I should think~~/it might be proved . But the perfection in fashion at the time was imputed to God

(7) I was much struck by ~~hearing/seeing, the~~ ~~this day of~~ the Terror of death, felt by a sweet young girl of 15 years of age, the daughter of an Unitarian, in her last illness - "Save me, Papa, pray for me that I may not die" The ignorance, in which the unorthodox leave their children is very lamentable. ~~I know not how/Perhaps~~ ~~to/they~~ can hardly do otherwise - ~~But, in an Order/ Society such as I~~ ~~would endeavour to conceive, I think I should~~ ~~imitate the Roman Catholic Orders in giving~~ ~~regular instruction.~~ Religious instruction by the Orthodox is given under authority - The

f16

Bible, the Catechism, or priestly instruction is all supposed to rest, not on discovery by human capability, but on more or less miraculous light. Those, who do not believe in this miraculous light, either think too little on the subject to teach, or they fear to teach what they are not sure of, or to disgust with what they know not how to teach—~~I am endeavouring to~~—/May we not look for/to see the possibility for/of a religious ~~Order~~ society the religion of which shall not profess to be other than the discoveries of mankind through the nature God has given to man, & through the teachings of God in His universe to that nature. ~~In so doing it seems easiest to take the principles of other orders which present the effects of experience, so I would, therefore, first examine where ever~~ The principles of the Roman Catholic Orders might, with modifications, be adopted. viz. I In Religion being the foundation & spring of the *life*.

II In unity of religious belief among those associated

III In a *regular instruction* in the principles of this belief.

In respect of youth, query, at an age when death can be conceived of so as to terrify, would there not be capability so far to conceive of the Ruling Spirit of the Universe as not to fear death. Grown up people shew such a stiffness in their ideas & prepossessions that ~~I imagine it to be~~/is easier to deal with fifteen years than with fifty, or even than with thirty or forty years. One

f17

says, "I believe all you say to be true," yet continues to manifest a fear of death & of punishment for the sins & omissions of this life. Another stops ~~you~~ short with, "I must have a God who" &c

Such religious instruction to children ~~as we speak of~~ would be inexpressibly facilitated by the *life* being a constant exemplification, ~~a constant~~ or manifestation of what was taught. ~~Oh!~~ How ~~can~~ I teach my children what I think of God's nature & purposes, of man's nature, duty, destination- & then live after the fashion of conventional life, & turn them back from my lesson on religion to the same life? This may be done consistently by those who can call their life the "state ~~of life~~ to which it has pleased God to call" them - who can bid their children pray, at morning & evening prayers, to be forgiven for having done nothing & omitted everything - but we, who think we ought to strive to fashion our circumstances so as to enable us, *in accordance with* the Divine Law, to do what is right, & *not* to omit what God calls us to do - how can we teach what we believe, & then send them back, as well as ourselves, when the lesson is done, to a life of which, we *know* that, *in accordance with* God's Law, the effect will be to make it impossible to live & to be in the spirit of that lesson?

f18

Gran

IV

~~Well then, father, she answered~~ "What is the religion that people ~~do~~ have now? If they do wrong, they say, Let us pray - pray for pardon & peace. If they have "trials", as they call them, they say, Let us bear them patiently - in another world it will all come right. If they are well-meaning & conscientious - & they make mistakes or fail, or are hindered by external circumstances, they say, God takes the will for the deed - in heaven we shall see our hopes fulfilled - not There will be no heaven for me nor for any one else, unless we make it - by wisdom carrying our ~~ideas~~/thoughts into realities. Good thoughts don't make a heaven, any more than *they* make a garden - But we say, God is to do it for us - not we - We? - what are we to do? - we are to pray - & to mean well - to take care that our hearts be right - "God will reward a sincere wish to do right" - God will do no such thing - ~~that~~/it is not His plan, He does not treat ~~us~~/men like children - Mankind is to create mankind. We are to learn
1st what is heaven & ~~then~~/2^{ndly}, how to make it - We are to ascertain ~~first~~ - what is right & then how to perform it" -

V

~~In her days of discouragement she wrote to me then, And how one (I had told her that I could not understand how, with her views, Why with our ~~her~~ certainty that all, through God's laws, ~~would~~/will come at last~~

f19

to perfection, ~~she did not make herself entirely~~/are we not happy?

happy "Is the man happy who dreams only of California & goes up & down finding no way nor means of getting there? I see, or believe in a better future a relief from present poverty- but ~~said~~ how am I to make my way into the new era, religious & social, which is coming? I have not strength to create it - I have not resignation to wait for it. ~~Now it is too late, but I would that I had taken~~ /Many a man takes refuge with one loving heart & so contrived to live till the ~~next century~~/time, when the world will have brought in ~~the~~ /a new era of itself -

~~It may be that I shall~~/In this way he survives the present storm - And ~~then I shall have learnt~~/thus he learns, it is true, the soundings, most effectually, by the way ~~my~~/his vessel has struck - but she will be too much damaged to continue her voyage -

VI

In this age, Atheism & Indifference are man & wife. In former times, Atheism used to be the father of Despair. But now, people live without God in the world & ~~they~~ don't so much as know that he is not there - they are not aware of His absence - Formerly, the terror & the anguish of the Sceptic testified to what he had lost & were the truest witness to God & to his own *religiousness*. Now, the Indifferentist is called the religious man - & the religious man is ~~a~~ the heretic.

How do you know ~~what is called~~ a religious man now? By his going to church - And going to church is considered as a duty - that is, as something *due* - to whom? to God - something you have done for Him. He is flattered by your going to church - But it is not always done as a compliment to Him - Sometimes it is done as a compliment to our fellow=creatures - Mrs. Ainsworth is deaf & cannot hear the service,

but she always goes to church for the "example". A great many ladies ~~always go~~/never miss going where they are known, for this purpose, ~~I believe~~ but if they are where they are not known, they do not go - What a poor compliment it is to God to go, not because you have something you want to say to Him, but because Mrs. Ainsworth goes - In a country church, if there is a wedding of any consequence, the church is always sure to be full the first Sunday the bride appears, ~~at church~~ in order to see her - "To see the bride" is a very innocent amusement, but is ~~Lord bless me, what oh my dear father what shall we do?~~ Religion is come to that pass in this country that people go to a place - where they say they expect to meet God - to "see the bride."?

In more civilized society, ~~you~~/a woman scarcely ever leaves a breakfast=table to put on ~~your things~~/her bonnet for church without hearing a joke among the men & the enquiry, "Shall you go this morning?" "No, I don't like the Litany - Shall you?" "Yes, I shall. I don't like shocking our hostess" - And, when you meet at luncheon, "have you fulfilled your ecclesiastical duties? Oh! shocking, don't you consider it a duty? I did not know you were so bad" - Or, "I counted 46 people asleep this morning."

And when one thinks that there are ~~thirty~~/fifteen thousand Sermons to be preached ~~that~~/this morning, & more than ~~thirty~~/fifteen thousand breakfast=tables where similar jokes are making, - ~~{illeg}~~ - and this is called a Church & this religion?

document, ff21-195, pen

f21

7

Dartnell

VII

"~~I think~~ The world seems to be/~~is~~ dead - There is a fable by Leopardi where Hercules visits Atlas & offers to relieve him of the world for a time, while he takes a holiday - And Atlas imparts to him his uneasiness ~~that~~/lest the world ~~is~~/shd be dead - there used, he says, to be a constant buzz & murmur in it - but now it is all quiet/~~still~~ - there used to be a great pulse beating in it - but now it is quite still - He says that he had even made preparations for the funeral & composed his Elegy, ~~but~~ fearing that the corpse would smell, but he has not perceived it yet - & is afraid of burying a still living body - ~~±~~/I partake the uneasiness of Atlas & I think this must be the case now - Look at what is passing on the world - Look at France submitting to such a yoke - And what do we discuss? Not the chances or means of recovery for the wretched French from this horrible disease - but - the personal character of Louis Napoleon, as if the "coup d'état" were a play or a work of art. We dispute whether he is a fanatic or a rascal, whether he is well=intentioned man using bad means, or a bad man using good means - Look at Switzerland! what a noble little people they used to be, ~~kicking &~~ struggling, on the tops of their mountains, for their independence, keeping all the world at bay - & only 14 years ago, how gallantly they armed their little fortifications & dragged ~~at~~/out their cannon & were ready to have their ~~little/very~~-watches smashed for this very man, who is dictating to them now

19

7a

* Note he became

It may be said, We should speak with generosity of a fallen foe - Is there no absolute right & wrong, but are we only to consider Schwarzenberg as a foe to us, not as a sinner in the abstract?

⊕

And now look - at his first word, they give up their privilege of affording hospitality - they agree to everything he commands - Look again at Austria when Schwarzenberg dies - & in this country, in the land of political freedom, as it calls itself, there appears the next morning on 40,000 breakfast tables an leading Article in a newspaper speaking with admiration of Swarzenberg's talents & saying that his country will remember him "with gratitude, ~~if~~/but not with love." For Swarzenberg *note - opposite page 7a - read Rush - or Mrs. Manning -

& speak with admiration of Rush's talents - Yet Rush committed only 3 murders, where Schwarzenberg ~~had~~ committed 3 thousand. ~~We do not care what/~~It is often said, what does it signify what the opinion of the ~~Editor of the Times is,~~ writer of a leading Article is? he is but one man. But the

"Times"

writes what will be *read* - & it is therefore a fair standard of the opinion of this country -

The days of martyrdom cannot return - we do not wish ~~them to return~~/that they should - when all that a man needed to do was to "~~sing~~/pour out" the truth which was in him, without caring what ~~came~~/became of it, not whether it were said in a ~~a~~/such a manner that any one could accept it - Those days cannot come back - & we should not wish them back - Still, there was a nobler element then in the character ~~then~~ than Silence & now that people are silent - (in the midst of so much speech) - silent about the convictions which are deepest & strongest in them, we must find some other expression which shall be as true & afford as strong a nourishment to the character as martyrdom formerly did.

VIII

"The prison which is called a family, will its rules never be relaxed, its doors never be opened? Think What is it, especially to the ~~female/single/~~ woman? The ~~male/man~~ may escape & does - The cases where a child inherits its parents' tastes are so rare that it has passed almost into a proverb. The son of a celebrated man is never a celebrated man. The two Herschels, the two Mills are mentioned as memorable exceptions - A son scarcely ever adopts his father's profession - except when compelled, as in the case of Caste - & ~~I confess I wonder,~~ in the lands where Caste prevails, ~~that~~ the race ~~does not come to an end/deteriorates~~ - How often ~~you hear~~ a parent is heard to say, All that I have done will go to rack & ruin when I am gone. I have none to come after me who will keep it up! It is said that the chances are 200 to 1, where a man's immediate descendants consist of 3 children & 3 grandchildren, ~~that~~ against there being found one, among these ~~there will be one~~ who inherits his father's & grandfather's tastes & powers. The law of God, it seems is *against repetition* Whatever the family, whatever the similarity of education, circumstances &c, ~~you never see~~ repetition is never seen. And ~~This does/is this seem to you~~ extraordinary?

In Chemistry, the mixture of two substances constitutes an entirely new substance, of which ~~you~~ neither the colour nor any of the properties cannot/be predicated from a mere knowledge merely of the colour or any of the properties of the two

original substances - So, in the family, though ~~you~~
~~you~~/there can be traced, it is true, the family character, the family
likeness - yet the children are all strikingly unlike
each parent, strikingly unlike each other - Here
~~you will say~~ the analogy with Chemistry *appears* to cease. For,
~~together~~ the product of two chemical substances is always the same
under the same circumstances - But, ~~taking into~~
~~account the probability of an anterior existence, &~~
~~also that there are~~ such are the minute differences of circum=
stances, which we never ~~can~~ estimate, that the analogy
may still remain - And, as it is said that there
are no two leaves alike upon the same tree, so &
much more, there never were created two human
beings alike - Now, what do we do with these
unlikenesses? The family strives to make them
all do the same thing - If one of the family, as
often happens, is superior to the rest, the rest
& especially the heads of the family seem to want
~~that~~/this one to be one with them ~~what~~/as we try to be one with
God, ~~namely, one with Him - this one~~-/he is to devote
all his talent & genius to forward their ideas, not
to have any new ones, - to put their opinions, their
thoughts & feelings into a better dress, a more
striking light not to discover any new light - &
above all, ~~find~~ \don't you/ he is not to find out any untruth
in ~~our~~/their ideas, or think ~~you have~~/he has any new truth,
"for there is no such thing!"
Jones To help others *just* by *living* - by being *oneself*,
is not ~~that~~/this the true meaning of sympathy, the true benefit of
companionship?

But, in general, we have to live by not being ourselves. And what a fatiguing way of life ~~that~~/it is! When ~~one is~~/we are not afraid of being ~~oneself~~/ourselves, when ~~one~~/we suits the people ~~one is~~/we are with, when what ~~one says & feels~~/we say & feel does not shock them or annoy them or frighten them, life is easy, life is improving, ~~one makes~~/we make progress - Now, how often does this happen in one's own family, where one can rarely speak without implying blame of something, knocking against some one's prejudices? And can it be otherwise when people are chained up together for life so close in the same cage? It is often said that ~~people~~/you are less known by ~~their~~/your own family than by any one else - Is it wonderful? There is much of which you can never venture to speak "The extraordinary reserve which he or she maintained with his or her own family" are words so common that every one has heard them - & yet they are always uttered as if it ~~was~~/were a solitary, or, as it is put, an extraordinary fact - "he is so much more agreeable out of his own family" is another common remark - And how often you see the countenance fall when he is speaking to one of his own ~~family~~/kin! As long as the iron chain is drawn tight round the family, fettering those together who are not joined to one another by any sympathy or common pursuit, ~~this~~/it must be so - It is often disputed what kinds of character like society- It is probable that those like it who can say aloud the things which they would think to themselves, if they were alone - But how few can do this at home? There is no tyranny like that of the family - For it extends over the thoughts.

11a

Suppose you were to say of me that I ~~m~~/do not desire the death of my child, but rather that she should turn from her wickedness & live - & expect that I should ~~to~~ be admired ~~from~~ for it? How God must laugh at us sometimes -

What blasphemy has there ever been worse than the blasphemy of the religious man of the present He tells us that God is angry, that He ~~is-reve~~ seeks His own glory, that He is revengeful, or sometimes, as a climax that He does not wish for the "death of ~~the~~ the sinner" Could any one ever think He did? Do we take Him for a murderer, Him? the Creator? Insert 11a

~~I am sure,~~ It ~~would/must~~ have done ~~me~~ much more good, ~~had I lived~~ in the days of the Pantheistic Greeks, to have gone down in the beautiful summer mornings to the river brink, & thought of its benevolence & its beauty & how much good it had done on its way, than it does now, to go to church & say the very same prayers over & over again to the Being whom we worship.

"Grant all this for the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord." ~~why~~ what a Being he must be not to do it because it is right, if it is right to do it, or because He loves us, ~~but~~ not for "the sake of Jesus Christ"! ~~I am sure~~ We cannot think such a Being good, tho' we tell him that He is so - "Have compassion upon thy children." {the following six lines have a large X drawn through them} Only think If I were to go to my mother & say to her, every morning, ~~too,~~ "Now, do be kind to my sister - Now do be kind to her - for the sake of Jesus Christ. She would say "Oh don't bother me, my dear child - Don't be so imper-
tinent I can ~~love~~/take care of her as well as you can"

Jemmon Is it possible that we can love such a Being? one who cannot, or will not, take care of His own children unless He is begged - & prayed=
We love Jesus Christ for saving us from Him/~~such a Being~~

It is all so poor. When there happens an accident on the Railway, I am to thank God for having saved *me*, & not to say, "Why, there is poor Mrs. _____'s son, you said if she prayed to you, you would keep him safe and now you have broken his arm." No, I am to thank God/~~Him~~ for having taken care of *me* & not him in this accident & ~~not him~~ - instead of thanking Him that he keeps the eternal laws inviolate - which His Goodness & Wisdom have planned.

~~She had been writing to me some of her imaginative nonsense about Saviour, to which I answered "I differ with you in the anticipation~~ It is often said that the time is past
of/for *individual* Saviours (male or female) - that the rough machinery of many hands & many minds must work out the slow results of regeneration; now ~~I guess~~ that the most enlightened despotism of mind or body (Emperor or Philosopher) will have a poor chance, even when Europe has burst her chains - that ~~w~~we have passed the days of enthusiastic Saviours - we must be of the mob; ~~even by your own shewing~~
Can that a J. S. Mill cannot ensure us of a single truth in Political Economy? ~~what~~ that no two men agree upon whether ownership or partnership is to form the remedy for the labourer's misery - ~~& Could~~ that neither a Pitt ~~or~~/nor a Fox could settle the best extent of the future suffrage? - nor the best scheme of Education - ~~& could a~~ that no future President could settle the Slavery question ~~elsewhere?~~/in America - nor government by any kind of representation nearer home ~~&~~ that ~~S~~single hands are non-cooperative - & when they have done their work, ~~what~~/there comes a collapse, ~~come next!"~~

XI

~~To this she answered "I cannot see how~~ Nevertheless, the world ~~is too~~/cannot be saved, except thro' Saviours, at present. A saviour means one who saves from error; ~~does it not? Only,~~ But we do not think it worth while to dignify with this appellation one

who saves from merely intellectual or scientific error ~~but~~/ & therefore it means ~~more~~ one who saves from moral error. It has been generally thought that Christ saved from *all* moral error - & that we have nothing to do but make "faith" ~~in Him~~, as it is called, in Him "effectual to bring down our pride, subdue our selfishness, restrain our tongues" - &c - Men do not see that pride is only the perversion of the natural desire (implanted by God in us) to be & to feel of importance - Every human being *is* of importance - & ought to be employed in a way to make him feel himself so - The "bringing down" *this* feeling has been the origin of some of the most cruel perversions to which the poor human being has been made subject - ~~to~~ - But Man does not know, 1st what *is* pride, nor 2ndly, how to save himself from it - & therefore he prays to God to make the faith of Christ do it - & then to give him his "great & final reward." He does not see that ~~there is no~~ God will not give it him, because it is not consistent with Infinite Goodness & Wisdom to *give* him anything, but that he ~~will~~/must work it out for himself & for mankind, not in the shape of a "reward", but of a state of well-being -

Now what are the Saviours to do? Not to do any=thing, *instead of* man - ~~But~~/Still it is not intended that every man shall learn all the laws of God for himself - In astronomy, Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, Newton, Laplace, Herschel, & a long line of - Saviours, we may call them if we will, - discoverers

they are more generally called, - have saved the race from intellectual error, by finding out several of the laws of God - We do not say, "don't look at what these men have done - they may be despots, enlightened despots of the mind - you must learn all the laws of God yourself from the beginning -

In the same way, there may be, there must be Saviours from social, from moral error. ~~It really seems to me that~~ Most people have not learned ~~the/any~~ lesson from life at all - ~~that,~~ suffer as they may, they learn nothing, they would alter nothing - if they began life over again they would live exactly the same life as before/~~again.~~ ~~My dear Grandmother & Aunt (one of whom said to me, "I have suffered everything")~~ they have learned nothing from life.

When they begin the new life in another world, they ~~will~~/would do exactly the same thing - & they must. till somebody comes to help them - And not only individuals, but nations learn nothing - ~~Look~~ Austria, four hundred years ago in Switzerland, was doing exactly the same thing which she is doing now in Hungary - She has learnt nothing - A man once said to me, 'Oh if I were to begin again, how different I would be'. But you very rarely hear this - On the contrary, you very often hear people say, 'I would have every moment of my life over again,' & they think it pretty

15a

~~You often~~/We sometimes hear of ~~people~~/men "having given a colour to their age" - Now, if the colour is a right colour, those men are Saviours.

15b

The intellect, left inactive, its powers without an aim - the heart, left empty, its *ennui* without an employment - the moral activity, left objectless, its appetite without food, gnaw themselves, - & the spectacle of life & beauty only excites & increases their torments.

& grateful to God to say so - For such there can be no heaven, in fact, it ~~woul~~ will not be there for them to have till Saviours come to help them. This is the "eternal death", ~~of which the Scriptures speak~~/insert 15a

~~You~~/People think that the world is in the mud & that it must stay there - ~~I~~/We think it is in the mud too, but ~~I am~~/we are sure it is not to remain ~~in it~~/there -

XII

~~Am I am~~

~~You tell me~~/We are often told to find ~~my~~/our solace in nature - To those who remain always children & to those who are still children, with whom the poetry of life is ~~still~~ every thing, nature may be all=in=all. But those who have attained the weariness & discouragement of middle life, of efforts which have been made & have failed, such require not so much the beauty as the wisdom of life - not art but knowledge & strength. Insert 15b { the next five lines have vertical lines drawn through them} ~~The~~ ~~intellect, left~~ inactive, its powers without an aim, - the heart , left void, its ~~nameless ennui~~/ennui without an ~~purpose~~ employment, the moral activity, left ~~without an~~ objectless, its appetite without food, gnaw themselves, & the spectacle of life & beauty only excites & increaser their torments.

The worst of inactivity is that it does not, with the faculties any more than with the limbs, lead always to activity thro' suffering - Though we detest the sofa which has become necessary to us, yet we dread the exertion which would save us & of which we are perhaps become really incapable.

Suffering ~~often~~/sometimes extinguishes us - sometimes partially paralyses us - ~~often~~/sometimes enfeebles us - sometimes it enriches us, indeed, as nothing else can - but, in the first case, what *can* save us but a saviour? Only where ~~it~~/suffering exercises our faculties, ~~does it do the last one~~/does it enrich us.

Pity ~~me~~/a man because ~~I~~/he knows too much of life to be happy? Pity those whose ignorance must one day be torn asunder like a curtain, & by passing through an age of misery, must be transmuted into pure wisdom before they can be happy -

~~I used to~~/Many long ~~so~~ intensely to die - to go to another world, which could not be a worse, & might be a better one than this - But ~~now I am not quite clear whether~~ is there ~~is~~ any better world *there* ~~for me~~, to go into? ~~whether~~ has Mankind ~~have~~ yet made a better world ready? We are sure ~~I am~~ that it will not be there till Mankind has "gone to prepare a place for" ~~me~~/us. Have we any reason to suppose that any other world is forwarder than this? ~~Perhaps I had better, after all, stay where I am.~~

The "kingdom of heaven is within," ~~you say~~/indeed - but it must also create one without. Because we are *intended* to act upon our circumstances - We must beware, both of thinking that we can maintain that "kingdom of heaven within" under all circumstances - because there are circumstances under which the human being cannot be good, - & also of thinking that the kingdom of heaven *without* will produce that *within* -

{The first paragraph has a large x drawn through it} [8:113-15]

My daughter & I were walking together. The high South wind was hurrying by - the sun shining bright & hot in the cloudy heavens - But the air was filled with a fog of dust carried before the gale, which blew ceaselessly, fiercely, like a destiny never weary of suffering - so at least said my poor foolish girl - The dust formed into whirlwinds & whitened all the fresh grass & the yellow spring buds which were coming out. "So it is with my life" she said. "The wind has blown down all my supports & hopes & plans - The dust has dried them up. But the sun is still shining high in the heavens & the fresh wind is still blowing"

~~How often I think of our Saviour's/Christ's temptation, she said "It is the epitome of all life - It as it was, no doubt, the epitome of his own, which he told his disciples in that form. A sensitive, noble Spirit could perhaps hardly bear to tell/speak of it in that any other form."~~

~~"But how can you," I said "have the experience of our Saviour?"~~

~~"Have not we all?" she answered. "Do not we live for forty days, often for as many years, in the wilderness, seeking bread & finding none? Have I/we not lived these many, many years trying to find bread in Society, in Literature the literary trifling/dawdling of a civilized life, in the charitable trifling of a benevolent life - in the selfish~~

elegance of an artistic life? - have I/we not, in these deserts, these long, long weary years, tried to pick up food, & at last, ~~hav~~ craving & despairing of anything better have we not eaten that which was not bread - ~~have longed for~~/ applause & sympathy for that which is not good - the vulgar distinction of social praise, the temporary forgetfulness of excitement? Christ was never satisfied, with anything short of the highest - He resisted the temptation, which presses so sore on weaker minds, of making stones into bread - Then comes the temptation to make the great leap - inconsiderately to disengage ~~yourself~~/ourselves thoroughly & entirely from this life of starvation - With some this temptation comes first - with others later, as St. Luke has it - But in all, it comes from a religious impulse, as it was from a "pinnacle of the *Temple*" that Christ was ~~illeg~~ tempted to throw himself down - And it is in "the city", not of solitude, that such resolutions are ~~prevented~~/bred - from the monotonous ~~trifling~~/superficialities of common-place intercourse - ~~Three times I have tried~~/Women often try to take the great leap - ~~Once, 14 years ago, when I waited, longed~~ They long for a man's education at college, & ~~thought~~/think of disguising ~~myself~~/themselves & going to Cambridge - ~~Once, 7 years ago, when I/They endeavoured~~ to enter a ~~Hospital~~/Institutions, to learn ~~my~~ a charitable Profession there, in order afterwards to teach it in a better way. ~~And once/or when all other "trades" having failed, with all my plans annihilated & all my hopes/ hopes blighted & all my plans destroyed~~ ~~I resolved to~~ /they try marriage with a good man, who

~~loved me/loves perhaps his wife but who would have initiates/d me/her into the regular life of the world."~~

~~"And why did you not take one of these leaps, my child?" I said.~~

~~"The first I myself had not courage for. The second you, of course, would not suffer. And I gave it up. It cost me my life, /Disappointment often costs the woman her life, if by life is meant all spirit, energy, vitality. The uncertain was so strong in me, I had thought of it ever was six years old - I might have been the Howard of Hospitals, which I mention, not, I think, from any puerile vanity now but merely because I believe, in that case, while the vocation would have been/ if gratified, as often becomes the angels' wings/hands to bear me up & I should not have dashed my/her up, that she shall not dash her foot against the stones - Oh! if I had done it, Oh if parents would let their daughters follow their vocations, when they have any, what a different creatures I/they should have been/they would be. But you could not tell that. I do not blame."~~

{the rest of the page has an X drawn through it}

~~"Oh" said I, "How I wish" said I, "you had some sensible man to talk to you, whom you would listen to, who would/could convince you of the folly of these ideas - You talk of Howard. What good did Howard do? Did not the prisons remain in the same state as they were for nearly a century nearly?—after all his effort?"~~

~~To this S/she made no answer to this/answered me nothing - & we walked a~~

~~long time in silence, by the side of a little stream, which ran over its rocky bed, in the~~

{the first paragraph has an X drawn through it}
 midst of the high, uncultivated, barren moor=lands.
 At last we came to the rock where, leaping over
 a fall of three hundred feet, it fell with a tremen=
 dous noise into the boiling ~~dark~~ black, bottom=
 less chasm below. But drifting on the air &
 sparkling in the sun ~~were~~/was the spray sprinkled with a thousand
 bright
 rainbows. ~~on the spray.~~ Gran

~~"Yes" she said, "how like is the course of that little
 stream, {illeg} is to ours! {X ends here} The "devil" shews us the
 glory
 of the "kingdoms of the world" - It comes, sometimes
 in the shape of the vanity of colloquial or literary or social
 distinctions,
 of reigning by the intellect or by the - word or by love -
 oftenest, to the woman in that of power over a
 heart. It comes in the desert, is most se=
 ductive to those who live out of the common vanities
 of life - and it comes, with overpowering force,
 upon those who have long wanted for bread &
 found nothing but stones - Christ resisted the
 vanitous devil, but how few do, when weary,
 faint & wounded, having prayed every day for
 their "daily bread" & found none, they see how
 almost any reputation is to be made by cleverness
 & none by wisdom, & yield to the temptation.~~

XIV

~~in the evening we were at church, for it was
 Easter Day. "I like Going to church at night, when
 it is lighted up, she said - "For the lights reminds
 me/one of the times when they worshipped in catacombs
 & in dens & caves of the earth, they, of whom the
 world was not worthy - as St Paul says - I should/one would
 rather say, of whom the world was so wanting of/in need, as Saviours.~~

f37

{consists of a strip torn from the left side of a page}

As
sorry
create
have
of man
And
died
~~offsp~~
sorry
I h
of a
way
life
The
She
to in
afra
man
reads
Women
as
stray
& doc
cloth
My
dang
tamer

It reminds me/one of the first churches, in/caves in the third story below the earth, in the catacombs at Rome - where they renounced the beautiful light of the sun & the Campagna - & lived, a greater sacrifice than to die. [end 8:115]

"It was necessary, ~~she said,~~ when man was still in the savage state of war, revenge & barbarous life, that the Holy Ghost, the manifestation of the Father, should make itself Forgiveness, Mercy - on His part atonement - on ours Humility, Imploring Prayers, Hope - We could not apprehend the Father in any other way then. The Father is, at all times, making Himself the Son, God becoming man to enlighten us. But how can we understand the Word, unless it is a Word that we can hear? How can the *Father* speak to us? We should not comprehend. He *must* speak through the Holy Ghost. Therefore, at that time, it was necessary to speak of "descending" to us, to our weakness & unworthiness - of hope & peace offered to the sinner through a *sacrifice* - with all the poetry & love of the Xtian ~~mythology~~/Epic. The Greek mythology was the deification of the powers or laws of nature. The Christian mythology was the deification of the spiritual laws or ways by which communication exists between God & a half=savage, half=corrupted man - ("I am the Way," Christ says -) a man who fancies to himself God offended with His own creation & taking His revenge upon it.

If Christ were obliged now to speak to the judges, magistrates & staff of our Criminal Courts, where he heard the word "punishment" used - must he not speak of the mercy of God, to those whom He sees condemning criminals, in perfect good faith, to places where they must lose every ray of humanity still shining within them? For is not Mercy the only goodness which Society can apprehend - while we still conceive the idea of *punishment*, still have the word at all instead of reformation? A Christ *must* speak of the forgiveness of God. Society can conceive of nothing else.

~~But we can't reform others & God can."I said it it not
Those who don't believe, myself, in reformation - in Sir Joshua Jebb,
may talk,
in Lord Shaftesbury & the Ragged deacons' Schools may hope -
But reformation is a vain thing."~~

~~"Yes," she said "& we have attributed the same
impotence to God. He can only hang them & put
chains on their legs, as we do. 'The Court feels
bound to pass a severe sentence,' what does that
mean? & the criminal is imprisoned for 18
calendar months' - what is that for? merely to keep
him out of mischief for that time re note (22a) or to deter
others by terror? or to reform him? We know
that the second of these objects is not attained -
& the third is not even aimed at. Would it not
be better to let him out? But no, "the Court
feels bound to pass a severe sentence" & God~~

feels bound to give the sentence "of everlasting chains under darkness till the great day" Can He too only punish, instead of reforming? The idea of eternal damnation had its origin amid a Society which exercised punishment - & as soon as Mankind sees that there is no such word, that reformation is the only ~~thing~~/way, eternal punishment will disappear out of ~~its~~/his religion - Everlasting damnation & capital punishment will go out together.

~~-1-~~

XV

Jones {all of this page has an X through it}

~~On {illeg illeg}/the first of May we were at a ball, up & down~~
 the splendid marble staircase, brilliant with lights
 the air heavy with the scent of the perfume of hot=house flowers,
 passed pale sad fair figures, floating in light
 draperies & crowned with wreaths - The buzz, the
 {illeg illeg} warm & loaded atmosphere, the music,
 the pomp of dress & luxury, the beautiful figures
 moving about contrasted strangely with the
 grave, melancholy countenances of the dancers.
 Here & there, a girl quite young, pleased with
 the light & flowers & motion, the atmosphere of
 riches - or a vulgar matron, triumphant in her
 success in "getting on" in Society appeared to enjoy themselves really
 -

Fulgentia, white as the pearl which glistened [8:116]
 in her dark hair looked that night like
 Corregio's Magdalen - As she stood for one moment
 at the door of the London palace, the resemblance struck
 me particularly - Like that picture, there was
 nothing but the dark background behind her,
 typifying the darkness of the past - she had
 gone through nothing but darkness - the sharp
 stones of the court=yard were in front - for
 there was nothing before her but a hard, sharp/strong
 struggling life. The light was upon her face -
 And she looked straight forward far out into the
 night, as upon a distant point, on which all
 her faculties were concentrated, in which all her thoughts were
 absorbed. The future was everything to her -
 She had no other thought - ~~or hope.~~ I noticed
 the peculiar expression of her countenance as
~~she stepped into the carriage - I/& asked her why~~

~~She I asked her whether she did not like
Society. She pressed my arm & said~~
 "What has "Society" done for us? what is the mission [8:116-17]
 of Society? of Mankind? to civilize & educate us -
 How does it fulfil this? mission? ~~Did you see~~/What does it do for
 those "women on the street"? Those who have
 committed actual crime it takes possession of, &
 either makes away with, or condemns to a place
 where they must lose all hope as well as all
 desire of reformation. One would have thought
 that Society which had done so badly for them
 in their childhood, would now have wished to
 re=model them. ~~& repair its error.~~
 That is not the question. To punish them is all
 that is wanted. They must go, where the poisoner
 becomes corrupted & the forger loses all feeling,
 divine & human - They must be punished by
 being deprived of all lingering claims to being
 thought human creatures. & our brothers/sisters "From
 him that hath little shall be taken away
 even that which he hath" - But if indictable
 crime has *not* been committed, what does
 Society do? what protection does she give
 those wretched women? what constraint does
 she put upon those men who make them what
 they are? does she even turn a shy look upon
 them? Not at all - On the contrary, she throws open
 the/her doors wide to them, vicious ~~to them~~ vicious as they are, &
 like the beggars,
 whom she puts in prison, while she praises those [8:117]

2a

Society takes pleasure in stimulating passion in
 every kind of way, by early excess in wine, late
 hours, school=boy conversation & classical books
 &c &c &c &c &c & then says "you must not gratify
 this in a legitimate way, under pain of exciting
 our censure - the illegitimate satisfaction is the
 only one we allow". And then she gives these
 satisfactions, "like lilies, with full hands" - & allows
 no difficulty to remain unremoved -

2b

Society neither finds ~~you neither~~ /us with work, if ~~you/we~~ are too weak to find it for ~~yourself/ourselves~~ - nor does it ~~even/so~~ much as suffer ~~you/us~~ to perish for ~~want of nurture.~~ lack of nourishment.

f42

-3-

who gives to them (curious anomaly!) so she says to **[end 8:117]** the woman, 'Get out of my path!' while to him, without whom the woman would not ~~be/~~ have been vicious, she says, 'Come to my arms - I have my daughters ready for ~~him/you!~~'

Insert 2a

But, if a criminal is great, if, by some political trade, he has, like Schwarzenberg, made himself useful to the designs of a Government, of a Sovereign, then he does not go to prison or to Norfolk Island at all, on the contrary, the "Times" writes of him that he will be remembered 'with gratitude, if not with love' - Society punishes a Rush and protects a Schwarzenberg.

And ~~†/we~~ who are not "fallen women" - we talk about Mankind creating

Mankind, - what has Mankind done for ~~me/us~~?

it has created ~~passion &~~ wants which not only

it ~~prevents me~~ does not afford ~~me/us~~ the opportunity

of satisfying but which it compels ~~me/~~ us to disguise

& deny. It affords ~~me/us~~ neither interest, nor affections, nor

employment (Insert 2b It has made rich &

poor, without

teaching the rich to use their riches, nor the poor

their poverty. ~~It never "found" me with work,~~

~~when I was too weak to find it for myself - nor~~

~~with training to perform it, where/if I had found/ got it for~~

~~myself - It refused me a vocation, because Society does~~

~~not suffer one in females of my class. - It says,~~

if any one dies of hunger, 'You must not starve -

So I shall be punished if you do.' or 'You shall

be provided for at the expence of Society - But

it never says, 'You shall not starve spiritually -

you must not want the bread of life - So & so shall be punished if you do, if you lack the satisfactions which are as necessary to the faculties & feelings as food to the physical wants."

~~And how are we to know, I said, what satisfactions are necessary, what bread is healthful?~~

~~"Ah! how?" she said, sinking into silence.~~

XVI

{the rest of this page had a large X through it}

~~The next morning they were all sitting~~ in the drawing room, reading & working, & [8:117-] visitors coming in & out - She had been doing her part with the latter & ~~even sitting~~ came into one of the large embrasures of the room, where I was ~~sitting~~ writing. The sun shone in through the lofty window. which was full of flowers - the large white Azalea, like a Grecian beauty statue, opening its large rounded fair snowy petals to the sun - with its rich & perfect yet delicate forms - ~~its beauty of the~~ like a beautiful Antique - in calm, deep, yet not melancholy meditation rejoicing like the sun of Homer - yet philosophical like all his heroes - the grand castes of antique/ancient happiness - of powerful, not frail beauty - grave, imaginative - but not dreamy or sad - upright, not drooping - with open eye, not bent head- the crimson Geranium, like the passionate Italian, with its warm colouring & ~~crimson~~/glowing robe of divine

{the first paragraph has an X through it}

love, like ~~the~~/Titian's devout Virgin, ~~wrapt in ecstasy/ie~~
 rapt in pure contemplation, in impassioned religious enthusiasm,
 and the "Venus's hair" fern like the dreamy
 maiden of the North, ~~hiding itself/crouching~~ in damp solitary
 crevices, hiding the seeds under its bosom which
 are to fructify over the world - always incomplete
 & dissatisfied never bringing all its ~~seeds~~/fruit to
 perfection at once - shewing no flower - with
 rolled-up germs of future leaves - yet graceful in
 its fragile beauty beyond all other daughters of
 the Earth - the Mediterranean heath, like the
 pale ascetic, with its rigid leaves & sharp points
 She was arranging all these plants for she had
 a love of art & of beautiful forms, which I
 never saw surpassed - I spoke to her - I spoke
 first about the plants which she characterized
 in the way I have described - then about her

morning's work, which was the epitome of half
 the mornings of her life. {x stops here}

~~"My past life?" she answered -- "Oh! If we ha~~
 lived in a race which knew ~~who~~ how to employ
 any ~~power of work~~/strength instead of frittering it &
 repressing it, - how different it would be. But now when it ~~has a~~
 /finds one of its members with a
 great power of work, it is disagreeably surprised,
 it does not know what to do with ~~it~~/him, he is something
 extra & troublesome, which it had rather were
 not there -

The will is not intended to be frittered away
 in little decisions about every moment It is meant [end 8:118]

to have a great type before it - means & inducements for attaining that type every day to receive some knowledge or training towards realizing it - every day to apply & test that knowledge by actual work - Repose, which is the employment of all our ~~faculties~~/powers (of mind & heart) is found thus & only thus - thus it may be found in a hell - This is God's repose - otherwise how could He be happy in the midst of all this wretchedness? There is always something repulsive in the thought of Him sitting up there enjoying himself, while we are suffering all this - as if there were something selfish in it - But in His goodness & wisdom He finds His peace - *Dartnell*

But, without a type of what human nature may become before one, ~~I do not see~~ how ~~one~~ can any one work? There is a kind of vague belief that mankind goes on improving - that every generation is farther on than the last - There is, existing at the same time with the other, a vague belief that it is a kind of law that nations shall rise to a certain point & then fall - without any particular reason but that it is a law - & people point to the Assyrians, the Egyptians & others, whose name is Legion - And some say that England is come to that point & must now decline. It is very true that ~~all nations with whom we are acquainted with~~ - have risen & are now fallen -

but not because there is a law that so it shall be -
 Do we know yet what the type of England ought
 to be? Has any one a type before them, in what
 they do? ~~Has~~ Do you think L Derby or any ~~English~~ {illeg minister?}
 has a type
 of what are the nature & destination of mankind in/or
 of England in his head? The words are absurd. L Derby
 thinks of "staying in" a certain time, of not
 becoming unpopular with the country, of not
 doing any serious harm - ~~I suppose~~

When a young lady takes a poor child out of the
 village & thinks she will teach it - has she any
 type before her of what ought to be done,
 of what it ought to be by a certain time? She thinks, as
 the phrase is that it is better than "doing nothing"
 for the poor child - that some good will come of it,
 she does not quite know what, either for her or
 for it - She has no type -

And it does not appear at all certain that
 mankind *is* always making ~~progressing~~ - Sometimes they are
 going forward, sometimes they are going back. It
 is every evident that Asia has been making
 retrogression - excepting the Chinese, who have
 probably remained stationary - perhaps the only
 people which has done so - Parts of Europe have been
 making retrogression, Greece, Italy, Spain - England
 & Germany have been perhaps advancing -

~~"Do not go off into your types & politics," I said,
 "you bewilder yourself with these things - 'Politics~~

~~cannot be carried on, it is said, in this with that wild womanish way, with types & theories & so forth. They must be carried on by practical men, with a view to the exigencies of the time & country & to what can be done & not done.~~

~~"I acknowledge, I acknowledge," she cried "all that you say about women, & much, much more. Women's life is spent in pastime, men's in business - Women's business is supposed to be to find something to 'pass' the 'time' - such a good { 'resource' } as the phrase is speaking of drawing or music or literature. worsted crochet. If I & my two sisters were/young ladies are seen now sitting round the table doing worsted=work, we should be/they are supposed to be very appropriately & rightly employed - especially if one were/is reading aloud. But if you & two other men were to be discovered sitting round the table doing worsted work, or even in the evening talking over the fire with you doing *crochet*, we how we should-/women would laugh! The reason is that men are supposed to be doing their business in the morning - & in the evening, when their business is done, to be talking about something important enough to prevent their ~~doing~~/being able to do fancy=work at the same time - But women have never anything to say so important as that they should not be looking at their pattern -~~

When tailors & shoe-makers are at their work, we do not laugh - because they are doing their business. & tailors & shoemakers are generally reckoned the

most intelligent part of the community - It is only ~~that~~/the regarding anything as a mere "pass=time" that strikes us as so ridiculous in a full grown man - & why is it not so in a woman? ~~too?~~ Without the right cultivation & employment of all the powers, (and where do we see the woman with *half* her powers employed?) there can be no Repose, & with it, as I/we have said, repose may be found in a hell - ~~I found it in a hospital. Without there half/in a hospital of wounds & pain & operations & death & remorse & tears & despair, I should never have known it. And what does that signify? what does it signify that I should know it or not know it? But~~ The effervescence of energy, which there is in every young being, not diseased in mind or body, which struggles to find its satisfaction in the excitement of Society, of Imagination, of the vulgar conflicts of social life, ~~sought~~/will seek its true occupation at last, in the anguish of real life - {the next paragraph has an X through it}

~~I have felt with despair, before I came to pass the hell of despair - What was easy, what I could have had, what would have kept me alive till came a better day, what would have been sanctioned by all the wiles & sympathies, human & divine, about/around me, Marriage, that I refused - Oh! afterwards, how bitterly I was made to repent it! But I could not make up my mind at the time I refused it, at that time,~~ call back all the many coloured & sweet singing birds, which I had sent out, on the faith of accomplishing some day a great destiny, into many parts of the world of thoughts, ~~of some recall~~ them to fold their drooping wings for ever in my life

{this paragraph is crossed out}

Of my life I was thoroughly weary. The ennui of [8:118-19] existing was too great for me. I who ~~could have~~/was ready ~~done~~ for everything, now I can do nothing. Well, be it so! If it is right that I should die to shew the effects of this killing system, I am resigned, I am glad.

~~mind's sad shame. I could not/Many a woman cannot resign
 myself/herself to lead
 the life I had/she has seen my mother lead, I had seen every
 women about me/her lead - of manufacturing parties,
 laying out the grounds, reading the newspapers -
 superintending children whom they could not influence/ she they cannot
 manage,
 servants whom they could not manage/she they cannot influence, schools
 which
 they they knew/she knows nothing about, & seeing them all fail - (I
 knew I should do so better, but perhaps worse)
 And this unsustained by any real deep sympathy
 with the good man she had married./ her the husband, good though he
 may be. He was is
 thinking of other things - he did /does not cause her to
 partake his ideas & plans - except indeed his
 desire to have such & such a person at the house,
 such & such a disposition of the furniture or the
 garden - I had no faith in myself that, I could lead
 a better married life than this - tho' I really loved. {the rest of
 this paragraph has an X through it}
 I hoped, I wished, I prayed for a better destiny -
 I could not give up this trust - Oh God! what despair
 I have since felt in having given up what I might
 have had, woman's natural strength & solace, & with
 attaining nothing else -~~

~~How I did labour/ Such a woman longs for a Profession - How I did.
 struggles to open to women the paths of the School,
 the Hospital, the Penitentiary, the care of the young,
 the sick, the bad, - not as an amusement, to fill up
 odd times, to fancy they have done something when
 they have done nothing, to make a sham of visiting -
 but as the Roman Catholic church, (whose /a name I
 hardly venture to pronounce in your presence),
 systematically, as a reality, an occupation, a
 "Profession".~~

~~And how much good does your R. Catholic Ch. do,~~

Wheeler

~~I asked, with its systematic encouragement of beggars, its making the people dependent, its hideous demoralizing influence, in the giving away of alms?~~

~~"That is the harm it does, not the good" she answered "I was afraid to bring up her name, because of all this harm - But I am convinced that the hold she has upon female minds, especially at this time, is from the vocations, the real work, which she opens to them - What does our Church do for us? As for me, I can say what has she ever done for me?"~~ For such women, what does the Church **[end 8:119]** of England do?

~~You are always throwing stones at the Church, I said. And but what would you /should we have better, I should like to know, if you/we were to do away with the Church tomorrow?~~

~~"We may well ask that/this question - And how much mischief has arisen from its not having been asked long & considerately before a/every change has been made.{illeg} - But how can I take A/we answer it? Solitary beings - Numbers of men must consult together & discover their wants & how to supply them, doing nothing hastily - For, from these hasty destructions, small good has ever arisen - In fact, the day of destruction is over - We must now build up - But to build up without much consideration is as unwise as to pull down without any. Luther saw the mischief of "Indulgences". & he, by the most colossal effort of the human intellect, set aside the idea of an authority which had never before been doubted - But, instead of one authority he~~

set up another - Instead of a Church, he gave us a Book. Then his mind was incompetent to look what was to be done next. And the Protestant Church is perhaps ~~no~~/little improvement on the Roman Catholic. In some respects - it may be - a deterioration - inasmuch as it expects to excite the same feelings, while it has lopped off half the means. Yet ~~you would~~/we should not say that Luther had better have left the Indulgences alone - Brutus killed Caesar - but he had not thought what was to come next - And there followed a worse than Caesar - In the same way, the French knew very well that Louis Philippe's government was an evil - & they upset him without more ado - but they had not thought about what was to come in his place - & behold, a worse than Louis Philippe is here - This is not saying that Louis Philippe was not an evil & that they had better have left him alone - but that they had better have considered what they were about to place in his stead. ¶/We quite agree with those who say, if we were to do away with the Church tomorrow, what should we have in its place? Mankind must consider - those of Mankind who want something more than the Church - To take her away from those who are satisfied with her would be cruel.

And, about every thing else, people do consider & lay their heads together - Mr. Hunt, of Herne Bay, writes to all the Medical Men in this kingdom, to ask what has been their experience about the effect

of Arsenic as a Medicine - And out of the experience of many men he deduces a result - People will do this about a medicine for the body, but they ~~won't~~/will not do it when it is only for the Soul. They will do it to

ascertain a fact - & when a fact has been ascertained, & people are interested in procuring means to apply that fact to their advantage, how they will work! Look at the Corn Law League - at the thousands of pounds which were subscribed in a few days, when L Derby's Administration appeared to threaten the return of protection.

But we are so little interested about religion, we are so little sure of our facts concerning it, that we ~~can~~ never go to the same trouble nor exertion for its sake.

XVII

[8:119]

~~We broke up the conversation, for she had to dress to go to an marriage, where she was bridesmaid For description, see Sir Charles Grandison.~~

~~"What a dangerous & hair breadth speculation it is, said she to me as we drove back," to bring up children on the plan of doing a thing, because 'you like it,' because 'it pleases you' - What does it signify whether I like it. what *God likes* is the question, - not what He likes by an arbitrary fancy, as we often imagine, but what His laws, His eternal immutable laws, the expressions of Perfect Goodness [end 8:119] & Perfect Wisdom, are for or against."~~

~~Yes, but what do you know of His Laws? And may not you be mistaken in what you think you know?~~

~~"Oh yes - I mean what we can ascertain of His Laws."~~

Let then the question be not what Mr. A. or Mrs. B. [8:119-] or ~~Mary~~ think, but what God thinks - ~~God's laws are for . Those~~ Those are first cousins who were married to day. Relations intermarry or persons with scrofula or insanity in their families - In the whole

family, which is a very large one, the question perpetually arose/immediately arises, 'Does Elizabeth like it?' 'I don't think Sabina does' like it.' ~~John~~, I am sure, does. He has quite got over all his prejudices against it" "And ~~filleg~~ A., she was always inclined to it.'

~~I am sure~~ The question never once presented itself to the minds of either bridegroom or bride or any of those in authority over them, Does God like it? Is there a Law of His or is there not a Law which favours or which discounts marriage between blood relations? Or between persons with hereditary disease in the family.

~~And how do you know there is not?~~

~~"I know nothing at all about it. I am not saying that there is not. I only know that the question never arose for an instant before their minds. I think if the case had been in my family, I should have~~ /People do not, for these purposes, investigated- Physiological Laws, [end 8:119]

~~consulted~~ Statistics & ~~made out~~/or make out what ~~I could~~/they can from the experience of ~~Medical Men~~ those who have experience - They consult fancies.

~~Last year I was bridesmaid at a marriage, where there was not enough to live upon.~~ Again, when a poor marriage is decided upon, neither bride nor bridegroom ~~made~~/make the smallest calculation - how much bread, how much butter, how much house ~~was~~/is to be had for 600 a year. They ~~said~~/say they ~~would~~/will be guided by the wishes of their parents - Which of us has not heard that dutiful speech? Then, afterwards, they grow tired of being 'guided by the wishes of

their parents', & quite amiably & respectfully
~~thought/"think"~~ they ~~could/can~~ marry, still without making
 the least calculation - The parents ~~thought/"think"~~ they
 could not, & disapproved - The poor girl ~~gre/grows~~
 thin & pale - 'Now, don't you approve?' she ~~said/says~~.
 or if she ~~did/does~~ not say, ~~they knew that she felt-/~~she feels.
 And at last they ~~were/are~~ fain not to "disapprove".
 Maye The thoughts of ~~people/~~children are ~~never/seldom~~ directed
 upon the question before them - but upon
 questioning the judgment of their parents.
 And this is not entirely their own fault. It
 arises from the views of authority & of their
 responsibility, taken by parents - They *assume*
 a responsibility they cannot have.

'I will wait two years for your satisfaction.'
 says the young lady - It ~~was to me~~ is exactly as
 if she had said, 'I do not know whether it is
 safe for me to go into that river or not, I have
 not examined the point how deep nor how rapid
 it is - I don't know whether I shall sink or swim,
 but I will wait two years - what for? for my
 mother's satisfaction, before I jump in.'

Is not this ~~your/a~~ true experience ~~as/of~~ what passes
 between parents & children in most families?

~~I remember when I was younger than I am~~
~~now, when I used to /~~A young lady teaches at ~~our/a~~ Sunday school &
 feels
~~felt~~ that it ~~was/is~~ all a sham & that ~~I was/~~she is
 pretending to do that which ~~I was/~~she is not really doing,
~~I remember begging & praying/~~She begs to be allowed to go
 to some place for a few months to learn to teach
 & ~~my/her~~ mother ~~always~~ answering 'You teach
 quite well enough *to please me.*' ~~I had a vague/~~The girl
 kind of idea that it was not all right, but

~~She~~ has a vague idea it is not all right but knows ~~wish~~ not what to answer.

~~How I hate~~ What a mistake ~~it~~ that word "indulgent", as applied either to God or man implies! If "indulgent" means doing what Love prompts & Wisdom teaches to be right, God *always* is indulgent & parents ought to be so - But if "indulgent" means giving something which may be a little hurtful, because you love so much, that is not true love, & God never is indulgent & man ought not to be "

XVIII

{the rest of this page has an X through it.} [8:119-20]

~~In looking over her old letters, I find a few~~ more relating to this time of her life - I was amused with some of her speculations - To endeavour to carry out such things into shape & form, in actual life is simply absurd - The world must wag on as it pleases, & the thing we have to do is to make the best of it - The vehemence with which she urged some of her opinions sometimes annoyed me, but I never had the least idea that she would step out of her position, forsake her duties & do what she did - Her sister, who married & married very well & satisfactorily, as I have said, partook some of her strange notions, and, I always thought, supported her in them, - though marriage had considerably modified her as it always does, & taught her to recognise the wisdom of many conventionalities which she had formerly rebelled against. I was proud of both of them, though they frightened me when I was ~~anxious, & made me laugh when I was merry~~

But here is a letter, which I found among Fulgentia's, from her married sister, relating to her five children — I hope they did not see it.

“‘Honour thy father & thy mother.’ But we honour [end 8:120] that which is *honourable* - I cannot teach them this, Fulgentia. In this commandment there are three fallacies - - “that thy days may be long in the land’ there is no connection, - &/between duty to parents and ~~to be rewarded with~~ ‘long life’? ‘which the Lord thy God giveth thee.’ The Lord did not give it them. They took it from the Canaanites by fraud & force -

What ~~shall/am I/are~~ we to do with ~~these~~ girls of mine? Fulgentia? It is vaguely taken for granted by women that it is to be their first object ~~is to be~~ to please & obey their parents till they are married. I am sure I do not wish it to be the first object with mine/my daughters - But the times are totally changed since those patriarchal days - & I am very glad they are - Man (& woman too) has a soul to unfold, a part to play in God's great world.

Marriage is supposed to exercise a magical effect upon the judgment - for a married woman of eighteen has more independence, & is thought better able to act for herself than a single one of thirty=six. But it is not to be the first object for a man ‘born into the world’; nor for a woman either, when he or she is of age, to please the parents - There is a higher object than this for the being, which is to be one with God. It is true the child must obey & ought to obey implicitly - The question is then, *when* the child

becomes of ate - If this ~~is~~/were left to ~~my~~/the parents' discretion, ~~I should~~ they would perhaps, ~~never declare the~~ with the best & purest conscientious intentions, ~~never~~ declare ~~my~~/their children were ~~so~~ ~~never~~ of never of age. Parents seldom think that their children are ~~of age~~/grown up - & the children who have made most advance, & are before their generation, ~~are~~/will always be those whom ~~the~~/conscientious parents are most tempted to restrain as ~~'mad'~~ & 'geniuses unfit to judge for themselves in the common affairs of life' - because, naturally enough, they cannot

understand them.- ~~Heaven forbid that I should~~
~~ever~~/We see parents building up obstacles in the way of ~~my~~ children which ~~is what~~

~~as I see most parents doing~~ /as zealously as if it were their sole vocation ! ~~of most parents.~~ It is

almost invariable that, when one of a family is decidedly in advance of all the others, he or she is tyrannised over by the rest & declared 'quite incapable of doing anything reasonable'. A man runs away from this - a woman cannot - The one who ought to be at the top of the ladder is always at the bottom - It is not only against those termed physically insane that Commissions of Lunacy are taken out. Others have been kept unjustly in confinement by their well-intentioned relations, as unfit to be trusted with liberty. In fact, in almost every family, one sees a keeper, or two or three keepers, & a Lunatic - Happy for the poor lunatics, if there are two of them in one family! - They

[8:118]

may combine - ~~The youngest of my girls, Mary, has by far the richest nature of the whole family - She is always at the bottom of the ladder. In fact, it must be so -~~ for Those natures which have the strongest affections, and ~~they~~ therefore cannot bear not to please the others, not to be in the same key with the others, & ~~therefore they~~ follow where they ought to lead.

[end 8:118]

It must not be left to ~~my~~parents' discretion to declare when a child is able to act for himself - The law has not left it at the discretion of parents & guardians to decide, when a man becomes of age - If it had, he never would have become of age - it had fixed this age at twenty=one - It has not said twenty or twenty=five, but advisedly, taking into consideration the experience of Mankind, it has fixed upon twenty=one - Guardians are not left to say *when* a young man shall come into the possession of his property. If they were, some, self=interested, would like to keep him out of it for their own sakes - others, well=intentioned & conscientious, would think he was still a child & not fit to manage it. But the law says *twenty=one*.

Gran Who is to decide when a young woman shall come into possession of herself? Not ~~±~~ the parents, certainly, A woman of twenty=one ought to consider herself of age, as regards her own conduct. It may be too early for some, too late for others. The real age of regeneration varies - when the child, generated by the parents at the age of 0, is regenerated by reason & education - But in spite of the mistakes which will follow, ~~I should think it/it~~ would be better for ~~my~~ children, if they ~~female=one~~ no longer consider themselves under tutelage after twenty=one.

The connexion between parents & children, in its present state of transition, is, ~~as I find to my~~ cost, a miserable one - Yet ~~±~~/we could - In former days, ~~when~~ children called their parents "Sir" & "Madam" - in the present days, they call them, at least one of them, "Governor" or "Relieving Officer," - in former times,

they did not sit down in their parents' presence, in these, mothers wait upon their daughters, & are vexed at once that the daughters do not do it for themselves, & that they are not grateful to them for doing it - in the last century, proposals of marriage for the children were made to the parents - the parents accepted or refused, often without the knowledge, generally without the consent of the children - in this, a man asks the woman herself, - without the previous knowledge, & ~~(as happened the other day with my oldest daughter)~~ sometimes even in the absence of the parents . In the last century, the relation was therefore a much more definite ~~or a~~ and easy one. Implicit obedience was exacted & given - Submission not gratitude, expected. Then ~~you~~/it might truly ~~say~~/be said that the responsibility rested with the parents. for they undertook & were understood to act in the stead & without the co-operation of their children.

But now, ~~the parents~~ with whom rests the responsibility? The parents assume that they have it - but without any longer the right to support it Many a mother of this day would speak (if her feelings were put into words) thus:

"My ~~grand~~ mother did not think of what her daughter thought - her daughter had no business to think - *she* thought in her stead - *I* allow my daughter to think, but I expect that she shall always thinks like me - That is the least she can do, in common gratitude, in return for all that I have done for her. I don't desire her to obey - no such tyranny can exist in that 19th century - but she is always to act as I should do - I don't wish her

to submit - but I wish her to be, what I wish to be with God, one with me - I don't command her to be silent, but I expect that her opinion shall always be the same as mine - I am excessively indulgent - that is, I take immense pains (~~in the my grand~~ mother took no pains of the sort) to make her happy - in my way - to please her - according to my taste - to do ~~to her~~ & what ~~I think~~ she *ought* to like - not what she does like - to ~~do~~/arrange what I think is good for her - not what ~~she thinks~~/interests her - & she is not grateful" In these days, it ~~is not~~/can no longer be, 'Do unto others as ~~they~~/you would be done by'

-
but 'Do unto others as ~~you~~/they would be done by' - In the vagueness of all things which belongs to this transition=time, the relation between parents & children is as difficult to find as your way in a London fog. The parents take responsibilities which they cannot perform - the children feel that ~~a great~~ they are not performed - the parents feel that they are going through a great deal for their children - the children that gratitude is exacted from them for that which does not make them happy - both sides suffer equally from disappointment, & both are alike to be pitied. The mothers are disappointed, that they are not loved - the daughters that they feel no attraction towards the parents - For we can only love that which is loveable to us. An uncomfortable age! The last one was better - But no - it was not. We could not go back to that if we would. And we would not if we could.

Still ~~I~~/we know ~~my~~/our daughters wish that they were married, as ~~I~~/we did, in order that they may exercise at least some of their faculties & attractions - And no wonder - ~~And~~ that is the reason why ~~I~~/we married - And they will have to run the same ~~way~~/chance with *their* children.

~~Just~~ See what is expected of poor unfortunate mothers, that they should be able to answer all the attractions of all their daughters - the parts which twenty people could not play must all be acted by her - She must be a poet with one, a woman of business with another, an artist with a third, a thinker with a fourth - In order to develop the capabilities of each - And why? Because they are shut up in a family, without free scope to find their natural attractions & exercise the powers of each.

Yet daughters are now their mothers' slaves, just as much as before - they are considered their parents' property - they are to have no other pursuit nor power nor independent life, unless they marry - they are to be entirely dependent upon their parents - white slaves in the family - from which ~~only~~ marriage alone can emancipate them - ~~I~~ Mothers acknowledge this, even while ~~I~~ feeling that ~~I~~~~am~~/they are the/~~my~~ daughters' slaves too -

It is so vague what we have to do that we are obliged, ~~as I/we said~~ often to keep our responsibilities, while we have lost the privilege to which they appertained & which alone could enable us to perform them 60

Ferriday

XIX

~~In answer to this epistle, Fulgentia wrote as follows -~~

~~"Let me see,~~ Shall we not all allow ~~this?~~ That every one ought to have exercise for all his faculties & that every one ought to come freely into contact with all others. But how is it? We begin by teaching something to our boys which, we acknowledge, if it is to be learnt, will leave time for nothing else - Dr. Arnold wished to introduce German into Rugby, &/but he soon found, if the boys were to learn Latin & Greek, they had not time for German or anything else. We teach language & history. History consists of facts, which can be made no use of by the boy, because he has not yet sufficient experience of life to understand them - they may lie fallow, it is true, till he has. And yet ~~I suppose~~ there is not one of us but ~~allows~~/admits at once that all the faculties ought to have exercise & food.

~~Then,~~ As to mixing freely with all others, we mix, at least our women do, with the narrowest of all possible circles, a family - where the chances are almost nothing that we shall find ~~one~~/two persons who will have one idea or mode of action in common. For the law of God is against repetition - In so narrow a limit, you can scarcely find room for the exercise of one of your faculties - For every body must do the same thing - It is well known what difficulties a genius produces in a family - We had much rather have a common place person -

Monasteries, according to their original plan, were a much larger circle than the family. For there people did meet for a common object - those who had a vocation for work, went into a House which supplied their kind of work - for Contemplation, into a House of contemplation. Afterwards they degenerated into place of idleness & vice - But, in their original idea, they were places where people who liked to work for the same object, met to do so & their enormous ~~diffusion~~/rate at which they multiplied shewed how they ~~met~~/responded to a want in human nature - Each was employed, according to his or her vocation - There was work for all - But there is no such possibility in the family - *There* every one must be employed within the narrowest of all limits, on the ~~most~~/occupations least ~~unexpandable~~/susceptible of any expansion - tied together, without rarely any common pursuit or interest, by the closest of all possible chains - & without a possibility of getting out except by marriage -

~~I~~so/ We so often pity ~~my~~ fathers, who, without any attraction for ~~me~~,/their daughters, are condemned to pass ~~his~~/their life with ~~me~~/them, in the narrowest of prisons - & cannot by any means escape from ~~me~~/them. ~~I am sure that~~ Many, who would never confess it, even to themselves, have a dread of being left alone, with some other member of the family - I once knew a father, the best of fathers, who begged that he & his son might never be left in the room together, without some third person - There is a constraint, an embarrassment, which

62

is the more painful, the more excellent the person, ~~the more painful it is to him~~ - Yet, what can be more natural, nay unavoidable in such a prison as the family? Open wide its doors, ~~Portia~~, not only to your sons, but to your daughters also - Let them all have free scope & exercise & room for all their faculties.

{illeg}

~~"I heard"~~ One of our most distinguished ethical philosophers says that he feareds the present tendency to separation into assemblies of *the same*. 'we find,' he says, 'the sick together in Hospital, the blind, the insane also - We find boys together in schools, young men in colleges &c - whereas *the Family*, ' he ~~added~~/adds, 'which is Nature's work, presents variety, old, young, - male, female -"

±/We entirely agree in the objection to that to which he objects - But ~~I do not think~~, if, by a family, he means the father, mother & the children born to them, ~~that this~~ the evil is not thereby remedied. And it is plain ~~to me~~ that, if it is ~~as I believe it is~~, desirable to bring together variety, *such* a family as this is by the very word pronounced against.

Such a family presents one man, one woman - the number of children uncertain. ± is ~~was going to say~~/generally said, but that word is inapplicable - Observation is ~~pointing to~~/indicating laws which regulate it. The tendency is to decrease in number, up to a certain point, with full exercise of faculty & sufficient supply of food. But take the family as it is now. Perhaps there is one boy, three girls - perhaps there are two girls - perhaps four boys, four girls, -or say one boy, one girl - ~~we have such instances before our eyes~~ - What that ~~you~~/we can call companionship in life & work springs from this? The father & mother have had an ~~different~~ education from life & circumstances different from the children - The father where

f65

~~-26-~~

he is earning his bread, necessarily spends his time apart from the mother & children - What sympathy in life & work is there, in general, between parents & children, however good & affectionate each may be! Then, as to the children, does it not come, in the family, to this, that the boys go forth to the work, the girls are left at home together? A *small* assemblage of *the same* is presented by the family in the *girls* - This is all the difference, (if we come to the consideration of parents & children in family life) between the family & the assemblies of schools & colleges -

~~I~~/We so agree with the principle laid down by ~~my~~/this ethical philosopher that ~~I~~/we would wish for a different organization of life & society. ~~I was~~ going to say that ~~I~~ w/We ~~am~~/are not satisfied to see father, mother & children living & working together - ~~But~~/ This was on our lips to say. But in fact we never do see it. ~~I~~ w/We see father, mother & girls living in the same house, & boys occasionally visiting them. We want to see all ages & both sexes really living & working for each other - each contributing what the other has not to the great existence, Humanity.

~~I~~ never find that w/We want/never have to root out feelings or opinions. ~~I~~ find that w/We want/have to make them more comprehensive - We want a family which will really live & work together in sympathy & efficiently. Whoever has *that* in parents or children, let him work on; however dear & good his parents or children, his brother or his sisters - or, if he see others wanting it - let him, in all love, look whether God did not intend

64

f66

~~-27-~~

Mankind to use their means to obtain sympathy & efficient work & help among the varieties of age, sex & character in the world - God knows we want to break no tie. We want to strengthen & enlarge ties.

65

Tharp Ironside XL

~~"Well! dear father, you/~~It is acknowledged that ~~children/~~daughters are brought into the world without the possibility of asking their own consent. ~~You/~~It is acknowledged that they have then but two alternatives - There seems to be no doubt that marrying a man of high & good purpose & following out that purpose with him is the happiest. But the mother must say to the daughter, 'I cannot ensure your meeting such.' & the daughter cannot go out seeking them for herself - the parents must shew them to her. "If I can shew you one such, it will be a great deal, ~~I say to my daughter.~~" if I can shew you two or three such, it will be an extraordinary thing indeed - & out of those whom I can shew you, it does not follow that all will want to marry you or you them." How many then are the chances against the woman embracing this alternative!

The other is, as we have said, to adopt the way of life which her parents have adopted for themselves from necessity or inclination, necessarily without any regard to her vocation, or capabilities for it before she was born.

And why do the parents wish this? Not selfishly. There is really no selfishness in it. for it would rejoice them, as we have said, beyond anything, if the daughter could marry as they like. It is because they are afraid of what the *world* will say, - of how they will judge a daughter who should leave her "duty to her parents" & "fly to other duties", who should for= sake her home sphere for 'strange fancies.'

To the *world* then I appeal. Is this right or is it wrong?

Men are so well aware of the fact that it is very important that a woman should marry, that she is anxious to try whether she cannot find more of interest away from home - that they take for granted, if they have means, that a woman will be too glad to have them -

Yes, it is very important, ~~I should say,~~ we ought to be able to say,

that a woman should marry, but not that she should marry you. She has a vocation - She will not marry, unless she finds a man with whom she can unite in high & holy purpose to serve Mankind. How unnatural it is that one man should be more interesting to her than God & Mankind!

2

Now she is asking people to marry her all the day long. It is said that she has no passion - that man has it all - Men only ask once and occasionally. Women are asking always - It is true that, where a man asks, he must take his answer - but a woman may ask, & if she gets her answer, she may draw back, (which a man cannot do) & say I meant nothing by it.

There are three things on which marriage is generally founded, - a good opinion of a person, - a desire to love & be loved, - & a wish to escape dissatisfaction at home. And real attraction is difficult. Because there is so little choice. For there must be similarity of means & age. There must be acquaintance.

~~You say~~ I/Will it be said, we do not take Love into the account?
~~I n/~~We hardly ever saw it, & therefore cannot well tell what it is.
~~I/~~We have seen women, asking men to marry them,
~~as I say/~~as we have said all day long, & men asking women
occasionally once - if ~~you call~~ that is called Love? I/We have
seen married people consulting together about
whom they shall ask to dinner or how they shall
lay out the grounds - If ~~you call~~ that is called Love?

~~You say,~~ What then do ~~you/~~we call Love?

~~I call it~~ Love is when two persons, a man & a
woman unite together in some great purpose ~~to/~~for
Mankind & God.

But ~~you say/~~it is said & ~~say/said~~ truly, that ~~so~~ few people
are capable of such a purpose - And are such
not capable of Love?

I/We have seen women in Love, as it is called,
& men too. I/We never fell ~~I could say,~~ now *that is*
love. ~~Lord & Lady P./~~Mr. & Mrs. l unite together to keep up 3
a 'party', to support each other in Politics - &
~~upon my honour that looks more to me/~~is really more like
love that most marriages, though it is only for Party
politics.

XLI

{the first five lines have an X through them} [8:120-21]

~~Portia & Fulgentia were driving together in~~
Hyde Park. "Well, said Fulgentia, what did my
father say?" Portia shewed her his letters -

"And is he not right," said Fulgentia, "do we
~~owe our parents duty?"~~

~~"And h/How are you to shew duty to your parents,~~/is duty to be
shewn to parents?
~~my dear child?~~ By destroying ~~yourself/~~one's self? They say
they want you to stay at home to take care of
them. ~~Why,~~t/The whole thing is a falsity! They
don't want you to stay to take care of them, they

don't want you to stay for their sakes, but for your own sake for fear the world should think evil of you. That is the first falsity. And you can't benefit them by cramping yourself, any more than a slave can benefit his master. That is the second falsity. An injury to any one person is an injury to all the world. ~~Oh! - t/~~That parents should fancy that they can be benefited or that anybody else can be, just by the cramping of the daughters.!

~~"But ought not parents to have the services of their children, in return for all they have done for them during their childhood?"~~

~~"My dear child, t/The parents don't want the services of the daughter - But they are obliged to pretend to do so, for fear of something unfavourable being said of her by the world, - out of kindness to her therefore & for her sake. † really think t/The parents are really as much to be pitied as the daughters.~~

~~"But our time & our faculties at least we have/"~~

~~"My dear, Children d/Daughters can do nothing but what their parents approve - they may, it is true, play at one hour & draw at another, as they choose But they must come down to the company which their parents have invited - they cannot even make even of their drawing a pursuit, for fear of appearing singular, of not performing what are called the 'social duties.'"~~

~~"But we can marry, if we like it."~~

~~"Well, about the marrying? You/They can only have a choice among those people whom your/their parents~~

like & who like ~~your~~/their parents well enough to come to their house - & among those few, if one suits you, well -^u if not, not so well -

Christ did not marry And there comes the confusion - about His being half God & half man - we profess, but it is only a profession, to

take Him for an example - ~~The young woman~~
~~But, however that may be, the young woman is~~
~~preached to all her life to take Him for her pattern.~~
 Now he was so devoted to God & Mankind that he appears not to have wished for marriage - &/And then she is told, "Oh! you would be like Christ, would you?"

~~"I cannot be like Christ I am sure,"~~ said Fulgentia with a deep sigh, ~~"I have not his objects to fill my soul."~~

^u There are two alternatives, either of which might be a happy one - a good marriage or this devotion to God & Mankind - But we say, she shall not be devoted to God & Mankind - she shall be devoted to doing what her parents **[end 8:121-22]** do, whether it suit her or not.

~~"But, dear Portia, is not doing what our parents approve devoting ourselves to God?"~~

~~"What we~~ parents ~~have~~/ought to do is not to approve what ~~their/our~~/their children do but to approve that they should do what *they* think right - to bring them up till they are of age, so as that they shall have power to judge what they shall think right - & then, when they shall have come into possession of themselves, ~~to approve~~/cordially to acquiesce that they should do what *they* not the parents think right, ~~not what the parents/we think right~~ - But

parents never think children of age till the children think like them. ~~We/They~~ want ~~you/the~~ daughter to have ~~your/her~~ own peculiar genius to think ~~our/their~~ thoughts, ~~adv~~ advocate their opinions, & say what ~~we/they~~ think right.."

~~"But surely, we do owe our parents that love & duty?"~~

~~"Love & Duty?— You/Children~~ cannot give love & duty for binding ~~you/them~~ down, for crushing ~~your/their~~ heart - ~~you/they~~ may recognize their good intentions. ~~I/We~~ never see children in the street without thinking, 'Why did you come into the world?' Because it was convenient or agreeable to Mr. & Mrs. ----- to marry, or because it satisfied the sensual desires of B & C to come together - for no other reason- "

~~"But, Portia, tell me one thing.~~ How is it, it is sometimes asked, that women of ~~our/the~~ upper class have nothing to do, even if they ~~were/are~~ set free, that they never desire nor look forward to anything but marriage? ~~if it is so?"~~ 6

~~"My dear, I think that v~~ Very few people live such an impoverishing & confusing & weakening life as ~~you do/the~~ women of the richer classes. ~~Because,~~ What is it? ~~You/They~~ have made up ~~your/their~~ minds to live in public - never to have any time to ~~your/themselves~~ - If ~~you, Fulgentia,~~/one of a higher stamp ~~do this, you won't/~~joins them, she will not help ~~them,~~ but ~~you will/they~~ all go to the bottom together - ~~your/their~~ brains ~~will~~ all get/become muddles ~~to~~ in company - they will go on impoverishing & getting worse to the end of their lives, & ~~you/she~~ will too."

~~"But I don't know what you mean by our impoverishing & confusing life?"~~

~~"Well, w~~What is it? Every body is reading aloud - half a page out of their own book . It is the most confusing life - They have all cultivated

general literature. ~~My dear~~ The mother ~~had~~/has a sort of pride in ~~our~~/her daughters being literary ladies - in ~~my~~/their having five books lying upon the breakfast table at once & quoting from a heap of authors - She ~~used to~~ says, with a sort of half pride, half regret that there ~~was~~/is not more done, 'You know they are literary" ladies."

~~"And I, do you know, Portia, I was such a fool that I thought it/there was something peculiar in me & that I ought to break up my mind too, in order to enjoy it & take part in it?"~~

~~"You ask me why it is a confusing life. You cannot bring forward an opinion without exciting a storm of words - you have made up your mind to live always in this whirlwind. what can be so confusing?"~~ 7

~~"You say you/We pity the mothers quite as much as you do the daughters. Why?"~~ "I do. The impossible is demanded from a mothers. ~~They are~~/She is expected to undertake all - to sympathize with & understand all ~~their~~ her children among whom ~~is~~/are the most dissimilar characters - the most unlike her own - Yet by our method of imprisoning in families, she is to supply all these different kinds of characters & wants, with sympathy, instruction & help - It is like having no division of labour. The end is, a mother does nothing well, only interferes with every thing, looks for the faults in those she deposes, & painfully feels, if she sees the faults, that she knows not how to prevent them." [end 8:122]

~~"But what would you do? Children can't be independent of their parents."~~

~~"That is an immense question - But at all events, / Let a mother, when my/her daughters grow up, I shall tell tell them my mind/her/ the truth as to the independence of time, faculties, money, which I think women ought to have at 21, allowing that age to be too young, but considering a *too young fixed* time better than an unfixed time to be regulated by the opinion of each individual parent."~~

~~"But supposing/ If a daughter wished to do something flagrantly imprudent, to marry upon nothing, for instance - Is she to be free to do it anything after 21?"~~

Hunt The parent has then to say, "You are free to do so, but I am not free to take a part. I cannot receive your meetings - You may correspond & meet elsewhere, if you have other friends who approve that course - That which would be spent upon you at home, I lay by from the moment you cease to spend it at home. I cannot, in duty to the others, give it into your hands, I keep it, because experience shews that you are undertaking what will probably require more than your share of that common fund, of which, in the present state of things, I am the guardian." Greater liberty than this, ~~I think,~~ could not be, because that could not be called liberty which would trench on the rights of others. ~~I think~~ Women ought to be free to follow any pursuit or to marry, irrespective of parents' opinions, so long as they can shew, on experience, probability that they will not trench on the shares of others - money for the others standing for means in like manner to follow *their* wishes. If they do

not wish to spend their share of means like the rest of the family, they ought to have that share for their own purposes - This liberty ~~as to sees to me~~ is alike at all ages after 21, never less, but never more, while the parent lives as Guardian of the means of all, because at no age must the rights of any be trenched upon."

XLII

[8:122-23]

~~"Dear Fulgentia, you say that you have no sympathy - In thinking over life, as it is now, practically, it seems to me is very desirable to understand, to feel truly as to our possibility of sympathizing with each other. Sympathy must & ought to be a want to man, where the essential nature of Mankind is to be one --where mankind is, as I should call him, the Son. We should not wish not to feel the want of it, if without it the evil is that people throw themselves into the outward, so that they do not feel the want of it.~~

9

~~I see how~~ Very few people, for instance, can sympathize with each other, in any pursuit or thought of any importance --~~I am sure that you wished for my sympathy in your ennui, in your politics, you used to try to insense me --~~ But If there have not been the means to learn, if one knows nothing on a subject, to pretend or try to sympathize is more balking than giving it up. If people do not give you thought for thought, receive yours, digest it & give it back with the impression of their own character upon it, then give you one for you to

105a

(a) Solitary confinement? should you/we be afraid of it? ~~why, I/~~It is solitary confinement. what are we all in but solitary confinement? To be alone is nothing - to be without a sympathy in a crowd, ~~that/~~this is to be confined in solitude -

do likewise, it is best to know what one is about, & not to attempt more than kindly, cheerful, outward intercourse, or occasionally each giving *information* to the other, which the other has some pleasure in receiving, though not able to make much of it. ~~Thus I like to hear what you tell me, though I don't understand half, & my father likes to hear my opinion~~ & t This is all well as far as it goes, & but it is better not to fancy it can be more - Poor little Mary is so sympathizing, she likes to think she does understand when she does not sometimes, because she has such keen sympathy & want of sympathy.

To think of the sympathy we don't have, as merely absence of sympathy, not fault in others (who often would gladly sympathize if they could) nor fault in ourselves (who also gladly would if we could) this, ~~I am sure,~~ helps us. (a) Insert 105a
~~I believe that s/~~Some of the most painful suffering in women of our class, arises from not understanding that sympathy cannot be *willed*, cannot be given at will nor attraction felt at will. The want of sympathy is painful enough, without the aggravation of blame to oneself or others - Some find amusement in the outward, do not suffer inwardly because the attention is turned ~~upon the outward/~~elsewhere When this is not the case, & there is this want of sympathy, of attraction, given & returned - must it not be a feeling of starvation? Sympathy, ~~B/~~being one of the essentials of the human spirit, must the human spirit be famishing, without it, as the human body is, without food? ~~I believe not. I cannot say that I never have felt~~ No We can feel what ~~I can~~ is to be called happiness, without attraction or sympathy. ~~I have felt~~ in certain exercises of the nature, & where God has had a part.

f77

~~-107-~~

~~If it is really true, I would not shut my eyes to the fact, if it be really true, that there is no alternative but to suffer, for those who are not outward, or who have not sympathy & attraction..~~

[end 8:123]

~~-107-~~

∴ [end 8:123]

In certain diseases, there is no remedy known for acute & constant suffering - & it is right that it should be so - in order to bring about circumstances in which the causes of such suffering shall be removed, in which Man shall attain a right physical state. Disappointment always springs from want of wisdom - ~~I do~~/ Let us not wish in a cowardly spirit ~~to~~ shrink from the pain of disappointment - but ~~I~~/ let us seek the wisdom which will prevent disappointment. It may often be that it is not in our present possibility to prophecy aright, but when this is so, ~~I~~/we would wish for the consciousness of its being so, which prevents 11 disappointment - It may be wise to try that which will fail, but not wise to feel disappointment in failure - ~~I do not believe~~ Hardly any class suffers more from want of sympathy than married women, even those who are loving & loved - ~~Where there is the~~/In some sorts of attraction which my mother had to my father, the woman does not want sympathy - she only ~~wants~~/needs to satisfy the want of "his" presence - the want to supply *his* interest or amusement or comfort - to feel what he is feeling & ~~supply~~ /fulfill his consequent desires.

To work at one or more objects interesting in the view of God, important in God's purposes for Man - to work with one or more, between

whom there is a mutual attraction, & who are mutually interested in these objects, not only for each other's sakes, but from their own natures, & for God's sake & Man's sake - this only is human happiness. Who has it?

~~My experience is that,~~ While unhappy, one/we can do comparatively little. ~~I wish to~~ /Let us look carefully to experience to make out whether there is to be nothing which can be called happiness, while this is impossible.

~~I believe~~ The want of all this ought to be recognised as a want - but ~~I believe that~~ it is not essential poverty, misery - ~~that~~ such a state admits of partial riches, of partial happiness, even with a sense of want & suffering -

12

Oneness with God, kindness, sympathy (even if not mutual) with the feelings of others, & such exercise of the faculties as life affords - together with attention to the idiosyncracies of our own nature, will, ~~I believe,~~ in many cases, prevent the suffering which paralyses - & improve= rishes - will turn suffering into a species of happiness, which is the only right way to suffer. We must not desire to be unconscious of it - To faint away, or to be paralysed, or to have the attention so turned away as not to be conscious of the truth are not desirable modes of escaping sense of suffering - Yet neither is it desirable that a phase of life & experience should pass, unattuned to all possible enjoyment of right kind which circumstances admit of - for this is in accordance with God's pleasure.

Will it not answer our purpose of stirring us to seek, if we are conscious of greater happiness to Mankind from a supply of what is wanting, without actual suffering in the want?

It has long been a practical question ~~to me~~ whether we can be happy without sympathy, whether it would be well to be without the inward cry for it - ~~I believe,~~ If that inward cry has made us conscious of the want, it will be well for us to find happiness in oneness with God & striving to do one's part (even if a little one, though ever striving after a greater one). Need we be impelled by suffering? May not the bliss of God & wisdom & righteousness attract us onwards & upwards? We cannot live on suffering & poverty. ~~I/We have often tried.~~ ~~I/We~~ must find peace & joy, if ~~I am/we~~ are to be or to do any thing.

There are so few means of learning to do any thing well, people's attention is so little directed to good objects, is so spent on many small objects, & we are so little thrown upon the variety of Mankind for associates, that even the want of sympathy in good work, one of the essentials of well being, is little recognised. The other essential of well-being is Oneness with God, but of this, too, few have the consciousness -

Love God & love thy neighbour, - how Christ resumed the whole science of Man's well being in those two sentences!"

XLIII

~~"Dearest, you ask me w/Why I pity~~ are mothers so much to be pitied? The Church of England is not the only power which declines as it becomes moral. Parental power declines, in proportion as a door is

opened to opinion. Neither the Church of England nor the Parent having any real foundation for power, they lose it, as soon as it is questioned. But the Parent, like the Church, must allow for varieties of character, *whilst* he retains his absolute authority - otherwise he too will turn out John Wesley, instead of being strengthened by his earnestness & zeal.

~~They talk of t~~"The Mother at home."! ~~I believe~~ There is not desert for the heart so oppressive as that of the 'Mother at home' in England in the 19th century - as some of the Deserts, at least, which she has to pass through - ~~On second thoughts, perhaps, I am mistaken.~~ Perhaps that of the 'Daughter at home' is sometimes as much so - ~~I~~/Many have passed through both - with excellent parents & excellent children. In both, ~~how have I longed~~/we long to love & be loved, to sympathize & be sympathized with! In both, as to participation of the thoughts & feelings most interesting ~~to me~~, it *really* is no exaggeration to say that ~~I~~/we should not have been more alone in any African desert. There is ~~the~~ (in both) the *appearance* of food which disappears whenever you stretch out your hand to take it. ~~is in both.~~

14

To excite you to remedy evils you must see things in a bad form - to shew their imperfection you must see them in a comparatively good form. When you see a bad school, you may think a good one would supply man's education. When you see a perfect one, like Mr. Brook's in John St., you must strongly feel that it cannot. When you see a family with obvious deficiencies

as a family, you may feel that a well-regulated family might afford satisfaction - ~~I come back to my own, thinking as to my two girls, how much there is~~ (~~supposing~~/Taking for granted that what girls in ~~our~~/the richer class are supposed to aim at ~~to be~~ is the right thing,) how much there is which is satisfactory! They are indefatigable at their music, drawing, reading - they really like one another, companionize each other in their reading. ~~I give them~~ They have all possible liberty. Their father is always an affectionate & enlivening element to them - they are good & well-intentioned - Yet ~~I feel~~ what poor work it is for human life! ~~I have not~~/The mother has hardly an interest in common with them, - though ~~we~~/they mean & feel so rightly to each other, ~~we~~/they can do scarcely any thing for each other - Yet there is so much of good in their lives that they will never know what its wants are, they will feel 'ennuyées', will look to loves & friendships & to outward things for 15 relief, often in vain. If a real attraction & a good one comes, they will embark in the same sort of family life, enter upon its evils & deficiencies, will live over again (unless they be some rare exception) the old story of thinking their children, their difficulties 'peculiar'.

Oakey When will it be revealed (by suffering falling upon a nature capable of distinguishing whence it comes & a remedy for it) when will be revealed a glimpse of human nature's wants? ~~I~~/We see no tendency to such a revelation.

If it is to be that I leave this world, seeing nothing done as to these objects, ~~which we have talked about~~, I hope I shall be able to die trusting -

& remembering that there is Eternity for God's work - But ~~I ought to~~ looking to probabilities as they can be estimated, ~~by me,~~ & if nothing is done now, ~~all that I know of~~ looks ~~against any/like~~ no other salvation in sight.

Neither do ~~I/we~~ see any tendency to ~~the/a~~ revelation to the thinkers upon religion - Some blind Clergy & Methodists will preach what will go against their reason - That is the only influence at work directed to them -

To return however to the question of sympathy; ~~about which you are curious~~ - Mothers, though living among the good & feeling, may be like John the Baptist living in the Desert, as to absence of sympathy. In return, they give none, for it is true that they generally know & care nothing about their children's objects - This to the children must feel a want. ~~We/Some~~ mothers have learnt not to blame their absence of sympathy: ~~with us/the~~ mothers'

absence of sympathy ~~with them~~ to be a deficiency which they have to complain of or regret. ~~I suffer very much less, however, for seeing these things more truly. I am not disappointed, reproachful to myself or them - I pursue my own thoughts, do not strive to pull open their hearts, take what I meet with on the surface, & thus I can love them better & do for them the trifles in my power. When I say I don't know nor care about their pursuits, how gladly would I know & then I should care, but it is impossible for me to know. How/Mothers have I longed to know about machinery & Natural History, to sympathize~~

with ~~my~~/their sons, but ~~I~~/they can't, & without knowing, ~~I~~/they can't care for these subjects, much as ~~I~~/they care for him. ~~I~~/the sons. They can't care at least with such a sympathy as the sons ought to like to accept.

But oh! the wretchedness of these family parties, of this do=nothing life! Try, ~~Fulgentia~~, to keep your head above water for the possibility that you may bring some light to the weary sufferers who know not why they suffer - ~~I must bear to the end, & am not likely to be able to help others - but only, while suffering myself, to cause the suffering of others, as I always have done & probably always shall do in this world - but I can say that I~~/Those who can only bear to the end may believe it/that all is well - that not one moment of sorrow is felt which is not essential to the perfect Whole - that even these helpless hands & this weary heart are working indirectly at that whole - And this is comfort!"

XLIV

~~"You say, Fulgentia, that~~/Is all this question about 17
relation between parents & children ~~is~~ new?

~~It seems to me that t~~/The question concerning our relation to God & our relation to our parents arises naturally, or rather *necessarily*, in these times - Hitherto, (at least in principle if not in practice), the nature of both relations has been taken for granted, though somewhat vaguely - In both cases, power above our own was recognized & acknowledged. In Mankind's earlier ignorant state, questions are not searched into by all or by many. A few, who think more closely or feel more strongly than the general run, are listened to as oracles - "Fear God," "Honour your parents." were acknowledged precepts, & largely governed

practical life - Those, who did not conform to them, dissented - *not* because they had thought out something else, which they felt more true - but because they were self=confident or self=indulgent. *Welch* In savage life, & for many steps beyond, - the perceptions are the part of the nature most cultivated & exercised. When the perceptions are much exercised, general laws not understood, by the intellect little cultivated, Fear of a higher power naturally arises -

The next step to this is that Intellect becomes cultivated by the few, while the many are "hewers of wood & drawers of water" - these few see the folly of the fears of the multitude, & some become unbelievers - But a higher power manifests itself to the learned as well as to the unlearned - Human nature is adapted to venerate - And, though some scoff, many acknowledge - ~~& various phases arise in~~ & the religion of the cultivated undergoes various phases -

18

~~I suppose that n/~~No other religion perhaps ever died out so entirely as the Greek & Roman Pantheon - ~~I imagine that, I/~~In Asia & to a degree in Africa (?) (though we know perhaps too little about Africa to judge) the old religions either remain, as the Buddhist & the Chinese, or modify the present either there or elsewhere - as the Egyptian, - to a much greater degree than do now the Greek or Roman or the religions of the North. These religions, ~~I suppose~~ we may say, expired - ~~I am aware that t/~~They left traces of themselves, in ceremonies & practices adopted from them by the Christians - ~~that~~ the abstractions, Virtue, Good=ness &c come from the Epicurean & the Stoic

philosophers more than from the Christian - ~~that~~ the worship of the Virgin, of a female Divinity, by the Roman Catholic, owes its origin perhaps to the worship of Diana - All this may be granted. But still ~~I imagine that~~ nothing of the *character* of the heathen deities appears in the Christian objects of veneration, neither in the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghost, the Virgin Mary nor the Saints.

The Father was the God of the Jews receiving Europe into His jurisdiction - The essence of the religion of Moses was to deny more than their one God - (at first because, though others were acknowledged to exist, *He* was a jealous Gods & where He was acknowledged, would admit no other.) ~~The Christian Moses, again, borrowed his God from the Egyptians.~~

The Christians, therefore, in adopting the Jewish religion, adopted this principle, so strongly laid down by their first teachers among the Jews. But it had been necessary to force their doctrine upon the Jews. If did not satisfy the nature of men, in general, -though it elevated a few, as it seemed, supernaturally, who were of high nature - Europe would not have accepted it. But Christ, deified under a character of love & self-sacrifice - the Virgin Mary, with all her loveliness & tenderness - the Saints with their heroism - the doctrine of the Atonement, so consolatory to Man, who felt his weakness, his sin, his danger - these doctrines, containing so much of truth & beauty, so much to engage the heart & imaginations, took a strong hold on the thoughts & feelings - And, so long as *power*, not to be questioned or criticised, was acknow=

ledged in Heaven & at the head of the family -
these doctrines remained in force -

~~I do not think that p/~~People are hardly aware of the very great importance of the present phase of religious & domestic life - of the change going on - of the want of a Saviour for this Hour of peculiar trial - When religion expired in Greece & Rome, the Saviour, who appeared in Judea, spread his influence to raise it from the dead -

~~You will say, why do I mix up the two subjects? - I believe t/~~These two questions of religion & family ~~to be/~~are so intimately connected that ~~I am not wandering from the subject in so conjoining them.~~
~~The question/~~to ask concerning the Higher Power, or Powers, acknowledged in heaven & on earth is one.

There *has* been an actual veneration for power, & readiness to acknowledge it, in Mankind - without enquiry whether it consisted in the righteousness, the truth, the goodness, the wisdom, which are the *essentials* of all *permanent* power.

No reason is felt, *now*, for venerating or yielding to the powers, which formerly influenced men's minds, from a sense of fear or duty. The changes, which we now must bring about, are the substitution ~~of/~~for *Authority* which cannot be replaced in heaven or in the Family, . of Sense of Truth & Right, of *Accordance with Right*. No longer ~~must/~~can it be *duty submitted to*, but *right accorded with*, which must be the Spirit of Mankind.

And an awful phase it is, while the former is a waning influence & the latter can scarcely yet be said to be a waxing one -

~~Sons/A Son used to call their/his father/s "Sir," now they/he call/s him/them/ the "Relieving Officer."~~

A son used to call his father "Sir" - now he calls him the "Relieving officer" - Man used to throw himself under the wheels of the Divinity's car - now
 "he'll not lose a cup of drink for thee:

Bid him but temper his excess;
 Not he: he knows where he can better be,
 As he will swear,
 Than to serve thee in fear."

God surrounds us. His Law is ever at work, bringing about the Right, so all will be well. Without this conviction, ~~I should look upon~~ the Present would be/as fearful, for, in the errors which are dying out, it is difficult to distinguish the germs of Truth, which are growing up - ~~I believe that~~

Truth, in our relations both with God & with Man, must come in this substitution of *Accordance* of the whole nature with *Right for Authority*, vaguely acknowledged from fear or duty. Let us do justice to these passing influences, to their good effects, imperfect & erroneous as they were. ~~I believe that t/~~They were better than the phase which is now, though this phase will lead to better than they - Oh! that we could help ourselves & each other out of the present selfish, cold, self=satisfied views, poor & narrow, while supposed to be new & improved lights!

21

Oakey XLV

~~"You say most truly, Fulgentia, that the m/Mistakes with regard to the relation of God to Man & of Breast to child, arise from mistaken ideas Concer=ning the/those attributes, which are common to divine & human nature.~~

Power, as we have said, is the attribute most universally recognized, both in the Divine & the human. ~~The man~~ Author of Being - In the earlier ages of civilization it is acknowledged that *Might is Right*, & the ideas of the parental relation, both divine & human, are much modified by this acknowledgment.

Now, when we say *accordance with Right*, we do not mean the right of might - right has come to have quite a different meaning - right, ~~I suppose,~~ probably comes from *rego*, I govern - but ~~the right of governing from/by~~ the right of governing & governing ~~fro/by~~ the principle of Right no longer mean the same thing - ~~I believe that~~ w/We are tending to the discovery that *all permanent Power arises out of Wisdom*. Thus the *nature* of the Supreme, the source & spring of all other natures seems to determine-

Under the idea that *Might was Right*, men worshipped Deities, in whom was no goodness, consequently no wisdom - They yielded to a Master (whether the King, the master of a nation, - or the Father, the master of a family) whatever his character, unless he were weak, & he thus forfeited his characteristic of Power -

22

But now it is coming into view, tho' indistinctly & unconsciously, that the Divine & human Parent must excite in us the consciousness of Love, Goodness, Wisdom, Righteousness - then we shall love & revere, trust & sympathize. but, if the human as well as the divine parent, is not in the state of being to *call forth* these sentiments, & if the child is not in the state to *admit of them*,

there will be no relation between the divine & the human parent of the child, except the latter yielding when he cannot help it.

~~I believe that~~ *This*, beginning to be recognized, causes the uneasiness of the present phase of domestic life, especially in this country & in ~~our~~ the richer class, - & when we look into it ~~I am~~ we are surprised that it is thus uneasy.

While God's Power was acknowledged to be in *itself* an object of Reverence, & ~~that~~ duty ~~was~~ to be owed to this Power, a family united in worship to Him - while they had more practical work to do, there was less time & occasion for the present uneasiness in families of the class, whose practical work is now done for them - & while the right of the parents to direct ~~will~~ was acknowledged, without examination whether they directed wisely or not, there was merit in submission & wrong in resistance - And ~~I believe that was/to have been~~ was a more peaceful, a less selfish, a more conscientious phase than this, tho' this will develop into a phase much more so than that.

23

But now, the Parent is getting more & more into a an anomalous & difficult position . More & more does any ~~tie~~ relation between his child & himself depend upon the love & wisdom with which he fulfils it. As civilization & luxury advance, he undertakes more & more for such wisdom as he may have - He, or rather she (for these difficulties chiefly concern the Mother - the Father escapes them - his employment of work or of amusement, lies chiefly out of the house) *she*, then, is to direct the servants, who are to provide conveniences & luxuries, not thought of formerly - She has never learnt & does not know how - but she ~~is~~ must take care to provide them. She must superintend the

nurse & the governess of ~~the~~/her children, though she knows nothing & has learnt nothing of the nurse's work. And the governess, whose time, if she prepared herself to be a governess, was spent in a poor little back=room out of sight of human kind, excepting of her master of music, singing=, drawing= or languages ~~masters~~ (or as many of these as time & money would allow) - what is she to do? ~~Oh!~~s/She must direct the characters of her pupils. How ~~she will~~ is she ~~be~~ fit for it? If she were not expressly *preparing* in youth for it, she comes out of difficulties perhaps little suited to prepare her for this work. Over her, so little prepared, the Mother, so little prepared, is to preside - Over the *society*, the duties to the rich, the duties to the poor - the poor mother is to preside, And, naturally she presides so imperfectly over some, if not all, of these duties, that the daughters soon begin to criticize - In youthful spirits, knowing little of difficulties - in the irresponsibility of opposition, they do this - She is one, they more than one, banded together in this criticism & opposition. The more, in her maternal affection or conscientiousness, or ~~from~~ in her ambition that they should excel, she has striven for them, the more capable they will be to criticize - And here, without blamable intention either in parent or child, is where we are not, in families in easy circumstances. Much power still remains with mothers, if they like, or think it right, to exert it - Whether they do or do not, their position is anomalous & unsatisfactory -

24

~~Fulgentia, you/We have heard from your poor aunt Cassandra,~~ something of the difficulties of a "Daughter at Home" - ~~I have told you now something of/~~ These are the difficulties of a "Mother at Home."

f91

~~-121-~~

Welch

XLVI

~~"You say, Fulgentia, w/~~What was the original meaning of *authority*? Does it mean the tie between the Author & those of whom he was the Author? The Author has Power over what He has created - God over the Universe - man over the family - & *might*, as we have said, was *right* in early days - Was this the Pedigree of 'Authority'? But reflection brings into view that *Might* is not *Right* - Query, is there any permanent power, any real power except what arises out of wisdom, truth, goodness as we said? The ~~truth~~/tie comes into view that the Author shall make what he has created a blessing to the created. 25

The more man's nature is rightly exercised & developed (i.e. improved from imperfection towards perfection, from ignorance ~~to~~/towards truth) the more will he appreciate the right & good, love the lovable, sympathize *with* the right, *for* the wrong, His real tie to his parents & to his children will be stronger & stronger. His ties to the Author of the Universe will be stronger & stronger. More & more, in proportion to his own improvement, will he love, venerate, trust, sympathize & *work* consistently with such feelings -

But this applies, ~~you will say~~/it will be said, to his relation with all men, with whom circumstances throw him into relation. What ought there to be peculiar between parent & child? is our question. Undoubtedly, the parent has *power* over the child. At his call comes into the world an utterly helpless being, who, without some care from him, would soon cease to be a *human being* (though that which is will never cease to be in some mode - nothing

that exists ever ceases to be, i.e., to lead to some other modification of being) Immense might be the power of the parent over the child for good, if he had wisdom.

However, in proportion as the parent has wisdom, goodness, righteousness, love, - & as these develop the same attributes in the child - will the tie be strong - The parent having peculiar power over the child will, in the exercise of these attributes, call forth the love, the respect, the trust, the sympathy of the child more than others who have not that peculiar power & influence -

[It is certain that there are to be families, i.e., there are to be parents & children, brothers & sisters & cousins - One remark we can at once make with regard to these relationships - that the relation of marriage is, by God's Law, not to take place between brothers & sisters & cousins. The tendency of this Law is separation. Marriage thus breaks up families , separates parents & children & sisters - Brothers go out into the world & are separated, whether married or not, in general. There is ~~almost~~ felt something almost unbecoming in a son living at home, after he grows up; he sometimes leaves home & lives elsewhere, ~~almost~~ for no other reason scarcely - God's laws seem to point to dispersion of families - Man accords, with regard to marriage, so much as often to seek or agree to marriages which are undesirable - accords with regard to the desirableness of sons going out to work in the world - to daughters doing so, who have to maintain themselves - But daughters, who are not *obliged* to maintain themselves, ~~may~~/must *not* do so - they may not leave the paternal roof except to marry. To try to find out whether this is

right, let us go back to the nature of the relation between parents & children. It begins with ~~a~~/the great point ~~of right for the~~ which we have already ~~talked about~~/mentioned. The parents calls the child into existence - ~~Oh!~~ - Let them take care that they can prophesy that the existence to which ~~he~~/they summon him, will, in probability, be one in the direct road to being *worth* having. All existence is essentially worth having . God takes care of *that*. But one of the means by which He takes care of this is by man seeking the right - by presenting means & inducements to man to seek the right. Till Man has an appetite for the right, he is under liability to suffering & privation - till he has attained how to find the right, he is under liability to suffering & privation - which are among the teachers of Mankind. 27

The parents, then, have to try to be able to prophesy that the being, whom they summon to human existence, shall find human existence worth having - This principle is, *to a degree*, acknowledged & generally acted upon in the educated classes - The class, in which women are able to live without working for a livelihood, takes it for granted, however, that "to be *worth having*" means "to live without working for a livelihood in the way which well-disposed parents have fixed upon."

So far we have come, then, - that the tie springs from the parents who, if they are in a right state, will feel a repulsion, not an attraction, to summoning this human existence, unless they can prophesy as probability that it will be worth having. Before we enquire what the being "worth having" means, let us inquire what will be the tie of children to parents & what the nature -

Parents have a greater field of influence than others. They ought to provide life & what is desirable in life till the child can provide for himself - Money answers to means for all that is desirable - Without means for food, clothing, shelter, sleep, man cannot develop & exercise his faculties for perceiving, thinking & feeling - Money, or something equivalent, is essential as a mode to enable Man to work with Man, in such development & exercise.

Does then a parent's power, his means for influence lie in money? And ought it to be exercised only till the child can earn money for himself? Partly, but not entirely, his influence lies in money. In theory, the parent has wisdom & goodness beyond the child. If he has not, he ought not to be a parent.

In proportion as a parent has wisdom & goodness 28
to fulfil the part he has undertaken, naturally & essentially will he have the affection, the respect of his children - But, if circumstances are such that present wisdom or goodness *cannot* exist in the relation of parent & child, the parent must not expect respect & love. For instance, suppose a parent, in ignorance, undertakes the relation of a parent & is not conscious that, not having learnt, he cannot teach, or superintend the teaching of a variety of things necessary to well-being for his child. If he finds that the arrangements of society & the wants in himself, ~~of which he was not conscious (all the time I mean she, or rather herself (for all time this applies much more to the mother) of which she was not~~ conscious impede the well-being of the child, let her see *this truth* - it is not possible for the child to love & revere her, though she be good, & would gladly do anything possible to her, in the way of active work or passive self=sacrifice

& endurance for her child. Let her find comfort in accordance with her God, in the lesson she has learnt - There is still a possibility of wisdom & righteousness for her, relative to her circumstances, - though not one ~~that~~/which will engage the affection of her children perhaps - What ~~I have~~/has been said is true, in reference to *most* families of the upper class now, ~~I believe, in our position,~~ though, of course, it varies with individuals.

If it appears that mothers cannot teach, nor superintend the teaching of, nor regulate life ~~in~~/for, their unmarried daughters, let us look what *should* be the fate of those? As things are now, at all events, they cannot go out alone into the world, as men can -

This ~~illeg~~/brings us to the difference between men & women, which would lead us too far - But thus far we may safely say that the difference is physical, that the woman in consequence of this, required help & protection from the man; hence the difference has resulted. But man 29 is not to work for woman, merely as a personal defender. one man for one woman, or one man for a family - This was so in earlier times, but cultivation of the whole nature is to do the work which then was for the strong arm. It is the remains of *uncultivation*, of want of good exercise, in consequence of which woman cannot go about freely, where man's arm is not known to be ready to defend her -

Any way in which the daughter can be helped to facility in doing well that ~~thing~~, or those things, which she has a natural attraction to do, will lead her to happiness, - provided however that her whole nature be so cultivated & exercised that what she does, she does *in sympathy with God & Man*, or, at all events, in *sympathy with God & for Man*. If she has this she may live for the present without sympathy *with Man* (though that is sure to come in the course of existence - the other is food to live - ~~that~~/this may be waited for)

Oakey

But is it possible to provide the circumstances, the exercise of the nature for a daughter, which will do this? ~~±~~/We know not - ~~±~~/we can only say, without this the essential of well-being is wanted - ~~±~~/We would ~~try to tend~~ to this as much as ~~I could~~/possible, if unable to realize it. There are institutions, which would seem ~~to me~~ direct means for the practical part of such an object - They should be accompanied with an endeavour to engage the whole of Man's nature in a recognition of the God, who calls upon us to accord & to work with Him, - by appealing to the Reason, to the Feelings, to the Conscience, by practical work, in accordance with the appeal, - ~~±~~/we would, if ~~±~~/we could, strive to make the daughter "one with Man & with God."

XLVII

~~"I do not see w/Why you should any one be so shocked at this? Ful-~~
gentia- What ~~±~~/we have said amounts only to this that ~~I believe~~ unmarried women should have every facility given them by parents to spend their time & faculties upon any exercise of their nature for which it has an attraction - which can be pursued in harmony with God, which can answer, in short, any good purpose - To know how to do well any thing ~~that~~/which has, or which leads to, ~~the~~/a good purpose for man, will be security for an existence worth having - To facilitate such an existence, then, should be the object of a parent. Many difficulties arise, ~~±~~ grant, in the consideration of this question - What is good purpose for Man? will be one of these questions - one where the parent & child will be apt to differ -

The Parents have the child's education in their hands before the child can form any opinion for himself -

Education may be comparatively better or worse,
but ~~I see~~ no means existing now for a good one -

Let us consider children in ~~our~~/the upper class of life - What
is their education?

Ennuyés in the nursery, - obliged to remain without
any object but the amusement of the moment, as far
as they can find it in their poor little selves, - obliged
to remain ~~in~~ (a very limited number of children)
always together, whether suited or not in character -
who is their Guardian & Directress? - Is it some one
who has studied human nature to whom ~~has~~/is given this most
interesting & important charge? - Has she an attrac=
tion for this employment? - Is she wise & experienced
in it? - Have her heart & her conscience sought it? -
No, it is ~~two~~/a couple of nursery=maids, ~~sitting~~ (making &
mending the lady's or the children's clothes,) who
~~are~~/sit there to prevent their/ children hurting their *bodies*. They
are to jump up, if a child is in danger of falling,
or burning itself, or otherwise doing itself or its
companion bodily harm - But if, with nothing to
do, with perhaps unsuitable dispositions, - these
poor children quarrel, & mar their *dispositions* -
the two nursery =maids had generally better sit
still, for, in such circumstances, the children *must*
be cross & tease one another. Interference on the
parts of the nursery=maids would only do harm.
They had better mind their work, ~~only~~ in extreme
cases only calling out, "Master Johnnie, don't tease
Miss Eliza so" - These innocent helpless victims
to ignorance, they *could* love, they *could* work -
and ~~oh!~~ how happy they might be! - Not in an
infant school, with faculties stretched all
alike, or nearly so, - & for no object for which they
themselves have shown an attraction, - though this

may be better than the nursery.

In the nursery nothing was taught - But afterwards comes the time for lessons, which lasts till children are said to be "grown up", -what do they learn? - what have they learnt when they are grown up? - When re-generated, they *should* enter into possession of the conscious direction of a human being, (till then more or less directed by others, with, more or less of conscious participation on the child's own part) - ~~what have they learnt,~~ when they enter into this vast possession, what have they learnt? - of God's laws, of the nature of God, of the nature of Man, of his destination? - Have they learnt to do any one thing well, with a comprehensive understanding of its nature, of its purpose? They know a good deal of history, but is it the philosophy of history? - of languages, but is it the philosophy of language? - they can play & sing - but does their music elevate either themselves or others, or send them forth to good things?

32

While direct teaching, & the indirect teaching of circumstances, is what it is, it seems of little use to speculate on what ought to be the vocations of women - Generally speaking, they have no vocation, no desire after anything - They read & play & draw & talk & are religious & go to see sights & to church & to hear music, they are dissatisfied, but they seek nothing better, & have no desire to seek any thing better -

We are enquiring into the nature of the relation between parents & daughter - but while education or the want of ~~education of~~ it, i.e. of *real education*)

so fetters the nature, - how can we judge of this relation, of what it should be?

It seems ~~to me~~ that the part of the parent is to make worth=having the existence, which he is the means of beginning - & that a human existence worth having means one, in which the person knows how to do well something ~~that~~/which he has an inclination to do, which is in harmony with God's purpose of man's well-being - but ~~we/I can't call~~ literature, music & drawing & fine needle=work do not answering to this definition - nor visiting, nor sight=seeing - nor parish or school=business, as *usually* done. Any of these objects *might* be pursued, so as to make a life valuable to one who has an attraction for them - but not ~~if~~/as they are super=ificially taught - not if so many of them are pursued that none can be done thoroughly - not 33 if they are pursued for the purpose of mere selfish amusement, - a *resource*. as it is called.

But what 'can' the parents do? - how can they help this? ~~I don't see that t~~/The means of teaching better do not exist. ~~I am sure that I~~/Many parents would eagerly ~~have grasped~~ at them, if they ~~do~~/did.

~~I believe h~~ He who would be a Saviour to mankind must offer these means for instruction & for living a true life.

And when children are "grown up" - with their wings clipped - their ideas, their instruction, the examples before them all leading them into the same path - is it likely that they should look out for any other? even if discontented in this? This one is not satisfactory to them, but any other would be still greater dissatisfaction - If, here & there, one among

parents is found who wishes something different, his children & society are against him - If, here & there, among children is found one who wishes to work at what he or she likes & to learn how to do it - though, in the sight of God, it be an unobjectionable or valuable employment , - society & generally the parents are in opposition to the child.

Welch And what else can be expected of the parents, brought up as they were?

There are different ways of finding fault, both with oneself & with other people - To see the truth must be desirable, ~~must it not? - but I know that~~ But we know that whatever is, is through God's Laws, evil as well as good. Most inconsistent with such a belief would it be, while disappointing, to condemn, to feel harshly towards those who, in ignorance wander in the dark, though the Sun is in the sky - who take sickly food, leading to numberless diseases, though the food is within reach which would supply the joys of health.

34

If all this evil were not, God would not be the object of our Love, our trust, our veneration - His nature, His will which springs ~~ing~~ from His nature - His law which springs from His will, would not be, as they are, perfect - ~~as they are~~ - perfect in willing that mankind shall attain excellence of nature & consciousness of truth by exercise - His law furnishing the means & inducements.

Let us rejoice & bless God, with our eyes open to the evils around & within us - All we suffer & see suffered, all the melancholy privation we ~~see~~ feel & see are voices telling us these" things.

~~& feel are voices telling us this~~

XLVIII

“Concerning the relation of parents & children, it seems impossible, ~~Fulgentia~~, to say anything comprehensively true, which refers to general arrangements of society, founded upon such a narrow view - The only comprehensive view of what the various relations of life ought to be, in order to effect the well-being of Mankind, must come from comprehending the nature & purpose of the Will, whose manifestation is the Universe.

What, in His view, is the well-being of Mankind?

How, in His view, can it be effected? 35

When men & women set about a mode of life, or relations in life, do they refer to these questions?

In the “lower classes,” the men & women seek a livelihood, if single; if united the objects are - for the man, a wife to help & make his house comfortable. for the woman, a homestead - at the expense of children, whom they must maintain, till these can maintain themselves - Some vague hopes & fears of religion, some affectionate feelings to each other are intermingled - But, to these poor people, can there be any type of life, which they are aiming to fulfil?

The “higher classes” are as little pursuing any type, as little enquiring after the purposes of God in human life & society. To live in as high a degree of the conventional life, in which his purse & his circumstances place him, as that purse & those circumstances will permit, is taken for granted as the object of a man in the higher classes - He varies it in some light particulars, but, in the main, conventionality lays down his life, spends his time & his money for him. Religion & the affections

& benevolence have a part. But conventionality, we might almost say, settles *what* this part is to be in his life.

In whatever science it is, if we start from a fundamental law, progress is made - It took six thousand years to discover the Law of Gravitation, but to what discoveries ~~it~~ has it not led - The source for the organization of Social Life is knowledge of the nature of God, which leads to knowledge of His purpose.

And where is this knowledge to be sought? - In the Bible? - In the Church? - In the Fathers? - In the history of material phenomena & of human consciousness, which will reveal to us the nature of God & His purpose - which purpose it is for us practically to realize -

36

But we must have some general idea of what we are attempting to realize - The ants on an anthill look to us as if running to & fro with no purpose, but each has his purpose ingrained into him by instinct. We are, as to man's view, moving about with the will of the moment - it may be with purpose for the day or something more, - but with no purpose springing from a principle - that principle springing from eternal universal Truth - To the view of God, indeed, there is purpose in all Man's movements, as much as in the movements, which are ignorant & purposeless in man, are organized by His Law to lead to knowledge of Truth & to right purpose.

The question, what is the relation between parents & ~~children~~/daughters? must lead us very deep - It is easily answered thus far.

The parents summon the daughters into existence -

It is their part, as we have often said, to facilitate to the daughter whatever will make her existence most worth having, in *the view of God*, for this must be most really worth having -

But this is saying little in general cases . For daughters, brought up in conventional life, seldom wish anything else. A few of peculiar nature, or peculiar circumstances, mothers or daughters, are urged - either by suffering from the trammels of conventional life - or by feeling the want of opportunity to learn what they would do, if they could - to wish for something springing from a truer foundation than conventional life.

It is for these sufferers to lead the way, if they can - It is not necessary for *all* to suffer. Some, through suffering, must find out truth - but, when found, its loveliness will attract others.

If life, springing from the true principle, - from knowledge & consciousness of God's purpose, - were presented in practical existence, it would be so congenial to human nature that it would attract those who ~~were~~/are feeling dissatisfied, though they know not why. ~~On that foundation~~ And thus truth in Life, in the organization of Society, would advance. On that foundation only can it make any real or important advance. In vain do fathers & mothers suffer & complain of their children - in vain do children complain of their parents, masters of servants, servants of masters, ~~men & women~~/husbands & wives of their unsuitable ~~marriages~~/wives & husbands. All these disappointments & sufferings in the relations of Society must ~~be~~/continue, till society springs from a true foundation, *the nature of God* - till it pursues a true type, which the comprehending & feeling the nature of God will reveal.

~~I believe that~~ t/The partial improvements, which are made now, cause the evil to be more felt.

which lies at the core. More teaching (~~†~~/we will not say a better education) is given to the ~~lower~~/working classes- But they have no fundamental principle opened to their view. They can read & write & understand grammar & astronomy & political economy. This last does give some principle as to the nature of life, but not a sufficiently comprehensive one, not a divine one. All this makes them ambitious to rise, as they think . But where? What is rising? Perhaps there was more conscientiousness, less selfishness before, except where sensuality got hold of a man. ~~†~~~~suppose~~~~t~~/There is now less drinking - more ambition to rise (as rising is understood) in society, than formerly - In the "upper classes", people are infinitely better taught various things. But ~~†~~~~suspect~~~~that~~ the better things are taught in detail, without a principle being understood or felt *For what purpose are they learnt?*

The Schools of Design? the teachers dwell much on the progress of the women especially - They have greater aptitude - It was expected ~~to hear~~ that, though they *began* better, they would ~~failed~~ somewhere in their course, when compared with men. ~~The~~~~t~~/Teachers ~~will~~/do not admit this. They think, from their experience, that all can learn, if well=taught, though, of course, with decided differences of degree in aptitude for learning - Most decided is the improvement in the means of teaching drawing to women. Here is an improvement ~~that~~/which cannot be doubted - viz - the drawing from models & from nature, (not from copies) of which mode of instruction, 100 years ago, perhaps there was not an instance ~~†~~ for women ~~†~~-- & which is now to be found organized, ~~†~~~~imagine~~, in almost every large town in England - What does this portend? It might lead to the Spiritual. But, at present, it has not, in general, any connection with it.

Such improvement is but urging on an evil crisis, resulting from the want of a principle - an evil less felt while people had less capability.

‡/We have been sick at heart with ~~my~~/our own faults & those of ~~my~~/our friends - ‡/We feel more & more how such faults are the natural growth of the soil . Modify it - its productions will vary - will be better or worse, according to the soil whence they spring - Thus God gives power to Man.

It is curious to consider each man's *possibility* at any given moment. He has certain physical possibilities. A certain weight (not an atom more) he could lift.. With a certain degree of speed (not the unimaginable part of a degree more) he could run. As definite are his possibilities of thought, of feeling. What do these last depend upon? It signifies little whether we say, "brain", "nerves", or "we do not know"- If it is brain & nerves, still we do not know. Because we know something about muscles &c in the physical frame, still we know not how ~~they~~/these bring about the effects, which are brought about.

39

The only real answer to the question , "on what depend each human being's possibilities of every kind at any given moment?" is "the Laws of perfect Wisdom, Goodness & Righteousness."

This is ~~only~~ a parenthesis ~~however~~. ~~I meant to say that~~ God means us to improve Mankind by improving organization & circumstances.

To return - ~~One~~/A true ~~consciousness~~/understanding of the nature of God & man, of our relations to God & to our fellow=creatures depends upon, requires the right exercise of the whole nature of all Mankind. We can only have such right exercise by a right organization of society - by Mankind arranging circumstances, so that they will have employment,

work, suited to their natures, suited to call forth their natures into right exercise.

But, through the wisdom of God, man has all this to find out for himself, with such help as the laws of God supply, which is all that it is possible for the God, who is Wisdom, to ~~supply~~ do for us -]

These objects, which we have to find out, mutually help each other - ~~I mean that~~ /To understand the nature & purpose of God will assist us, rightly to organize society & to arrange its work - to understand the nature of God man will also help us in organizing his social arrangements & his work - On the other hand, in proportion as man's social arrangements & his work are right, - God's nature & his own will be more & more revealed to him, better comprehended, more truly felt by him. We must work on, recollecting that we *must* see & know imperfectly God's & Man's nature, while our social arrangements are imperfect, - that our social arrangements *must* be imperfect, while we know God & Man imperfectly, remembering that the light by which we work is imperfect - though more & more is attainable, whenever we work for it in a right direction.

How great is Thy Wisdom who keepst silence, excepting in the never silent voice of Law - & excepting in those voices, those human voices, inspired by Thee, in accordance with Law! If we complain of want of companionship, the want is only temporary, &, like all other wants, may be supplied by our own work. As, in the course of Eternity, we improve ourselves & our fellow-creatures, God will more & more dwell in us & in them, will speak to each through others. For no two are alike. Each therefore will be able to give & receive, to give to ~~& receive from~~ others some light from

God which others have not, to receive from others some light from God which he has not . We are to have the voice of the One Perfect, ever the same - the varied voices of all Mankind - But for both we are to work. Both will be heard only in proportion as Man works - And, in proportion as Man works aright, One & the same God will be recognized by all. For Truth is one -

While our God is taken from the Bible, a collection of books, written by different .people - from the Church, composed of different natures living in various circumstances - the notions of religions must vary. The old Mahometans, ~~I suppose~~, perhaps vary/varied little, for they

fo/went by one book, written by one person.

When we go by the revelation God makes of Himself, we may differ indeed, as astronomers differ, while reading, by imperfect light, the book of God in the heavens. But more & more of indisputable truth will be revealed.

41

In religion, which comprehends all truth, as in various kinds of truth which compose religions, there must be teachers & leaders. ~~I do not believe that e/~~Every man will not go to the fountainhead to work out his own religion. It will not suit all natures to do so. No man can feel for another, or think for another - but one must supply for another that which will call forth thought & feeling - How carefully, how earnestly, then, should those work who have the nature which disposes them to work out what religion is!

These are difficult times, certainly, in which to work at spreading a truer revelation of religion than exists, & at improving the organization of Society! For there is no loud or general call for either. There is an inclination to go back to the old forms of religion in Roman Catholicism or to stick to the ease & well=doing of the English Church, & to keep

up ~~its~~ protection by Articles - or to throw off all religion, because the error of these two ~~last~~ is evident to some.

It is true that speculation is going on, as lists of books shew, but not with much earnestness, as if life & hope depended on it. With some exceptions, it is more as an intellectual interest.

And the same of social arrangements.

There is much discontent, though no definite want of a better thing, which is looked upon as impossible.

The improvement of religion & society must go together. There can be no high tone & object in society, except from a true understanding, a true feeling of Him who brought man into life, of what His object is, His Law for effecting His object. Nor, while we live poorly, can we comprehend the nature & purpose of the Highest - nor our own.

To offer help, whether by words or work, which is not sought, is difficult. Each family, or, at any rate, most families suffer more or less but not enough to make something else ~~sought~~ than the life which they lived, sought for - Besides, most find relief & pleasure in the Outward. But ~~I think that~~ a mother's situation now requires the impossible. Before she was a mother, she had not means of learning how to fulfil its requirements, &, if there were means, to learn or to practise all would be impossible. ~~You ask me w/~~What is she ~~is~~ to do? Her best plan would be to have a pursuit of her own - with her family, if any of them like it, - without them, if they don't or can't do it. like Mrs. Fry or Mrs. Chisholm. But then what a cry the world makes! And the little Frys? - one did not quite see why they were called into the world by Mrs. Fry.

~~"You say, Fulgentia, that I am so /All this is so indefinite & I feel it myself that I am so.~~

Perhaps/For no question can be studied comprehensively without embracing other studies with which, in the nature of things, it is interlaced.

The nature of God is, I believe, at the foundation of every subject. None can be rightly appreciated, none rightly applied in practice, unless the understanding & feeling of the nature of God is at the foundation of the study & practise of it. But we must study the nature of God in other natures, in which He has manifested & revealed His own. Thus, our ignorance, our ~~little~~/want of feeling of the nature of God checks our improvement in social organization, makes our social habits wanting in a principle, in a foundation. What fundamental principle can there be but a reference to the nature of Him whose nature constituted what well-being *is* - to the Law of Him, through a *certain manner of keeping Whose Law only*/alone, well-being can be? By a certain manner ~~±~~/We do not mean an arbitrary manner; ~~±~~/we mean *the* manner which is in accordance with Wisdom & Right. As certainly as from the invariable Law of Gravitation, kept by a man in one way, he is dashed down a precipice; kept by him in another way, he stands in well-being firmly on the earth - so certainly is his well-being regulated, with respect to every part of his being, by the *mode* in which he keeps those Laws, which *not* to keep is not in his power -

43

The relation between Parents & daughters, its nature, & how practically it should be worked out - how is this to be referred to the nature of God? - how are we to find answers to the questions, 'what is this relation in principle, in theory?' and 'how is it

(a)

~~I remember once saying~~/A mother was heard to say, where it was a question whether one of ~~my~~/her daughters should go to another country, for the sake of prosecuting a work upon which she was intent. 'It cannot be, because it entails the other, staying at home, if I am not to be left alone' - *If ~~I am~~/she is not to be left alone?* If the purpose of God in bringing female children into the world is that one ~~old~~ woman ~~should~~/shall not be left alone, then ~~I~~/she was right in saying this & this way of ~~illeg~~/thinking & ~~it~~ was just & correct. But, since then, ~~I have~~/she has widely altered ~~my~~/her views as to the purpose of God in ~~bringing~~/causing that a woman ~~into~~ be born into the world.

practically to be worked out in life? from a study of the nature of God? (a) Insert 139 (a)

Granted that we discover, from observation & from experience, that, whatever is, is according to invariable Law - that this Law bears the impress of an invariable Will - this Will the impress of an invariable nature - granted that we trace this nature to be Benevolence, Love, Wisdom, Righteousness - we have then to inquire, not merely 'what do people say & do?' or 'what do books say?' But how far is what people say & do, what books say, consistent with the purpose of Benevolence, which wills well-being? and, what, that has not been said by people or books, may yet be consistent with *that Will*?

Man must then come to observation & experience, to reveal to him what this relation between Parents & daughters should be in order to be thus consistent. What are the laws

of human nature? In accordance with what mode of keeping them is human nature's well-being?

Observation & Experience will reveal to him that the exercise of the faculties of the human being in *certain modes* constitutes happiness - He will discover how the benevolence of God works through, & by, human nature - (thus giving human nature the happiness of such work) yet leaves it to human nature to discover what the work is to be, & how to do it - Otherwise there would not be the exercise which, in the view of Wisdom, constitutes happiness. Thus he would see the parents constituted guardians that the daughter shall have the organization, the development, the education, the opportunity to exercise her faculties aright - i.e. according to the nature of the human being & of her own individual idiosyncrasy - Thus, in the general, would be revealed the relation of the Parent to the child.

Oakey As the relation of the child to the parent, it would be the natural flow of sympathy, affection, gratitude, respect, appreciation to the parent for the right exercise of that guardianship.

This mutual relation would not involve that the parent & child should live together, work together, or that they should *not*. This would be according to their characters, their circumstances - according to whether or not they mutually found the best exercise for their faculties, the best purpose for their faculties, in living & working together. *Neither* would wish it, if it were not so - *Both* would wish it, if it were - But the love, the reverence, the gratitude would exist from the child to the parent, whether they lived & worked together or not. The child's wish to promote the happiness of the parent would be one of the wants, the appetites of his life. But he would know that he could not promote the parent's happiness, except by right & appropriate exercise of his own nature, for a purpose in sympathy with God's nature. The nature of God involves that this guardianship shall belong to the parent, that the response to it shall belong to the child.

Does not my son, at this moment, make me much happier than if he & I tried to live & work together? does not he love & respect me more than would be the case, if we tried to do so? This is admitted in the case of sons, but not of daughters. It is almost a proverb that sons & mothers "get on the best" together.

But ~~I believe I must admit that,~~ as things are now, few daughters *will* wish not to live with their parents, in order to have the saving of trouble, of effort, of responsibility, which prevents certain *dis*=satisfactions, if it does not give satisfaction. And the difficulties for a woman to exercise her faculties up to the best of her possibility & for her

141(a)

Is this a fiction? Is it an unknown case? Is it a solitary case? Or has it been said by hundreds & felt by ~~hundreds of~~ thousands of good women in this generation?

Few indeed will be able to say or to feel what follows: though it is the truth,

best purpose, are great, even if both parents & daughter desire that she should do so - while Society is regulated by Conventionality, not by reference to the nature & purpose of God.

~~I believe that~~ If Mankind were set on organizing society by such reference, modes of life would be almost entirely different from what they are now -

As to the present, ~~I believe that~~ all that the parent can do is to give all possible facility to the daughter to learn, if she is inclined, some mode of exercise of her faculties, which will be in harmony with God's purposes, & which will be in harmony with her own individual idiosyncrasies, (by which God marks His purposes) & afterwards to facilitate as far as possible her practically using what she has learnt.

"I have been a daughter living with parents, whom eternally I shall love with tenderest affection, whom I shall honour with sincerest respect - They were unselfish, conscientious, religious, had excellent abilities, most affectionate hearts. I was by nature, ~~I am sure,~~ conscientious, religious, affectionate - Both 40 they & I had active spirits for work, living spirits for/towards God & man to lead us to work aright. How was it that we made each other unhappy? Will it be permitted to us again to come together & to prove our love? To make them happy was the ideal of my childhood - as to have a good influence on my children, to make them happy, to love & be loved by them was the ~~beau~~ ideal of my womanhood, I can do ~~nothing~~/little for them - I can be ~~nothing~~/little to them. They cannot/~~not~~ but little love me. I would work. I would love. But I must live in solitary confinement with every appearance of social life & liberty around me. I say all this, in love to all, especially to *my dear & good parents* (insert 141a) & husband & children -" "God is the source of my suffering - & I bless Him for it. I know it is all right - I will try to learn my lesson."

‡/We want to give that which the family *promises* to give & does not. ‡/We want to extend the family, not annihilate it. ‡/We want "not to destroy, but to fulfil" ~~its promises~~ /the hopes it holds out -- to supply the sympathy, the love, the fellow=feeling, the tenderness, which it ~~promises~~/offers to supply & does not. Where is there such rudeness as in a family? Everywhere but in our own family our feelings are regarded. Now ‡/we want to make a family where there shall ~~should~~ be companionship in work, mutual attraction, love & tenderness, ‡/we want to make God's family. ‡/We would not take away *any* thing - ‡/we would enlarge & multiply!

But where is there such absence of tenderness, such constant contention as in a family? And the oddest part of the thing is that every body thinks it peculiar to themselves.

No, certainly, family does not answer its purpose. (Nor is it likely it should among five or six) ‡/we want to make it do so -

47

The law of God seems to be to scatter - 'Go forth & conquer the earth & possess it,' he says. Marriage does this. Sons do this, The only exception to this rule seems to be the unmarried daughters. *They* must stay at home . Because, in a half savage state of society, it is taken for granted that men have injurious feelings toward women, therefore women must remain at home till they are married for the sake of protection - or till society is in such a state that they do not want protection. The only exception to this rule is when they are obliged to earn their own

livelihood - then, when they have something to do, they are allowed to go forth - that is supposed to be a protection.

But the Exodus should always follow the Genesis. Generated by the parents, when they are supposed to be regenerated, they should go forth. Only unfortunately, then comes the Leviticus - A number of rules & laws must be laid down, because they always misbehave when they have gone forth.

‡/We don't ~~want~~/wish to force them *out of* the family.
‡/We only wish them to be where all their faculties will be best exercised. *Wherever that is*. Surely it cannot be denied that these two things are ~~des~~ necessary, viz. That we should come into ~~relation~~ & free communication with mankind, so as to give us room for our sympathies to find a response - *and* that we should have all our powers called into the highest exercise. If these two things were, there would be happiness - because then we could find ~~happiness~~/work & sympathies for ourselves. 48

~~But, father Portia said to me one day "I brought/Parents bring~~
~~the children/daughters 21~~
~~them~~ into the world without their consent. The law
gives them nothing. God gives them their time &
faculties. May they not have these? And, if the
life, which their parents & the other members of
their family lead, does not interest them, does not
~~employ/exercise~~ those faculties & employ satisfactorily that time, may
they not
use them elsewhere than at home, or would they
be wrong if they sought to earn their own livelihood
by them? ---- It does seem unjust that, whereas, if they
were to marry, ~~I might give them 30,000, that/~~their fortune might
consist of thousands,
they are not to have a farthing (*because they don't*
see any body who tempts them to marry) till ~~±~~
their father dies. ~~The age/life of a man is threescore~~
~~years & ten - he may live to it may be eighty~~
The days of our years are threescore years & ten - & if,
by reason of strength, they be fourscore years or ~~more~~
fourscore & ten, the daughters may be fifty, or sixty
years of age when ~~he/the~~ parents dies - ~~Our daughters were~~
~~all born while we were between the ages of 20 &~~
~~30~~ And is it not hard, because the customs of
conventional society forbid their earning their
bread with their own faculties & time, without
losing their class, - & because they may not see any body
whom they like well enough to ~~marry~~ induce them
to earn their bread by marriage, that therefore they
should have nothing, no kind of independence
till their parents' death? ~~You gave me a thousand~~
~~a year when I married - you give Fulgentia nothing,~~
is this not a premium upon thoughtless marriage?"

{illegUmlruff?}

~~"My dear" I said "don't flatter yourself/It will be said that marriage does not give people/the woman independence - You must know that yourself/the contrary I might give you a hundred £/Thousands may be given her at your/her marriage, but the law gives it to your/her husband. You/She will not have half a crown of it - a married woman does not exist in the eyes of the Law - she cannot sue or be sued - her husband gives her a cheque when he thinks right - or rather not when he thinks right - he never thinks it right. but when she bothers him. You must know these things very well. Does your husband, or does he~~
 {the following paragraph has an X through it}
 not, whenever you bring him one of your house=

keeping bills, say 'That seems a good deal, does it not?' or 'How can you use so many cabs/so much of this? I can't think' & altho' he may say at the end of the year, 'Well, Kate, we don't seem to have spent much in housekeeping this year, I wish you would spend more upon yourself,' does he or does he not, every time you come upon him for 100, say, 'Why, it is only last week I gave you fifty.'?"

~~Dear father I know all that. But I ask you, has This is true. Still has a married woman more or less the command of money more or less than a 'daughter at home'? have I more or less to spend than Fulgentia? - The Law may be against us, but still married women but still they have very much of the disposal of their husbands' incomes, and daughters have not, of course, of their fathers', during their mothers' life=time.~~

~~"Well then let Fulgentia go & earn her own bread,/A 'daughter at home' if she will, self-willed girl! I shall not prevent her But she may depend upon it, I shall leave her nothing."~~

~~"No I am not prepared to say that she ought not to give up her share of what you/her father will distribute among~~

~~your/the children, when you/he no longer wants it your/him
self, viz., At my/his death ?~~ 23

~~Yes, If you/And if he believes her wrong, you/he will probably
think it right not to leave her anything. But, if it
is not wrong, that will not be fair. & I, for one, she is
should not think her justified in being willing to
give up her share. Nor would you, I am sure--
Therefore should not parents ask themselves, 'Are
the following facts true or untrue?' We have adopted
the mode of life which suits ourselves, before our
daughters exist, or before they are capable of having
a preference one way or another. Perhaps this mode of
life gives no interest to them, or perhaps all but one
would choose it, by preference, that one only/alone cannot.
Are we to alter our mode of life to suit that one or
any one of our children? Certainly not - Are any or all of
my/our daughters to be condemned to my/our mode of life
which may exercise none of their faculties & to be
entirely dependent as long as we live, which may
be till they are 50 or 60 years of age? It seems
to me that what I inte Whatever I/parents intended to
give my/their daughters if they marry, ied, I would give
them/why should they not have when they come of age - deducting from
it
the cost of their maintenance at home, if they
choose to remain at home?~~

~~"You will find it very inconvenient my dear,
I can tell you, to pay that ready money from the
common stock to a parcel of foolish girls
coming to the age of reason or of unreason."~~ [end 8:125]

~~"It seems to me that I should like to live~~

But parents live in such a way that ~~if~~/they *must* say, ~~Yes,~~ "if /We can spend £300 a year on a house in town, but ~~if~~/we can't give anything like that to ~~my~~/our daughters - it would be very inconvenient." 24

~~"But the house in London is for the daughters as well as or more than for anyone else."~~

~~"Yes,~~ but Yet perhaps for one of them the life in London has no interest. Is *she* to have nothing, because she cannot like what the others like? The ~~common~~/course of things is this. The parents provide a common board. If the children, according to a vulgar proverb, "choose to take what is there, they may have it - if not, they may lump it." It often happens that one daughter, who chances to have the same tastes as her mother, may spend any thing, because it falls in with the spirit of the family - and another, who has a somewhat differing turn of mind nothing. Her life may be full of interests, but if she have not those which her mother & sisters have, she must have none."

~~"Well, my dear, I hope you will carry out your own notions with your own children. But I can assure you~~ It is said, first, that it is much better for a family to bear & forbear among themselves, & if one is a little different from the rest, the ~~exercise~~/lesson of self-denial is the best exercise ~~you~~/which can be ~~have~~/given her - better than 300 a year - Can anybody follow his own fancies in this world? Secondly, that ~~your children~~/not only the daughters will be all the worse for the money ~~you~~ given them - ~~&~~/but every body else too they will build almshouses, perhaps, or something

worse - ~~How can I tell?~~ And thirdly, that the scheme is an impossible one to carry out - for ~~you will/~~any income would ~~break up all your/the income/~~be broken up in this manner 25

~~"And I should say,~~ /Yet if ~~my/a~~ daughter wished to build an Almshouse with her share, more shame for ~~me/the~~ parent not to have taught her better Political Economy, but ~~I should/~~that would have no more right to prevent her than if she were a married woman, so long as she did not trespass upon her sisters' right - If indeed one should have an object, which was so heartily recognised by all, that all should wish that ~~20,000/a~~ large sum should be given to it, ~~that~~ again, ~~I think,~~ would be quite fair. But, otherwise, each must keep within her own share. "

~~"But how many women, my dear, have an object at all, do you think? Not three in a hundred."~~

~~"Ah, my dear father, I was afraid all along that you were coming to that. That can~~ But the real difficulty is this. ~~The rock against which I sh & my fine theories will/shall go to pieces - There are not/You are quite right~~

three women in a hundred who have any object. Woman are like the slaves - ~~You can't/~~They do not even get ~~them to~~ wish for their liberty - & they would not know what to do with it, if they had it. They are very uncomfortable, & they don't know why, & think that they would like to marry ~~-I only know two women who~~ Few if they were set free to morrow, would know what to do with themselves - One ~~would/might~~ be an Artist, for which she has all the power - ~~the an=~~

other a Moral Philosopher, a/a third a Sister of Charity - You may well say, /But most, if they had their time & their faculties, what could they do with them? First "catch your hare" - first give them their faculties - for, at present, how many women are taught well enough to do anything?" Dartnell 26

~~"But, letting that pass, & looking on to 'the things which are before', to that Utopia of yours, when all/every woman has a vocation, or a mission, or what not do you call it? will you tell me~~ But how is a parent ~~is~~ to make an unmarried daughter independent? - The Duke of Sutherland gave his daughters 10000 when they married - that is 300 a year - they probably cost him very nearly that at home. D/Deducting their dress & maintenance, what would they have had left, even if he had followed your plan/advice & given his single daughters the same as his married ones? Another rich man, ~~a friend of mine,~~ gave his daughter 5000 when she married, that is 150 a year - If he had given ~~the~~ her that when she came of age, ~~it~~/there would have been ~~2~~ nothing left, after deducting £100 a year which he did give her for her dress & what she cost at home - ~~So will you tell me what becomes of your plan?~~ M/Most girls actually cost their parents as much at home as they do when they marry.

~~"Yes I acknowledge that . It is very often the case I can only repeat that it - It seems to me that I - But is it not extraordinary that parents should not like to live in such a way that my/their daughters must marry or wait till my/their death, in order to carry out any of their plans which require money, or to be independent at all? But I am quite aware that my dear father 's statement is correct - I only think that the thing/case ought to be - And I think that all that can be done is to represent the case.~~

~~I do not think d/Daughters can not, however, claim the money -~~
 But their time & their faculties ~~I believe they/they ought to~~
 claim. What objection can there be, in the minds of
 good parents (the only cases we are now considering)
 to their having these?"

~~"Merely, my dear, what I said before, that~~ But they
 would not know what to do with them, when they
 had them.

~~"That I quite acknowledge - If parents did not make~~
 their claim upon the whole time of their daughters,
 to dictate how it should be spent, in entertaining
 the company, sitting in the drawing room, driving
 out, reading aloud, cultivating accomplishments,
 visiting the poor people, what would she be doing?
 Her drawing, her music, her intellectual work, her
 interests (not very deep) in the people around her,
 her flirting, her reading to herself & her outward
 things - She had better fritter herself away, ~~under~~
 as ~~(not "the law directs", - I mean that is the parents, than~~
 by/ as she herself directs. There is less of the selfish element in
 it.

~~But what is the truth," I asked "with regard to~~
~~its being the duty of parents to dictate or to judge as~~
~~to the object which should engage the time and~~
~~capability of an unmarried women of mature age?"~~
 {the following paragraph has an X through it
 To this question she made not answer. The con=
 versation took place at a crowded party, ball I
 think it was in a London palace - And at this
 moment her husband came up to take her away, or
 to introduce somebody to her, I forget which -
 And she could not answer - But I suppose
 she thought about it all night - poor Portia! -
 For the next day I received this long note
 from her by the Penny Post -

XXVIII

"Let us look at the relation of parent & child. When
 Turn over

parents/people marry, they summon human beings from the Unseen World into existence, no power existing in the hands of the latter to accept or refuse it. consequently no stronger bond of responsibility (to make that existence a good to the child as far as lies in the parent's power) cannot be imagined than that between the parent & his conscience, his feeling, his sense of what is reasonable. Now it is taken for granted that an unmarried daughter, when grown up, is wrong not to devote her time, her capability, to the life, the circumstances, arranged

by her parents before she was born, or while she was still helpless & incapable of forming a wish - To marry, or to devote herself to these circumstances are the only alternatives in which she can enjoy the approbation of her parents. Parents, in general, are sincerely & earnestly desirous of the happiness of their children - If a marriage, which they think for the good of their child offers, they rejoice; they would be shocked at the idea of refusing it, in order that their daughter's society or work might not be lost to *them* - But with anxious interest for their daughter, they refuse her pursuing any path of life except that laid out by them, (if she does not marry), because they fear for her the condemnation of the world which takes for granted that ~~that is doing~~/to follow her parents' path of life is to do "her duty in that state of life ~~to~~/into which it hath pleased God to call her," - for "God" substitute "Mr. & Mrs. ____" They parents plead with *her*, indeed, the hardness of her not giving them her society, her co=operation in carrying on, in the way they approve, the details of the life they have established. They are disappointed, complain that she is discontented, if she does not enjoy this life.

Let us look at these two alternatives, marrying, & living a life the details & interests of which are regulated by her family.

God has instituted marriage, but apparently as matter of choice. It is not to be concluded that every human being will feel the desire to marry. He whom we love & revere above all mankind, whom we *call* our example, lived to a mature life without marrying, & does not appear to have desired it. God & Mankind so filled His soul that He

appears not to have wanted more particular & individual interest. 29

To the generality of Mankind, however, it will not be doubted that married life will & ought to have most of interest & enjoyment - provided it be a marriage of attraction, of suitableness on both sides.

But, for a woman of high nature, for one who has sought to make an example of Christ, in devotion to God & Mankind - what will be the opportunities of marrying, with suitableness of purpose in life, with attraction to pursue that purpose together? Whom will she see? - Those whom her parents like & who like them sufficiently to visit in their family. How will she see them? - Not at work, where she & her capabilities are drawn forth & attractions manifested. Men & women (unmarried) meet *only* in idleness, in the present age - Where will she see them - Under her parents' & companions' eye, where the eager game of marriage is played, where, in the thoughts of many, it is uppermost, as she knows - & where there is no work interesting enough to divert ~~the~~/these ~~mind~~/thoughts from it.

Let us now suppose the other case of a woman living with her parents & brothers & sisters - It is not, *a priori*, to be calculated upon that their tastes & interests will coincide like the triangles of ~~like~~ Euclid's 4th Proposition & for this reason - that the Law of God in the characters of Mankind appears to be variety, not repetition. ~~I have heard it~~ It has been conjectured that, if ~~you~~ taking 3 children & 3 grandchildren in the same family, it is 200 to 1 that ~~you~~/one will not ~~find one~~ /be found of the same character as the parents. One would think it easy to make out

81(a)

(a)

It is almost a proverb that the son never adopts his father's profession -

whether this be so or not. The materials for the enquiry are always before us. 81(a) But, however this may be, 30 we may set down that God's law is ~~variety, not~~/against repetition. There ~~are/is~~, therefore, ~~many~~/the strongest reasons why a family cannot develop itself to perfection within the walls of one home. With sons ~~this~~ /it is thought out of the question. Three or four living at home all day is a state of things never seen, never desired. Each must follow a ~~course~~/career of activity out of home. But what an alternative it is for a woman!

~~Now t~~/The ordinary expectation, the eager desire of most mothers is that the daughters should find other homes by marrying - This desire may be suppressed & concealed by the mother - perhaps even from herself - But ~~(I speak from my own experience)~~ I believe there is no excitement so strong to a mother, as that of marrying her daughters - except that of marrying herself. And this,

~~"Ah! Those are your worldly & ambitious mothers."~~

~~No,~~ whether she be a good & affectionate, or, ~~as you say,~~ a worldly & ambitious mother, ~~this~~ is a mother's first interest - ~~it was mine.~~ In the former case, she generally feels the insufficiency of home to satisfy the yearnings of the young nature, for which she has, perhaps unthinkingly, undertaken to find food other than the daily meals - In the latter case, ~~it is true, as you have often said,~~ she desires it, because it

is the only field where she can exercise the talents & desires which a statesman exercises in the House of Commons, a Lawyer at the Bar. ~~see~~

But how very few are the opportunities which a woman has for seeing any variety of character, or for knowing intimately the character she does see in

Mankind! This is so completely acknowledged that it would be wearisome to dwell on it.

31

May we not then take into consideration the case of a woman living at home with her family, who does not wish to marry any of the few with whom she has a superficial acquaintance? Is this likely to be such a very extraordinary case?

Now the father & mother formed their habits & modes of life, as we have said, before she had a character & inclinations at all of her own - without any reference, therefore, of course, to her - Sisters differ notoriously in character from each other. Take any family, ~~you know - Do you think, -~~ If the question were asked (& answered with sincerity) ~~that~~/would in most cases, any one sister ~~would~~ like the idea of living with all the rest? Would not the answer to such a question be, in general, an acknowledgment that it was well such & such an one married - they "could not have lived together"? But perhaps one or two or three remain, &, of these, one or two or three may be of character not disposed to adopt the life chosen by the parents to suit their own ~~conditions~~. characters - may be of character finding little sympathy from any inmate of the home (not from anything wrong in any of the party, but) because of God's law of variety - Is man to make a counter=law, & say - they shall all be confined to the same pursuits, the same society? - Why? - Because it will be cruel to leave the parents - those very parents, who would rejoice probably, beyond any thing that rejoices them, in a marriage, which pleased them, for this daughter who must not leave them - Did they bring her into the world

what God's happiness is & what Man's capability of happiness is. Perhaps multitudes of really good people go through this life without experiencing it. ~~I rather think, I~~/Indeed, that those who *do* feel it are exceptions. *Enjoyment* is felt by very many, & this prevents the want of *happiness* from being felt. Man becomes satisfied, ceases to be *dissatisfied*, without his natural food. He takes stones for bread. Some cease to be dissatisfied by smoking & drinking, Perhaps this can hardly be called *satisfaction* to those who are most eager for it. Some find satisfaction in the outward - satisfy one part of their nature, so that the other is stifled, & no longer cries for or even wants food. To cry for food which one wants is grievous: To cry for food, not knowing *what* food one wants, is still more so - Not to *want* the food which the type of human nature *would* want, if without it, is more so still. Yet this last is the state of by far the larger proportion of mankind, including the "easy" classes, as we may perhaps truly call them. This indeed is the state which people seek & approve - for themselves & others - And what a hopeless state! Till some Saviour strikes a chord which reveals to man what is his proper food by giving him a taste of it, or a consciousness of what that taste would be - For, by God's law, it is the appetite which is to lead to food, to determine *what* food - If, then, the appetite does not exist, or if it exists for that only which is not sustaining food to man's nature, how is man ever to become the realization of his type, except thro' such a Saviour?

~~I see n~~/Nothing in this age is tending to reveal, (except to cases of exception, which one never can

f128

~~-86-~~

tell how to calculate upon, - which, sometimes indeed,
are pressed into being, squeezed into shape by opposition

3
4

of a particular nature to the general tendency) ~~I see~~
nothing, even in the best tendencies of the age, ~~is looked over to~~
reveals

what Man's proper food is -

~~XXXIII~~

Maye

~~To this enigmatical epistle, I answered, beseeching~~
{the rest of this paragraph has an X through it}
her to come to terms, & to explain to me in good
~~plain/Queen's English, suited to a plain man like me,~~
what she wanted for women, - whether she
doomed all women to single life, who were
too high=flown in their ideas to fall in love
in the common=place way, - what marriages she
would have, as she so very much condemned
those made by ordinary mortals in the ordinary
~~way/manner - to this she answered,~~

~~XXXIV~~

~~"I think, p/Probably, in the course of Eternity,~~
for each Man, for each Woman, there is an
union, an exactly adapted one - Many will be
formed which will not be the exactly adapted
one - Man wants variety - Man wants concentration.
By this union will the latter be secured, then
for the former he may go forth into the Universe.
He wants one fixed companionship & he wants varying
companionships. Thus will he have both. Except
we be as the Father "we shall have this treasure
in earthly vessels." Two will form one in every
instance, sooner or later.

In cases in general, the excitement between
the two is partly the pleasure of being an object
of interest - the hope of affection - (†/that can scarcely

be called affection ~~that~~ which exists with so slight an acquaintance, as in many cases - or after long acquaintance, as in many others, where they remain indifferent for years, then, qualities being just the same, all at once they become devoted to each other) partly it is the common interest, ~~of~~ between them, of the new eventful life in prospect.

35

What real love is ~~I am~~/we are almost unable to say - Can it be God's plan of bringing about that Man shall have intimate companionship, as well as infinite variety, secured in the course of existence? That then *two*, when the *right two* are united, shall throw themselves fearlessly into the Universe & do its work, secure of companionship & sympathy in one instance, consequently, (though ready & glad to take it, when it comes in any other form), not shrinking from any temporary absence from it.

But how few "twos" gain together that which prepares them to do the world's work! The spirit is exclusive which brings them together. It is understood that there is to be no third.

In proportion as the interests & objects of affection are exclusive, ~~I believe~~ it will not last, on into Eternity - When two are bringing different qualities, or partly the same, to bear upon a common object, & that God's object - ought it not to be this ~~that~~/which suggests the question, shall we physically, mentally, affectionately, spiritually be one? When two meet each other at work upon an object interesting to both, should not this be their introduction to love? Perhaps it will be said that the Drawing=room

in which they meet, is life interesting to both. But God is not often there. And He should have a part in that which attracts them to each other.

36

~~I think, that~~ God's purpose, as to the Man & Woman, is to effect, ~~as I have,~~ ~~said,~~ an union of two spirits closer than with the rest. ~~& that~~ Eventually each one probably is to have a real mate. The different work to be done, in *physical* human existence, requires a physical difference, it is clear - It would not be well that every human being should perform the physical part of a mother.

There are spiritual, affectional, mental & physical attractions. It is plain that great & even good men have had physical attractions to little & not good women - In some minds exists an attraction to great talent, without the feelings being affected. To some the affections (no other part ~~of us~~) are attracted. All these attractions should meet in the two who are to be peculiarly united, but it is daily experience that it is not so. If it were, & if, though there were differences in character, there was interest for the same work, & *that*, good work, then would there be a real independence for these two. They would together devote themselves to God & Man - to the Universe. This would secure them *all* sympathies, in the course of Eternity. But they would, at each particular present, be independent in having each other's sympathy - trusting for every other.

XXXV

~~The next day I had from her the following letter,—"The present education of a woman makes everything impossible but marriage - where she can go with her cut wings, or where she must cut them, if, by chance, she have not had it done.~~

88a

(2) She goes into the larder & store=room - She does not know how much the servants ought to use. She is certain there is waste somewhere - but she does not know where - nor how to correct it. But she does her best. She tries to say authoritatively that "she will not have it" - & to convince the family that she knows that something wrong is going on.

(6) She goes into the village to visit the poor people. And what is visiting the poor? very like visiting the rich - ~~we hope that something will turn up to say~~ & we ask them how many children they have & whether they go to school, & so on - we don't go for any purpose, but as we sit in the drawing=room, merely for the chance - not because we want to say something which they want to hear, or, vice versa, ~~that~~/because they want to say something which we want to hear, but for the chance of something turning up to say - that is part of the lady's business - to tell

Go on to P. 89a

already. For what else is there which a woman can do? What did she do? She ~~draws~~/drew & played & reads, & then she ~~teaches~~/taught a little in the school, & visited the poor people

3
7

& reads the Bible to them, which is the worst of all, because it is making her fancy that she is doing something when she is not.

A married woman's life consists in super-intending what she does not know how to do - (1) She goes into the kitchen & orders the dinner & tells the cook that it was very bad the day before, but she does not know how to tell her the way to do it right - Insert 88a (3) She goes into the nursery, knowing nothing about young children, where she has a nurse with whom she is much out of sorts, because the nurse actually does not like "mistress to come into the nursery when the baby cries". Her life is spent in imposing upon the servants - in making them believe that she knows how to do things which she has to scold them for doing badly. (4) She goes into the school=room, because she thinks it right to see "how the children are going on with the governess" - And something different is done because she is in the room, in order that they may never look as if they were doing nothing. (5) She "looks in" at the poor school, because "they want looking after", & the master "requires a little stir now & then." But the master knows, privately in himself, that he knows more than she does about a school. (6) Insert 88b

This is the way her life is passed -

the poor people that they are wasteful - that they don't make as much out of 12/ a week as they might - in order to be comfortable, which is very true - but - she can't tell them *how* to make the most of 12/ a week - she does not know.

~~I remember, when I/A~~ young married lady ~~asking/~~asked the advice of a very intelligent woman, a great many years older, ~~than myself,~~ as to housekeeping, & she said 'My dear, when I married, the first thing after we settled down at home was my cook coming to ask me how I liked to have the pig cut up - & I hardly knew that pork was pig - but I said, cut it up your own way first,'. ~~We all thought t/~~This was thought so clever, (& she was a very clever woman) the mistress *taking in* the servants in this way.

f132

~~-90-~~

~~It really seems to me that t/~~The business of a Superior is to tell others to do what she does not know how to do herself - How different it would be if she felt a confidence in herself that she knew what was to be done & how to do it - & to do it well! How different would be her whole life & happiness. But now, it is all disappointment, if she is wise - ungrounded security, if she is foolish - And so she spends her ~~life da/~~days."

XXXVI

~~To this I answered that, if women would but think seriously of their responsibilities, & would illeg themselves by proper studies in Natural~~

Lemmon

VIII I.

~~I was in despair. I had taken Columba to~~ [8:125]
 {the rest of the paragraph has an X through it}
 stay at her sister's house, hoping that ~~she~~/Portia would
 have more influence with her than I had, &
 would prevent this mad scheme of becoming a
 Catholic - And now they held long disquisitions
 together upon the comparative merits of the
 Roman Catholic & Moravian systems - & went
 into the minutiae of the Religious Orders - I
 entreated Portia to take the matter seriously.
 Columba was a person who pursued everything
 to extremities - & I begged her to do her best
 to keep the girl in the church in which she was
 born [end 8:125]

~~"In /It is often said that we are to stay in the religion in which
 she was/we were born, to she said,
 doubtingly. "Think what a bar to progress, if you
 are always to stay where you are born 1 Then the
 Mohamettan, the Jew are to stay where they are born?"~~

~~I pointed out to her the arguments in the
 Epistles for "abiding abide in the calling wherein we are
 called." & said, (which of course requires no
 proof,) that there is a far wider difference
 {the rest of this paragraph has an X through it}
 between other religions & Christianity than
 between the religions of Christianity - & that
 the arguments for leaving the former ~~did/do~~ not
 apply to changing about in the latter.~~

~~She said, thoughtfully " Were we in Astronomy
 to take one book as our final rule, our ultimate
 appeal, the same things would happen inevitably
 as has happened in religion - Some things in
 it we should absolutely ignore, as when we~~

f134

~~-74-~~

ignore that Solomon said 'Man is like the 2
beasts that perish' - & of other things we should
say, 'he did not mean that; he meant some=
thing else,' - as when Christ says, 'hate your
father & mother,' 'sell all & follow me,' - No one
would cry out so much as the Bibliolaters, 'Oh!
what a shame! ' if we were to *do* it - but they
say 'he did not *mean* it! Could we go on
with such a system in Astronomy?^L [8:125-26]

~~I pointed out to her the absurdity of the
Roman Catholic claim to unity & infallibility-
the difficulties which beset *all* churches, but
her most of all -~~

~~"I believe," she said, "a/As much as the Roman
Catholics can believe that there will be Unity & Infallibility,
so do we. I don't see h/How the preachers of toleration of the
present day can say, 'take the religion which suits
you best' - any more than they can say 'it may
suit your mind better to believe that the Sun
moves round the Earth - if so, take the belief
which you find best for you'? There may be a
mind which, from want of imagination, want of
cultivation, cannot be made to apprehend that
the earth is not an immoveable body but one
flying through space - and it is true therefore
to say, 'there are minds which must believe
that the earth is stationary *till* they are more
cultivated.' But Unity in Religion ~~there will~~/there must [end
8:126]~~

be one day as surely as there is Unity in Astronomy -
~~I mean that t/There is objective truth & untruth
in Religion as in Astronomy - & ~~that~~ the well=
constituted mind, by the exercise of its own power,
~~will~~/must & will come to this unity of truth."~~

~~"And you do away with all private judgment,"~~ 3
~~said I.~~

~~"I think there/~~It is a mistake about 'private judgment' - ~~I think~~ those words are dangerous - Because they seem to imply that one person may judge one way & another another, according to their 'private' view of things, according as it 'suits their own minds', as the phrase is. whereas it is the truth, as it were, which *judges* - for ~~you/us~~ The principles of 'private judgment' ought to mean, if it means anything, that ~~you/we~~ are to

search

earnestly with all ~~your~~ might for the truth & that *that* is to judge, not that ~~you/we~~ are to judge - ~~You~~ The principle cannot too strongly ~~put the principle laid/lay~~ down that there cannot be two truths, any more than two Gods - there can be but one truth - it cannot vary to suit the minds of each - There is but one truth & ~~you/we~~ have to find it. The Roman Catholics say truly, there is but one truth - ~~So do I.~~ But some say that ~~you/we~~ are to find it in the Bible - some that ~~you/we~~ are to find it in the Bible & Church together. ~~Of/~~Comparing the Churches, some say that ~~you/we~~ are to find it in the Roman Catholic Church. ~~they are quite sure~~ -others that ~~you/we~~ are to find it in the Church of England - & some that we are to find it in the Roman Catholic Church *or* in the Church of England, they are not quite sure which But ~~I/we~~ don't want to ask the Church - I/we want to ask God - But God tells different people

different things, ~~you say.~~ So it was in Astronomy. God has told Sir John Herschel a great many things which He did not tell Galileo, which He could not tell Galileo. Do we complain of this? - We do not say that each is to take the system of Astronomy which best suits his own mind. Are we not to strive to find out the truth in Religion as we have been striving to find it out in Astronomy? There is but one truth - Most dangerous is it to allow the belief that there may be two - that it is as our 'private judgment' judges best. God judges for us - & His truth it is which we have to find out. 'Private judgment' is not the question. It is God's judgment."

~~"Well" said I, "with all your religious theories, you would be the most intolerant of all the Inquisitions, which have yet been set up on this unlucky earth."~~

~~"Should I? Because I say, t/There is a truth & we must find it out? - - - 'It is the truth for you,' - we don't say this in Medical Science - we don't say, 'if you will' only believe, - & believe sincerely, & it does not signify what you believe - be but conscientious in your belief, that will do.' Religion is the only thing which is of so little importance that we can say this - In Medical Science, we say 'it is a matter of the utmost importance to your health & that of your patients that you should discover the truth - search for it then with all your might - if you don't find it,~~

there may be fatal consequences' ~~in the~~
~~disease of such an one.'~~ But in Theological 5
 Science - & theological science only - we do *not*
 say 'you must bend your whole faculties, to
 discover & earnestly to search out the truth.' no,
~~we/"tolerance" says, 'if it be only your conscientious opinion, -~~
~~mind, it must be your conscientious belief, - &~~
 if it suit the nature of your own mind, that will
 do.'"

Maye

~~"But how are we to know when we have~~
~~found the truth which each man is to search~~
~~after? But what test have we, if each man is to~~
 depend upon his own faculties?" it is said.

" In Medical Science, there is a test - to make
 the body healthy. But this test does not exist
 for the theological physicians - viz., to make the
 soul healthy - On the contrary, *They* are to say
 that the soul never can be healthy - It is as if
 medical men were to say, 'You were born in such a
 a state of disease that I can do nothing for you in
 this world. There is no hope of your ever being
 well - You will never get better here - Do not
 therefore expect it or strive for it. But I have
 to announce to you that, by some method which
 you cannot understand, by the death of a God a
 long time ago, you will be quite well in a
 state which comes after the time when you will be
 dead in this - Only believe this & you will be
 quite well - *then* - *here* you never can be.'"

~~"Surely, however, using your own test, you~~
~~see that one religion has a more healthy~~
~~influence upon one person than another, upon~~

a person"

"The essentials of religion ~~said she~~ are love & veneration & trust & duty - It may be that some will have less of these essentials of religion while believing one form of religion than another. Yet it will not do to say that *'that religion is true for them.'* There is one truth, which is God's truth, & we have to find it out & to educate Mankind to be capable of receiving it. But ~~you/~~"tolerance" says 'any religion will do which you yourself think a good thing.' ~~Why,~~ ~~it's not/~~Is it for me with my foolish thought to say, what is a good religion? It is God's thought which I am to seek for - 'But that is the truth for you & this is the truth for me,' ~~you say/~~it is said. 'If he only follows his private judgment, it is the truth for him.' It is not for him with his 'private judgment' to make a truth ~~Indeed I must repeat, you cannot say too strongly that t/~~There is but one truth - which all have to find out - not ~~that~~ there are as many truths as there are private judgments & individual minds."

~~Then I repeat, you /~~This, it is said, is to go back to the Roman Catholic Church, ~~you/~~to "turn back again to the only foundations of certainty, & lay once more" in her "the basis of your faith".

"Rather, ~~we/~~it is to go on 'to the foundation of certainty & to lay' at last 'the basis of faith' which must be our object - It did seem, ~~that/~~no wonder when men asked whether poor little babies

were damned or not, & ~~that~~ the Church of England 7
~~should say~~ /said 'it was an open question,' 'it
 did not signify, you might believe one way
 or another as you chose, - it did seem no wonder that she
~~that~~ thus sent so many earnest men, who thought
 that it *did* signify, into the R. Catholic Church.
 The R. Catholics say that the Ch. of England
 'prevaricated in her answer". ~~I don't think~~
 She did not 'prevaricated' - she said 'she did not
 know - it did not signify.' The R. Catholics
 say, 'Ask Gregory' what he would have said.
 But ~~I/we~~ don't want to ask Gregory - ~~I/we~~ want
 to ask God."

~~"But God tells you only -/Not thro' "revelation" -
 there only do you/we find definite truth."~~

Can there be anything less definite than
 what is called "Revelation"? less definite than
 the doctrine which is to be found in it? It
 is not there that ~~you/we~~ can find certainty."

~~"Then where? - In your private judgment?"~~

~~"I think very much as the R. Catholics
 do, as I have said, about private judgment -
 'You may think as you like,' say the asserters
 of the right of 'private judgment' - they do not
 say, 'there is a truth to be found & you must
 apply your whole soul & mind to find it.
 & great harm will accrue to you & yours if you
 don't find it! - they say, 'if you can only believe
 conscientiously, you are safe, you may think
 for yourself' - We do not say in Astronomical
 There are three ways as to Religious truth. ~~The first~~ /One is~~

or as if we said in Physiological Science, 'you may think for 8
 yourself - believe conscientiously - believe that
 such a system of Medicine is right - that
 boiling oil will cure gun=shot wounds - that
 Calomel will cure Indigestion - & then, - (it
 does not signify) you are safe' ~~On the other~~
~~hand, the other party~~/Another way is to say ~~(as we do)~~ 'there
 is a truth - but - 'you will be damned if
 you don't believe it.' We do not say this ~~that,~~
 but - 'there is a truth & you will find it
 out in time,' - & it is of the very greatest
 importance to ~~our health & to our friends' health~~
 that we *should* find it out.

But people now pique themselves upon not
 being startled at anything - They like to talk
 among one another - They make a merit of it
 that they *like*/wish to *hear*/know other people's views!
 They treat truth as an exercise of the intellect,
 not as something of the utmost importance,
 which is to be strained after, & bought with
 our brow's sweat & our heart's blood. They
~~wish~~/like to 'hear people's arguments', they say -
 It is a titillation of the intellect, which is
 agreeable - not a matter of life & death - ~~I~~
~~don't know that I was ever more struck by this~~
~~than once when I had heard~~ Good men, learn=
 ed men, Senators, & men of action discussing
 together free=will, necessity - the origin of evil - God's
 purpose, ~~&c they parted~~ the most momentous questions of man's destiny,
 & as they parted to
 dress for dinner, ~~one said~~ say laughing "you know

f141

~~-74g-~~

who reasoned high

'Of providence, foreknowledge, will & fate.'

9

"And found no end, in wandering snares lost.'

and ~~ran~~/run off. It ~~was~~/is a mere matter of intel=
lectual amusement, this search into man's
nature & God's nature - It would not have
been so, had it been a search into Man's
muscles & arteries."

~~"I do not see, said I, "how you can ever
expect u/"Unity can only be attained by/through man~~

~~"By the/man exercising of man's/his faculties, said she,
not in *this* way, but in the way in which
Archimedes & Newton & so many others set to work upon *their*
Sciences. shall we attain Unity."~~

Dartnell ~~"and infallibility too?"~~ said I.

~~"And I/Infallibility can only be attained in the same way.~~
Each will learn of God 10
who is infallible (by exerting his own faculties)
the truth - The truth is discoverable, if we will
bring our faculties to it as to any other truth - Is
it not as infallibly true that a man ~~shall/must~~ not have
three or four wives, or that I am not to go into
Mrs. M.'s room & take a 5 note, if I can find
one, as that the Earth moves round the Sun? Does
I not all educated England believe the one as "infallibly" as the
other?

~~does, I believe.~~ Polygamy
& theft are wrong as "infallibly" as it is ~~wrong/untrue~~ that the earth
is
stationary. Yet the Mahometan does not
believe the first, nor did the Lacedaemonian
the second. These are discoveries as
~~abo~~ to the nature of man. These lead directly
to discoveries ~~about~~/as to the nature of God - which,
discoveries when man applies his faculties to ~~them~~/make such instead
of pinning them to a Book, will be as remark=
able as ~~will~~ have been his discoveries in every
other thing. ~~else~~ So, with the exercise of man's
faculties, there ~~shall/will~~ be "Unity."

~~"Would I could see it coming!"~~ said I.

~~"But s/Suppose, "said Portia,"~~ that, in nautical
matters we were to say "I think so - You think
otherwise - It would be very illiberal of me not
to think that you may be right & I be right too -
It is better that ~~all~~ men should be of different
opinions - Let each man have his own. - Let each
take the opinion which suits his own mind &
tolerate the others." Were this said in nautical
matters or were ~~they~~/naval men to refer to a book written
in 1800, what would be the consequences? - Yet, thus

it is in religious matters - There are two ways - The Roman Catholics say 'There must be Unity' (& they are right ~~there~~ - for the want of unity resulting/s from some minds not having yet received the truth, not from there being no absolute truth) But they say, 'There must be a Church to maintain this Unity & to interpret that book.' The other way is to say 'The more sects the better - Difference in religious opinions is good - Let *me* believe what I like & do *you* believe what *you* like - This is called *liberality* or *toleration* - Religion is treated quite differently from anything else . We do not appoint a Church or Assembly in nautical matters, which is to be infallible - But men search & discover- ~~But~~ The principle of searching is still unacknowledged in religious things - And as to the other way, ~~that~~/it is simply saying that there is no "truth" -

~~How can~~ It is often wondered at that any one be taken in by the claim to infallibility of the Church of Rome. ?— But there is so much in saying that you are infallible Faith can remove mountains - Faith in yourself does remove mountains. Those who speak with a tone of authority, mothers, doctors, are more than half believed for doing so. ~~We/Children/~~We cannot have this ~~faith~~/belief in the Church of England, because, if ~~she~~/we were to go to her & say, 'You are infallible' she would ~~say~~/answer, 'No, I am not' - while, if ~~she goes~~/we go to the Roman Catholic Church & says, 'Mother, teach me, you are infallible', ~~she says~~/answers, "Yes, my child, I am." "

~~"Well, Portia, I do hope you will do your best~~

~~to keep this poor misguided child in the Church
in which she was born."~~

12

~~"I do not understand your/The principle of not
leaving a Church because you were born in it,
dear father/is unintelligible. Error is error - whether you were
born into it or not. is it not?~~

~~The argument which you used, as I understand
it, is, is it not?~~

A church is a desirable thing

All churches have defects

Therefore remain in the church in which you
were born

And do not bring pain upon your family,
All Churches are beset with difficulties. ~~you say~~
So is the Roman Catholic Church - difficulties more
vital than the rest, you do not say, but "such
as no one can overlook" - Is it not fair to conclude
that you consider those of the Anglican Church as equal?
~~I have often heard you say that you would not
have left the Catholic Church, if you had been
born in her."~~

~~"Well," said I, impatiently, "I wonder that
you do not become a Catholic yourself, Portia."
But most of all~~

~~"Father," she said solemnly, I/we want my/our God. He is my/our
first & my last/want - The
Roman Catholic's God is not mine/ours - And to live very
closely with those who are all worshipping very
fervently one God, while I am/we are thinking about
another, & that other not at all like theirs, would be very
painful. To have sympathy with my/our God, to be
able to esteem Him is the first thing - (a) Insert 76a~~

~~After this, I could say no more, & I was silent.~~

There is ~~very~~ great interest in tracing the derivation of words. It is a means of tracing man's thought. It is interesting to think concerning each word that there was a time when it had never been used, to ask the questions, of what thought, emotion, or sensation was it the consequence, ~~which~~/when it first passed the lips of man? 13

The word *truth* appears to have been derived from *traweth* - that which a man believes was *traweth* or truth. And here ~~you~~/we see into a common error ~~in~~/of mankind. Often Man does not look for the absolute *what is*, but satisfies himself with that which he "traweth". Nay, many go so far as to assert that there is a different truth for different natures. If we mean by truth *that which is*, we mean a definite mode of existence not subject to be changed by the view which different men take of it.

But, ~~you will say~~, in the different views which Men take of religion, is one, then only true?

All are imperfect - none without some true belief, if, by true belief, we mean belief of that which is. The conception, the comprehension, which the finite & imperfect struggles for of the Infinite & Perfect must always be, like himself, finite & imperfect, but, like himself, it may be ever advancing & improving.

Gran It has been said that Man makes his God. He does so in an obnoxious sense, if he supposes that he conceives & comprehends the whole truth concerning God in his creed, be it what it may. 14

He who fashions a figure of wood & then bows down to it is called an idolator. We are shocked that, by his limited faculties, he has limited the conception of the superhuman power. When Man limits his conception of the superhuman power by any form of words, he makes the same sort of mistake as the man who fashions an idol with his own hand. Let us ever remember that our conception, our comprehension, our feeling towards God must be ever imperfect, yet should be ever advancing. We must not *make* God - we must *find* Him & feel Him more & more. "He that loveth not, knoweth not God." How imperfect our Love, how imperfect our w/Wisdom to fulfil the purpose even of such love as we feel! In proportion as we partake the attributes of God, shall we know Him better - Love & knowledge must unite. He who feels & comprehends, by his feeling, God's love, will know God better & better, as he penetrates into His wisdom as revealed & revealing itself in the everlasting tale of the Universe. The nature & history of the material, the intellectual, the spiritual will all, to him, as he learns them, be revelations of God - Love, without knowledge will form a poor conception of God. Knowledge without love will form none at all.

Seeking truth as *that which is*, we ~~may~~/can never believe a contradiction. That which *is* never is *not* also. We recognize that a Supreme benevolent & wise Will *is* & has been. Nothing therefore can be (or have been) coexistent with this Will, which would be contradictory to it. As far as we can penetrate into what *is* a wise benevolence, what the thought, the sentiment, the purpose consistent with it, we may interpret the past & present; we may read the future - These are the auguries, the prophecies open to all mankind. {the last paragraph has three slanted lines drawn through it}

I ask myself the question what after the experience of my best moments, my conception is, or rather my grasp after a conception, an imagination of the best & greatest happiness that is - the truest happiness, the happiness which would satisfy the Spirit of all that is good & wise, true & righteous, lovely & beautiful in the abstract.

"We must put out of our heads the word 'Law' as applied to Moses' Law - God has not said 'Thou shalt not kill,' because people *do* kill, but God's Law is never broken - Think what it would be if. God's world were, as it is often represented, a continual breaking of His Laws, & being punished for it! -The world would be out of joint indeed. But it is not so - His moral & his physical Law stand on exactly the same basis. Neither is ever broken - Bodies do not fall upwards, & his moral law, which says, 'if you kill, certain consequences will follow, & if certain circumstances take place, you *will* kill,' is always kept. 'Thou shalt not kill.' was Moses' not God's thought. God's thought is, if a certain phase of education exists, there will be 999 murders in the year - & that thought is always accomplished - & accordingly, we see an average of 999 murders annually in Great Britain."

~~This was said to me one day by Portia when I was questioning her about her "three Phases" & her God of the Perfect Laws - & what she meant by Laws - "If you observe," she said, "you will see that, g/Generally, as the belief in miracles decreases, God dies out - At first, as is very natural, while the laws of God are little, or not at all, understood, people are expecting & finding miracles every day & see God in them - St. Teresa lives in a perpetual expectation of a miracle - She speaks to God. He hears & answers - And the state of~~

such persons is truer than the state of the assertors of Law is now - ~~I mean that the t/Trust~~ in the God who will works a miracle in answer to their prayers, ~~the veneration for/{illeg}~~ the God who works the miracle, ~~the thankfulness, the love to Him~~ for having worked one (though we may feel we could not love a God who did work miracles) are truer feelings, juster appreciations of Him than the appreciation ~~of/given~~ by the "positive" school of the present day - Alas! ~~we may truly say~~ that, as the belief in miracles dies out , *God dies out* also.

~~But t/There is, or rather there was a time, said I "as with us Protestants now a days, when we do not/without believe/believing in miracles, †/people yet have/had strong faith in prayer & in God.~~

~~I should rather say there was a time. That is what I call~~ This is the "supernatural" Phase - when people prayed - & ~~expected/believed~~ that alteration took place in God in consequence, & that something different was done from what would have been done if they had not prayed - & thought it very good of God, & were grateful to Him, & loved Him. Wesley & Fénelon were types of this time. ~~But do you suppose now that the farmers now go to church, & pray for rain, & say, 'This morning the crops looked very bad & I was very low, but we prayed for rain to day & to morrow they {illeg illeg illeg/will look better? do not you suppose they feel, as the Clerk said, 'it is no use praying for rain - while the wind is in that quarter'? Do you suppose~~

Jones

~~that~~ Did any one looked to see whether George IV had made any alteration because they prayed 18 for him - whether he had become more virtuous since last Sunday? No, people go on saying the same prayers, because they are there in a 'Form', but they don't ever look to see whether any change has come in consequence, they don't expect it - ~~And therefore I say, t/~~The God of Prayer has also died out, & the far higher God of Law is not yet come [8:126] ~~"I could not help recurring here to the idea ever present to my mind, & I begged Portia since she was so far removed from Roman Catholicism herself, to exert her influence to keep Columba out of it or at least not to exert her influence to urge her into it.~~

~~"I may be very clever," she answered, half-laughing, "but if a person has no stability in their belief beyond my not exerting my influence, I do not see what is to be done - I cannot fancy, I mean, your belief depending upon a person. And as to my dear Columba, you may keep your body in one room or another - But how can {the rest of the page has an X through it} you keep your heart in one church or another? How can you keep it from following your convictions? How can w You say, dear father, that it is your happiness & her duty to that she should stay in the Church of England? How can it be your happiness & her duty that she should stay where her convictions no longer are? Would you say of a man who, had/having heard & thought & read (especially the Bible) & prayed & found that his convictions were in~~

{the first paragraph has an X drawn through it}
~~another church, that it was his duty to stay~~
 where he was? I do not quite understand 19
 the line you wish me to take - do you wish me
 to use the arguments (which have convinced
 myself) with her? or do you wish me to use
 persuasion that it is her duty not to distress
 her friends?"

~~"I wish you to use both argument &
 persuasion."~~

Almost ~~A~~/all that ~~I shall say~~/can be said against the evils of
 the Roman Catholic Church ~~will apply~~/applies equally
 to those of the Anglican - while, ~~(if you have a~~
~~Church,)~~ ~~I see none~~/there are hardly any of the advantages in the
 Anglican which ~~{illeg}~~/there are in the Roman Catholic Church
 if you are to have one of the existing Churches at all
 Almost every thing that ~~I~~/could be ~~say~~/said against
 miracles at Loretto ~~would~~ /holds equally ~~hold~~ against
 the miracles of Christ - ~~St~~/ Sir James Stephen
 sees this & says, (in his Review on Port Royal
 in the "Edinburgh",) *topping up*, with a senti=
 ment, without giving any reason, 'Rather let my
 right hand forget her cunning than that I
 should say anything against the miracles of
 our Lord. The Devil did the miracles of the
 19th century, if there were any - Christ did
 those of the first' - 'Why?' - 'Because I believe
 it - I might as well say, I believe the Devil
 did the miracles of the 1st century (the Jews
 did say so, who saw them) but those of the 19th
 are of God. ~~Stripped of its sentiment, is not~~
~~this the substance of what Stephen says?"~~

~~"But what/how can you explain away any of Christ's miracles?"~~

"Wherever miracles have been believed, we know that miracles have been." 20

~~"And this is the doctrine that you are going to teach your own children."~~

But ~~it~~/there is no spirituality in disbelieving the miracles - There is nothing very inspiring nor particularly tending to morality or progress in disproving them, - ~~Certainly not,~~ if that were all -

~~I can so well understand t~~/The feeling of the Church of England is very intelligible. Many know that they are in a state of "twilight faith" - But what can they do? If they step out of it, they step into a state of darkness. They have not admitted the principle, "Search" - & it is like stepping out of a rickety house ~~{illeg}~~/into the blank cold darkness ~~& bare heath~~ of unbelief."

Hurrull "It is so easy, ~~Portia,~~ now - ~~A man~~/men can have no religion & not know it ~~himself~~/themselves. Because it is all laid down for them what they are to think & what

3

8

they are to say - ~~I don't suppose it is~~ - their services are not with them ~~repeating the~~

~~same words & all that.~~ a matter of feeling. The Dean of Hereford the Bishop of S.~~odor & Man,~~ while labouring so intensely in the cause of Humanity - ~~do you suppose that~~ have they any religion? - And yet they don't know themselves that they have none, when saying their services - They never think of asking, because they have no doubt they have. "

"~~I agree with you, Columba~~ - People have no God now - A few speculate as an amusement to the intellect - But most have a diluted religion of the kind of St. Teresa's - They use the prayers she did - (A "form" of prayer they may well call it) They pray for rain - But they look at the Barometer & ask which way the wind is - What can you expect of a religion which uses the forms without ~~exp~~ awaiting the result? - They pray indeed, but they don't know whether they shall have it or not - If they have, they are rather surprised - If they have it not, they say it was not wise to give it them. But our God always does what is wise, whether we suggest it to Him or no - St. Teresa was so much better than her God."

"But how comes it that we don't love this wise God & that St. Teresa did love hers?"

"We open a book of Science, & we read of a God all order & Beauty & Goodness - & He excites no feeling - We open the Life of St. Teresa - & we find a God all injustice & disorder, & we find her in a 'rapture' about Him. The God of Law is always speaking to us - always saying what is wise & good. The God of St. Teresa speaks to her sometimes, & says something which is often foolish & not good. ~~How e/Curious it does seem~~ indeed that, while the God of Science never appears to have excited any feeling, the other God has excited so much! May we not hope that the day is coming when we shall feel as much, yea a great deal more for our God than she did for hers?"

39

"~~But t/The Protestants, you see,~~ /it is said, do not feel so much for their purer God as the Catholics do for their unjust One?"

"But ~~±/we~~ can hardly call the Protestant God a God at all. What does He stimulate us to do? What does He require of us but to go to church once a week? ~~±/We~~ cannot say, 'why are the Protestants not better than the Catholics, ~~for~~ their God ~~is~~/being so much less absurd? ~~±/We~~ can only say, they Protestants have hardly any God at all. They were so occupied with the absurdities of the Roman Catholic God that, as often happens, they did not perceive that they had left themselves no God at all - For the last 300 years, the work of religion has been the work of destruction."

"And when will it come to be a work of edification?"

"Even now ~~we~~/we hear "the voice of one crying in
 the' crowd, 'Prepare ye the way of the Lord.' ~~we~~/We
 do not wonder at the rejection of Monotheism 40
 on account of its dulness - ~~I should think~~ /The
 Jewish religion & the Unitarian are the dullest of all.
 They are pure Monotheism. The Catholics, with
 their angels & devils & Saints & Virgin & the
 Holy Ghost & the Son, do make ~~God~~ /religion a little
 cheerful ~~in~~/with all that company. But God sitting
 up there by Himself, enjoying Himself while
 we are suffering, is the most revolting cheerless
 religion. No wonder we turn from Him with
 disgust - & then complain of our hard hearts.
 But all that the Catholics have we shall have
 in our religion. Angels & Saints we shall
 have, as soon as we have made them - Every
 man is not intended to be superior in every
 thing. But, let him organize a right life, &
 men superior to himself in different things
 (or "angels") will spring up. And Mankind, not only Christ, will
 be the Son - ~~I think that~~ a/A
 great sacrifice has been made for us - ~~that~~
 God is suffering for us - not enjoying Himself
 by Himself - Our religion will have everything.

“ The Incarnation - the Trinity - the Atonement seem ~~to me~~ to be abortions of a comprehension of God's plan. The Incarnation? we do not see that God is incarnate in every man - we think He was only incarnate in one - We make the Trinity God, Christ, & the Holy Ghost - instead of making it God & Man & such manifestation of God as man is able to comprehend.”

41

~~“And the Atonement?”~~

~~“The Atonement? - I really hardly see of what this was an abortion. It seems to me such an utter mistake. Man had a dim perception of God passing through sin & suffering for man & in man, & also of sacrifice & compensation - though it seems a curious sort of compensation to kill God's son because we have offended Him - the whole scheme of grace & redemption~~ what appears to be an elaboration

of error

~~& confusion it does appear /struck all /founded upon some truth. does appear~~
And yet this is believed - & the simple scheme of God's providence men are scandalized at - ~~But~~ it is indeed necessary to have a Church to keep up with all this.”

“How very glad I/we should be, if God *did* speak to us, as St. Teresa thought He did is often said ~~poor Columba.~~

But ~~“t/~~There is hardly anything which it has ever been ~~said/~~ supposed that God ~~has said/did~~ say, *~~& I do not feel that I/we~~ could not have said a better thing ~~my self/ourselves~~ ~~in w/~~What St. Teresa says, - ~~in~~ what Moses says, - the ten Commandments - are they not full of mistakes? ‘I am He that brought thee out of the land of Egypt-’ ~~Why,~~ He was taking care of the Egyptians as much as of the Hebrews! ‘I the Lord am a jealous God’ - The

iniquity of the fathers *is* indeed visited upon the children, but not because God is 'jealous' - The 5th Commandment contains three mistakes, first, we can only honour that which is honourable, - secondly, filial piety has nothing to do with living to old age, - thirdly, the Lord did not give them that land, - they took it. As to 'Thou shalt not kill,' 'thou shalt not steal,' it did not require a voice from God to tell us that it was better not to kill & steal. Christ ~~I think,~~ does *not* say that God spoke - It shews His great wisdom - But, in the few times when ~~He~~/God is said to have spoken in the N. Testament, it does not appear ~~to me~~ that He said anything very inspiring - He said 'This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased, hear ye him. When He speaks to Paul, & ~~±~~ ~~feel sure that He would not have sa/id,~~ says, 'I am Jesus whom thou persecutest.' ~~±~~/we feel sure that that is *not* what He would have said."

Jones "But ~~a~~/All religions up to this time have been founded on Miracle. Christ's was - Mahomet's was - Did not the Greeks & Romans believe in miracle?

"It is true, ~~this~~/ours is the first Religion which has been founded on "Law". All religions have been hitherto founded on Miracle - on the breaking of Law - It is a bold attempt to preach the first religion founded on "Law" -

"Had it not been for the ~~supposed~~ miracles & resurrection of Christ, would ~~do you think~~ the Christian religion have been founded? - Would the Mahometan religion have been founded without the miracles of Mahomet? - ~~Do you think that~~ Would the pure, devoted & beautiful life of Christ, His doctrines & teaching ~~would~~ have ~~founded~~/laid the corner stone for the Christian religion without the Resurrection?"

No, ~~ours~~/this is the first attempt, ~~I believe~~, to found a religion upon "Law" - ~~I do not think that t~~/The Christian doctrines would never have founded the Christian religion."

"It is true, there is ~~so~~ much in the Christian religion which has nothing to do with Christ -

43

"The Atonement, the Incarnation, mortification, these ~~He~~ never preached - nor ecclesiastical pomp. nor the whole fabric of the hierarchy- "

" Nothing, in the vagueness of people, strikes ~~me~~/one so much as their raving against the Catholic superstitions & ~~their~~ not seeing that, if the words of Christ ~~are~~/were exactly followed out, the Catholic Orders will result - the ~~selling~~/parting with all they have - the leaving father & mother - all excepting their mortifications - those ~~I allow I cannot find that~~ He never preached."

"The orthodox got hold of a great truth, ~~however~~, when they got hold of the Incarnation - but they confined it to one - they did not extend it to all. They think so much of the Passion of Christ , which He suffered for us, (which was chiefly physical), for a few hours, or at most a week - & they think nothing of the Passion of God for Eternity - which He suffers for our sakes since the world began - Books upon books have been written upon that day's suffering, till the most fanciful schemes have been built upon it, as might be expected, in order to supply materials for thought - ~~Still I cannot think what they can find to think about in those long Meditations which the Catholics make for years, for centuries, upon those few hours.~~ If they would think upon the

plan of God, the sufferings of God from Eternity,
 what materials for thought are there not there!
 what truths might not be discovered! what
 mines are there not to be worked! The Gospel
 of a Perfect God - What a Gospel to be preached!

44

But they go off upon preaching the necessity
 of Baptism - & those doctrines, ~~one would think,~~
 must be very dry - The Evangelicals, too, so often
 complain of their hard hearts, say they cannot
 love God. ~~But~~ ~~I~~/Is it any wonder? How can
 they love the Being whom they imagine? They
 work themselves up by excitement into a kind of
 spasm of interest about Him - but they *must*
 find it dry, & they must find their hearts hard,
 in such a religion."

~~"But what do you mean by God's suffering?"~~

~~"It seems to me to be inconsistent with
 Love & Wisdom to leave the work & the suffering
 to any but itself - therefore I believe that God
 works in us - that the true feeling of God in us,
 which led to the belief of one Incarnation, ought
 to be extended to the Incarnation of God in all
 of us -"~~

~~"But do not you think the R. Catholics
 scheme a very fine one?"~~

"The R. Catholic idea is not nearly so fine
 as God's idea - but it is the *next* fine idea to it -
 If God had not done what He has done, He would
 have done what the Roman Catholics say He has -
 that is, if He had not made truth discoverable
 by the exercise of man's faculties, He would have
 told it to man in one continuous line of communication

f160

~~-110-~~

Lemmon

& revelation, as the R. Catholic Church says He has to her. ~~Still when I see The/It~~ is curious however that the whole cumbrous fabric of contradictions, - contradictions ~~as I think all of them,~~ to Love & Wisdom - ~~and~~/should be

4
5

right & orthodox, when compared ~~it~~ with the simplicity of God's scheme,

~~I wonder that/at which people can do /are "shocked" at this, & think that right & orthodox. — But o/On the doctrine of sin, as held by them/ Church, necessarily follows the Atonement - I mean, — unless you say that 'man sins by God's Law, & his sin (or ignorance) is to be removed by the increasing knowledge of mankind, which is to be gained by the exercise of their own faculties,' - you will say, 'I sin - I cannot help it. I must have an Atonement to save me - Else I am lost.'~~ For your very Theology teaches you that you must never hope to avoid sinning in this world."

"The Roman Catholics say 'we' are so bad & yet He loves us.' & that melts Saint Teresa & Father Gentile into raptures of gratitude & love."

±/We say, 'we are so bad & He is helping us to be good'. He does not love us while we are bad - that is a contradiction . He can love only what is loveable - But His ~~loving~~ Law of Goodness is always working out our good. - "

{the last paragraph has an X through it}

~~'Portia, I do not quite understand what you mean when you say that we cannot love our God.'~~

'What a God that must be who likes to hear it said to Him every day, & said in a 'form' too, that He is good, (when He knows too that we don't believe it, & only say it because we think Him

f161

~~111~~

{first paragraph has an X through it}
~~a 'jealous' God, jealous of His own 'glory) — who likes~~
to hear the praises of His own glory sung, - who likes
to be to us as if there were no one else in the world 46
but Him, as St. Teresa tells us! - To say every
morning to Him the very same words "I love you,
I love you", which would be obnoxious to any
human being, how very absurd it does seem,
~~how very sure one feels that those who can say~~
~~it do not feel it! — I believe {X ends here} Mankind have~~
thought a great deal about doing the will of God.
~~the Methodists have desired to do His will.~~
~~but then I would think~~ /have not thought *what* God is & *what*
His will will be - what He will like - when
I/they try to do it."

"And now people think less, ~~I believe,~~ of
what will be the will of God than of what will
gain the sympathy of men - now, too, in times
where it is so very different what God likes
& what men will sympathize with, - where
indeed what God & man will sympathize with
will hardly ever be the same thing, ~~this is~~
~~rather dangerous."~~

Lemmon

VI

XV

If we knew what vice is, if we could conceive of the depth of its horrors, we should conceive that the pure, the loving God could not, consistently with His nature, with the law whence it should spring, Himself calmly contemplating & administering to others the suffering, which is eventually to bring about the metamorphosis from vice to virtue.

It ~~was~~/is in ~~visiting~~ the dens of vice that ~~I~~/we most earnestly ~~felt~~/feel, 'is this thy work, O Lord?' Yet *all* is Thy work. He Himself took our infirmities.' He wills that divine Love shall make the great attainment - the attainment of ever-increasing good, thro' successive phases of existence, by the exercise of the divine attributes. The perfect Thought, the perfect Feeling of Love shall become more & more legible, as Man learns to read & interpret the Universe, its manifestation. But perfect Thought, perfect Feeling of Love can never be consistent with an eternal Law, calling forth the work & the suffering of others - with an eternal contemplation of this work. Thought, Feeling *will* the eternal work, assure its success, the intention in to the reality . Life & work must be successive. They will occupy the ages which have no end.

And what evidence is there for all this? ~~You will say?~~ 48

That this only is consistent with the revealed character of God.. God, it is said, is "of purer eyes than to behold iniquity." Yet, through His Law, is Man called upon, not only to behold it but - oh the depth of misery, little conceived by those who live, who play on the surface of the world! - to live & be it.

‡/We who have been called upon to walk through varying scenes of life. ~~I have seen/~~to see the pure & the noble. ~~I have seen/~~ to see the debased. ~~And I~~ can tell ~~you~~ that Mankind, in general, little conceive the misery of iniquity, but still less the heaven within a man's nature from which he is in banishment, because his capabilities are not exercised. Mankind must unite to organize life, so as to exercise these capabilities - Meantime, the divine nature "descends into Hell."

Does it, ~~you say/~~it is asked? Oh! does it not? Is this any strange thing to say, for ~~do you doubt/~~does not that capability for Love & Goodness exist dormant in many, when the sign of ~~them/~~it is not to be seen? ‡/We have known natures, showing love & kindness which could scarcely be exceeded in intensity, but life did not exercise these natures aright, & from the Spirit of love proceeded that which was not of it, that which was entirely in opposition to it. Oh! that ~~my voice/~~we could reach the heart, the consciousness of Mankind, that ‡ /we could

arouse them to look at what they are, at what they might be! Eager they are in pursuit, but what are they pursuing? 49

What can we know of the Being we call God, but from the manifestation of His nature, His attributes? - Look for His Thought, His Feeling, His Purpose, in a word, His Spirit, within you, without you, behind you, before you. It is indeed omnipresent. Work your true work, & you will ~~feel~~/find His Presence in yourself - i.e. the presence of those attributes, those qualities, that Spirit, which is all we know of God. If we recognize this Spirit without us in the rule of the Universe - if we recognize this Spirit within us, whenever man is well at work, may we not say "He is in us & we in Him."

We shall find this no vain or fanciful theory. If we seek Him by true work, true life, we shall find Him, (i.e. His attributes, which are all we know of Him,) within us, - limited indeed, as is right, till our life & work shall attain for us higher regions of being, i.e. greater love, greater wisdom, greater power.

Well it is that power is so limited, while love & wisdom are so feeble. Blessed are the limits of humanity, till it has advanced to greater purity & truth! Peculiar power, whether arising from nature or from circumstances, is seldom now a good for the individual or for mankind.

And let this be tested by the realities of life, striving to look at these comprehensively, in relation

to all being & all successions of being . This only can we, in any degree, see as God sees, which is "Truth."

Gran VII XVI 50

"Tomorrow is Sunday" - & what a curious thought it is, ~~Portia,~~ that tomorrow, in all the length & breadth of Christendom, people will put on their best clothes & be in time for Church & think, ~~as you say,~~ that they have performed a duty by going to Church. & hardly any body will feel any feeling whatever there -"

"And what is the cause of its being Sunday tomorrow all over the Christian world? why is Sunday kept?"

"The feeling of a Superior Being; ~~I suppose.~~"

"But why does that make people put on their best clothes?"

"Out of a feeling of respect to Him."

"But this Superior Being appears to be more particular about the fashions than about the Arts - for there is such singing in the Church as you would not suffer for a moment in your drawing=room. ~~you would say if you were invited to hear such singing, 'what music these people have brought me to hear!~~ Such reading aloud there is as you would not allow in your own family - ~~I suppose~~ nowhere is such reading as the clerk's ever heard, except in Church. 'Let us sing ~~for/~~to the honor & glory of God,' & then such ~~singing/~~music follows as is certainly not to the honor & glory of the singers - Then, although the people are dressed in their best, the Church is not - It is generally so uncomfortable, ugly & bare a place that you would not go into it, if it were not the House of God - God's House is much dirtier & shabbier than anybody else's house."

~~"Why, w/~~We think so little about God at all 51
~~I am sure that~~ most people think men much superior
to God. ~~I do not mean that~~ they do not say so, ~~that~~ they do not admit
this to themselves, but ~~that~~ it is really so - God has no
interest in their thoughts. ~~I mean,~~ what He will think
has no interest for them. They attach great weight
to some men's opinions - What the Dean of St. Paul's
or Mr. Gladstone says makes a great impression on
them - They think 'what a clever man that is. what
did he say upon that question? - I shall meet him
tomorrow - will ask him what ~~will~~ he thinks of this?' But God
makes no impression on them - They attach no
weight to His opinion, to what *He* would say."

"How can ~~you~~/we expect any progress to be made?
The Theologians preach to us to despise riches. The
Political Economists preach to us to amass riches -
And nobody ~~but you~~ asks, 'what is well-being?
what does *God* think well-being to be?' If you
were to ask it of any body, they would ~~say~~/think, 'That
is a stupid question - we must mind our own
work & not be theorizing' - And the main question
of all, 'Is well-being riches or poverty? if it is
neither, what is it?' is put aside as a question
which does not concern us - 'do what you have to do
& do not perplex yourself with abstract enquiry,' is
the answer - "

~~"but would not your religion make us happy,
if it were true, Portia?"~~

~~"That~~ The religion, which we preach dictates a
right life. And ~~therefore I don't expect it/it~~ cannot therefore be
expected to produce
well-being or happiness, till there is a right life. ~~±~~/We
am not surprised at not being happy - How can

113a

(a) To say that we wonder our religion does not make
us happy is to say that, if we have a true religion,
we ought to be able to do without food or without
exercise. God intends that our faculties should
all be in right exercise - that we should have
no happiness without this. And our religion is
to teach us to look out ~~for~~/how to do this - not to enable
us to do without it.

we expect it? How can one expect of God that He should wish one to be happy? It is His voice, our unhappiness telling us to make a right life. (a) 52

~~It is indifferent to me, I should like to say to man,~~ whether you believe this religion or not. ~~I believe~~ I/We may appeal to experience to prove that persons of a religious feeling, continuing in the present mode of life, can do nothing else but sin & repent - Unless you make a life, which shall be the manifestation of your religion, it does not much signify what you believe.

Organize then your life to act out your religion. To point out the evils of the family, to say anything against the family, is useless & hurtful. But ~~I believe~~ you will find, in organizing your life, that family is too narrow a basis to build it upon & that Christ was right - that, if you will do His work, you must do as He says - & that it was a proof of His wisdom & His strength, when you take into account the tender nature He was of, as He shews it by His conduct to His mother on the Cross, ~~(from that & so many other instances you cannot doubt the tenderness of his nature) that it was a proof too of His wisdom & His strength when/that He said, 'Who are my mother & my brethren'?~~

To protest against the family is no use at all - will only shock people - you must shew a better life."

(Notes a)

114a

53

Every thing is arranged *contrary* to attraction now - The family, the school, the University, there is no attraction in any of these - It is true that young men do like Cambridge - that boys like Eton - But it is generally in the inverse ratio of the purposes which they are ~~made~~/there for - ~~I mean that s/School & college are not liked for the purposes/~~what they are intended for - for learning & education - they are liked for boating & cricket & such like - It is not the education ~~in them~~ which people like - On the contrary, they are built upon the opposite principle - It is laid down as a principle that boys cannot like their "education" - that they must be coerced - that they must be flogged - For people to follow their attraction is rarely or never thought of - One boy wishes to go to ~~the s/Sea~~ - he must go into the Church, because there is a 'living' in the family . As to the family, the principle laid down is to *bear* with each other. To *repent* of your sins & *bear* with your sufferings is the theory of life. It is never thought of, the changing any organization in order to seek another which shall cause you to commit no more sins, which shall remove the sufferings - We never try to alter the organization of life - Attraction does not come at all into our theory of life.

~~"You are a This is not Fourierism, in everything but his matrimonial schemes."~~

~~"No, I am not. I think t/The Fourierists & the Roman Catholic Orders are alike wanting in~~

a main point. The Roman Catholic Orders have the right *end*, viz. that to work out God's purpose is all we have to do - But they have mistaken the *means* - they think the purpose of God is to be forwarded by our being 'like dead bodies', by our 'preferring the office we dislike most,' by our 'disregarding natural inclinations & friendships especially. The Fourierists have got hold of the right *means*, viz., that we should follow our attractions, that education should be the discovering of these attractions, not the counteraction of them - that we should take the friends we like best, the occupations which our natural inclinations discover us to be fittest for. But they have mistaken the *means* for the *end* - They have no end, no purpose but to follow their attractions. Now, our *end* must be oneness with God in all we do, His purpose must be ours - in life - if we have not *this* 'end', this high aim, the following our vocations becomes mere caprice.

Besides, ~~I think you don't want to~~/We would not destroy the family, but ~~to~~ make it ~~the~~ family larger - ~~You don't~~ 59
~~plan to~~/We would not prevent people from having ~~family~~ the ties of blood, but ~~you wish to~~/we would secure all that the family promises, by enlarging it. The family is for love, sympathy, protection, support, for the opportunity of exercising & enjoying all these - ~~you~~/we wish to secure ~~us~~ sympathizers, protectors, helpers - ~~"But now, if a mother feels a particular attraction~~
 Hurrull " But now, "~~said Portia,~~" if ~~†~~ a mother feels a particular attraction for one of ~~my~~/her children, ~~†~~/she must not allow it - for this would produce distress to all the rest - If one of ~~my~~/the sons has a great feeling for one of his sisters, it will produce nothing but unhappiness & heart=burnings. Whereas, if the family were much larger, if it were God's family, there would be room for indulging all these sympathies - because the others would have sympathies too with others - But now you must not enjoy them - for the others have none to supply to them the want of yours." ~~see~~ a Insert 114a

"Should ~~you~~/we have fasting in ~~your~~ life?"

"We are God's activity - And the principle of fasting, or of eating, ought to be to keep our bodies in such a state that they *shall* be the activity of God."

"Should ~~you~~,/we, like the "Evangelicals", object to balls & society?"

~~"I don't think that they~~/He does not object to balls & society, because it separates ~~them~~/him from God - but because ~~they~~/he conceives it to be in some way dis=

pleasing to God/Him - If ~~they~~/he thought ~~so~~ much about
 being separated from God, ~~they~~/he would object to 55
 the drawing=room equally or to church. For ~~†~~
~~don't believe/am sure~~ that God is often no more in church, ~~more~~ than
 He
 is in a ball=room - we often ~~don't~~ feel His
 presence no more in the one than in the other."

~~"But don't we think of God in the drawing=
 room?"~~

"God has nothing to do with Social Life -
 He has nothing to do with what carriages we
 have, nor with whom we ask to dinner - It would
 be impious to think so - He has nothing to do
 but to punish us in some quite other state
 of being - The flogging of a boy at school is
 reasonable, compared with this - he is flogged
 immediately - there are some faint hopes that
 he may learn his next lesson the better for
 having been flogged. But we are flogged long,
 long afterwards - we don't know whether we
 shall be flogged or not, & we are flogged when
 it can do us no good - for all opportunity of
 amendment, we are expressly told, is past -
 It is not therefore for the purpose of making
 us learn our lesson, for there is no longer any
 lesson to be learnt. No, we do not believe
 that God has any intentions about our Social
 Life."

~~"But surely submitting to God's will is a
 thing practised by us in our social life."~~

"Submitting to God's will" is a phrase ~~which I/we~~ cannot understand. It is as if you looked upon God as something apart, *without*, independent of all principle, to whom you have only to submit - But if, for 'God,' ~~you/we~~ read 'the Spirit of Perfect Love & Wisdom' - how can ~~you/we~~ talk about *submitting* to Perfect Love, directed by Wisdom? ~~you/we~~ accord with it - ~~you/we~~ don't submit - It is often said, 'So=&=so is so good, she submits entirely to God' as a *merit* - In so far as she is good, she is part of the Divine Goodness, accordant with it, willing the same things, omnipotent in as far as she wills the same things - Is it not a mistake to call this submission? It is *oneness* - Christ's will was God's will - the will of Love -

'The happiness of private life,' it is often said, 'consists in giving up our wills mutually'. But, if private life were enlarged, so as to allow more room for the possibility of attraction, there would be those together who would have the same will -

'It is the Divine Will that we should be made perfect by suffering," ~~you say~~ - But, if we could look into the Divine Thought, we should not see there, 'Suffering shall be the instrument of progress to human nature,' or 'so much suffering shall be sent to make them perfect'. but 'human nature shall attain perfection by their own efforts, there *will* be suffering' - not 'suffering is the means to progress' - for *enjoyment* is often the means."

~~"They say that b/~~Butchers become so hardened that it is said to be a bad trade, because it destroys the better feelings. In the same way, Magendie, groping among the entrails of living animals, must have had all his own feelings destroyed - must have been the death of all his own better life - So ~~I think~~ of God. ~~"If He has~~ & if He has not the plan in view for His creation, which reconciles all evil, - the plan of Eternity for each, - of perfect happiness for each, - He does seem ~~to me~~ like a butcher. Think what a spectacle the world is now - what it must be to Him. There He has been, ~~through his life,~~ with His hands in the hearts of ~~my/the/us~~ poor ~~Aunt Cassandra/~~ suffering human beings all through ~~her/our~~ life. If ~~she/we~~ were

not

on ~~her/his/our~~ way to anything, if ~~she/he/we~~ were now simply ~~dead/~~ to die, how hardened ~~He/~~ God must become with it all! It ~~seems to me~~ is doing an immense injustice to the Spirit of Love & Wisdom to think that He will call us here - for what? - to play our parts on a theatre, of which He is sole spectator."

~~"You won't let Him do anything," I could not help chiming in here - though I had been sitting all the time with my newspaper, - {the rest of the paragraph has an X through it}~~

a passive audience to their dispute. "you are like the people in the Litany who say, 'Don't go there - oh! don't do this - oh! don't do that.' So you say, 'He must not do this - he must not do that - 'till you leave Him nothing which He may do."

Umlauff ~~"No,"~~ said Portia, ~~"We don't say of God, 'He must not,'~~
but ~~'I am/we are sure He will not'~~ - it would be

5
7

misunderstanding Him to suppose He would."

~~"But with all this evil in the world,"~~ said I,
~~"which you cannot explain, how can you say what~~
~~He will do & what He will not?"~~

" In speaking of the evil which is in the world,
people say, 'There are signs of there being a good
God. It is very difficult to understand how He
permits all this evil - whether there is a Devil
who causes it? - or whether it is altogether a mystery
which we can't comprehend? 'One of these two things
they say about evil - & then they say, 'man fell, &
since that, it is no use ~~man/his~~ hoping to be good -
he must be bad - it must be sinning & repenting' -
(they even write it down & put it into a ~~form/prayer,~~
which is to last for ever) '& somebody else must
manage the whole matter for us. somebody must
die for us.' - (God must kill His Son to satisfy His
justice -) ~~as the children are sacrificed to Moloch)~~
'& that must save us in the next world -
nothing can save us in this.'

They say this about evil - they don't try
any organization of life which shall enable them
to leave off sinning, enable them to act according
to the purpose of God. If they are to go on
always saying what is written down for them to
say, of course it is no use - They don't say, 'Let
us see whether there are not any of these evils, out of which
it is ~~not~~ in Man's power to help Mankind
~~out of.~~ This has never been tried - not, at least,

after ~~a~~/any type - At first, in the world's history, every body tried to get as much as they could - 58
& there were quarrels about wells & so forth - every body was on the offensive & the defensive - then came Governments - & then a great organization to preach the Atonement & put into form people's confession of their sins, while ~~we~~/they live as ~~we~~/they can. but never any type of living by what it was the purpose of God that our life should be - by any understanding of the nature of God & the nature of man - That is the last thing that comes into people's lives - ~~They are to go on sinning & repenting - & somebody else is to manage the matter for them, - they go on without any view of what the nature of man requires-~~

One would have thought that life was the most important thing of all - that men would have said, in the *first* place, what is the nature of God & what is the nature of man? what is the purpose of God as to the life we should lead? ~~But, if you expect that, you will be very much surprised, for nobody thinks of this.~~

It was not so about the organization of war - But that we must not be surprised at - The physical must come first. In war, every thing is exactly adapted for its end - & the end is carried - for exact obedience is rendered. But, even in politics, the very business, ~~the only business~~ of the opposition is to harass & oppose the ministers, & prevent them carrying their measures - And we call it our "glorious Constitution".

120a

(a) A Theocracy! what a sublime idea the Theocracy of the Jews was! ~~what a great thing it will be when we come~~ to be governed - not by Kings & Presidents, but by God! when Cabinet Ministers will be ~~there, holding Cabinet Councils~~ for the purpose of discovering & carrying out the purposes of God in politics for executing the laws of God - when Lord John Russell will be Premier ~~for/in~~ order to performing the will of God, what a change it will be! Now, ~~I am sure~~, we think God so foolish, though we do not say so, that we believe Him quite inadequate to carrying on the business of a great nation - a nation would fall to pieces if its business were done according to His will & no wonder, - it certainly would, if done according to what we conceive *now* to be His will, to what we are *told* is His purpose - No wonder we exclude Him from our Cabinet & our politics -
& ~~better a~~

~~"I see," said I, "you would do away with all liberty."~~

~~"It seems to me," said she, "that f/For any great end 59~~

there must be perfect obedience - & perfect
obedience rendered knowingly & consciously to an
imperfect leader (not smuggled in, - but freely
rendered as being, on the whole, what is best) -
for the leader must always be imperfect, while
Man is imperfect - (a) Insert 120 a.

(the next seven lines have three vertical lines drawn through them)

~~"Lord, what is man?" - - -~~

~~"Why, man is what God has made him -~~

But, when we make mistakes, we pray, & we beg
God to forgive us, & say it is a mystery, &
think about the Atonement - we do not see
that our mistakes are part of God's plan,
& no mystery at all.

Whether, if there had not been the Church
of England for these people, to make them
satisfied with going to church once a week,
whether they would have thought more about
religion? ~~I do not know -~~ The Anglican Church of
England does not even call itself the Church
of Christ - It calls itself the Church of *England*.

~~"Why, you who are such a great materialist,"
said I, "must trace all these things to the
English material."~~

~~"Perhaps," said she, "then it is the spiritual [then?]
which generates the material, - not vice versa,
as some think, the material, & material only,
which generates the spiritual" & all the
spiritual."~~

“On the subject of the government of one, & the government of a council, experiments have been made through all the history of man with which we are acquainted. But they have been made, generally, without any true view of his nature or of the purpose of his being - How, indeed, can the purpose of his being be comprehended without a true comprehension of the nature of the Will whence Man's being springs? How little - in the various attempts at Government by one, or by council - has any correct or comprehensive view of Man's nature or destination been sought, as a clue to direct such attempts!

60

In the earliest histories which we possess of Man, the many, in order to live at all, or to live without intolerable physical discomfort, appear to have found it necessary to put themselves under the direction of some one, the strongest, or the most able, (in some way) to contend with their common difficulties. But such government had reference to ~~but~~ a very small part only of Man's nature~~s~~ & wants.

Query, is it not a religious Governor, in the true & comprehensive ~~form~~ sense of the word, to which past & present experiments are leading? ~~I mean,~~ Is it not such a religious government which is really in accordance with God's purpose

& Man's nature? And to what *is* in accordance with God's purpose & Man's nature we may be sure that the past & the present are leading - There have been, indeed, various attempts in theory, various attempts in practice at a religious government. There have been essential defects in such theories & such practical experiments from the essential misunderstanding of the purpose of God & the nature of man which has attended them - The Pope, the Roman Catholic Superiors are instances of ~~them~~/such experiments in modern history - and, among Protestants, the King of England, as so-called Head of the Church, Pastor Fliedner, as head of a Protestant Institution - Among these, the Roman Catholic superiors alone, (except Fliedner, who is an individual instance, representing no class) have governed in many instances, though by no means invariably, with a religious intention. Religion, in the sense in which we understand it, has had little to do with the government of the heads of the Roman Catholic Church, or of the Church of England. *Dartnell* Query, may it not be gathered from the study of the purpose of God & the nature of Man that "it is written" that Mankind will form itself into communities, with an elected chief, who will be High Priest, or Physician & Leader in regard to the spiritual, the

intellectual & the physical natures which are under his superintendence - the whole community being educated with a view to the comprehending such truth as is known, & to the seeking unknown truth concerning God & Man - the whole community therefore at mature age capacitated to choose their Leader - the Leader's length of ~~time~~/rule being fixed with a view to make it long enough to give fair trial to his thought, so as to make it experience for Mankind, but not long enough to injure materially through the mistakes to which he will be liable? ~~I do not mean that h~~/He will not himself be the only practical High=priest, intellectual school=master & physician, but the head of those who are such -

62

Religious *life* & work require the healthy state & the devotion of the spiritual, the affectional, the intellectual & the physical nature - Each community of men should modify itself, & choose its chief leader & all subordinate leaders with a view to rendering its life & its work in accordance with the Spirit whence springs life.

~~I~~ would/We should aim at implicit obedience to leadership, together with scope for individual exercise of idiosyncrasy - this ~~I~~ saw is a difficult problem - The Perfect Spirit alone accomplishes it perfectly. His one Law of Truth & Right effects from every living being a perfect obedience - yet each shall attain through it to the free exercise of his idiosyncrasy . To fill up the practical detail of how such implicit obedience to Government & such free exercise of idiosyncrasy are to be attained in human Government is a problem, which the ages must gradually solve. Certain it is that it must be the object of the human as well as the divine Governor in attaining implicit obedience to attain freedom for individual idiosyncrasy. Hitherto, generally speaking, individual obedience checks freedom of idiosyncrasy. But this is a remediable defect in the Governor & the governed, not one existing in the constitution of human nature.

Well may people ridicule or be indignant at the idea of a religious government when religion is so comprehended or so little felt! The

f180b

government of the Jews was called a 64
Theocracy, but what a God was theirs!
Let him not be called a God (or Spirit of good) till we lose our sense of the meaning of words - What a fine idea, still, was that of Moses, viz. of a Theocracy, of God governing by High Priests receiving His oracles! If only they would receive them "through all the powers" "irradiated"-
- so "purge & disperse all mist", so
"tell of things invisible to mortal sight!"

f181

~~-12-~~

Dartnell

III

Try to gain some few who would fervently wish to live as *one with God*. But, if this is ~~my~~/to be our endeavour, ~~I~~/we must strive to know, & to declare to those few, the Being with whom ~~I~~/we seek that we may be one. And, here, we must imitate the best of the Roman Catholic orders. A fervently felt religion must be our bond - And ~~I believe that,~~ like the Roman Catholic orders, those, who unite to seek a life springing from religion, must unite in the reception of the same truth. ~~I~~/We seek not to burn those who praise & worship in God, what they would despise in man. ~~I despise not,~~ ~~I~~ /We sympathize with parts of most religions. ~~I ever heard of-~~ But, if ~~I~~/we unite together with a few, to strive to live a life dictated by the Spirit of God, we must agree as to what that Spirit *is* - If one thinks it right to pray continually for forgiveness of sins, while another feels those sins to have been the cross which man bears for mankind, & that it is truth magnanimously to bear the cross of our past sins, while striving by God's means to emancipate ourselves & others from the burden of that cross - can these two be harmoniously, in life & feeling, one with God? 5

f182

-16-

Jones

I

One great advantage of the Roman Catholic teaching of religion (an advantage, at least, in one sense) is that there is *no discussion*. ~~I believe that I should wish to imitate this.~~ {written large}

~~IV then, I/We should object to illeg/religious instruction in the way of discipline - One is chosen as the teacher - & she or she, is to be listened to - Not that the hearers are to suppress their own doubts. They might perhaps give them in writing to the teacher, & the teacher might give, also in writing, or in her/his address, such answer to them as s/he could. Nor do I mean that it would be objectionable to associate, without exact accordance of opinion - but that the person at the head of the "Society" or Institution should say, "I mean to live, & that/for myself & for any, wishing to associate with me, shall to live, as closely as possible in accordance with my religious belief - Any one who finds my belief that which it does not accord with his or her views of right to live *with*, or *according to*, is entirely at liberty to leave me any day". Unless he has such reason to give, ~~I think~~ no such association should be made for less than a year, because frequent changes would impede the effecting any valuable work of life. My present impression is even to forbid religious discipline in the Society. Private study as much as the work of life permitted - receiving instruction from the teacher - & suggesting, in writing, any difficulties, would be best, ~~I believe~~ - in writing,~~

3-f

1-19

f183

-16-

because that would be a test that consid=
deration had been given to them, that it was
not loose exclamation from emotion, or crude 2 (written large)
thoughts, merely, disturbing both to the pupil
& the teacher. Perhaps, in writing too, if desired,
the society might offer to each other on a
fixed day any of their questions for solution.
in a religion, which each man is to learn
from his God by the capabilities God has given
to mankind, there are, of course, many
considerations to be taken into view, in which
we can have no guidance from the Roman
Catholic Orders.

f184

-17-

II

(8) It will be said that fear of dis=
cussion arises from a want of "Combativeness"
or "Destructiveness", as it is called. ~~I do not~~
~~admit this to be the right name . I suspect~~
~~that d/Destructiveness, self=esteem, hope, love~~ 3 {written large}
of life, &c - all of which intimate a wrong
state, - shew, whenever they appear in a head,
an overflow of some quality. A certain degree
of depression in one portion of the skull makes
manifest that a man cannot estimate himself
sufficiently well - This is called a want of
self=esteem, ~~I believe, truly~~ - i.e. it manifests
a want of *true estimation*. The exact state
of true estimation would not be appropriately
called self=esteem - for ~~directly that~~ if you
think well of your doings, *because* you have
discernible an organ of self=estimation, you

f185

~~-18-~~

think on no true foundation. You may be right, or you may be wrong, when you go on your course fearlessly, because you have an organ of self-esteem. From a deficiency in that portion of the brain, you may be discouraged without reason. It is natural to have called *this* the organ of self-esteem; since it manifests itself clearly then only when that state of the brain would be attended with the effect of thinking well of your work, even without good reason, (unless modified by some other portion of the brain.) Perhaps all that we can say is, a certain appearance of the skull exists with a character which appreciates itself too highly, a certain other state appreciates too low (unless modified by other organs) There is a state which, if not impeded by other portions of the organization, is accompanied by a character which thinks *truly* of itself & its work.

4 {written large}

f186

~~-13-~~

9

~~which God loves & man recognizes not, is not here a manifest imperfection in man? Yet~~ ~~†/The religious order/"Society" must limit (but not without intense consideration) the social relations of its members.~~

Looking to any probable means of efficiently introducing new views of religion to be the spring & foundation of the mode of human life - *some=thing*, after the manner of Roman Catholic orders, appears ~~to me~~ the most feasible means - ~~†/perhaps would say, the only means - as far as I can discover.~~

Lemmon

VII

Machinery, which is, at present, mainly the assistance to effecting material wishes, will become a grand & noble means to ~~this~~ a truer connection of Mankind. 13

While it is impossible, at present, for individuals to effect such a connection - a more limited & modified connection, that of ~~another~~/society, may be possible -

Imagination may strive to picture what, even with our power of comprehending the nature of Wisdom & Love, we may prophesy, will one day be. Isaiah, prophesying that there will be peace, says that "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb" - A much higher peace than this will be - It would not be accordant with Wisdom that the wolf should so alter his nature - he will cease to exist, as unfitted for that state of progress - Mankind, with the various characteristics which, in accordance with God's Law, are impressed by climate, by races, rightly blended, will join in one common purpose, or aim, at one common purpose with God

We may well see, then, that ~~an Order~~/ a "Society" must be very limited in its capabilities - But a little leaven, is it not said? should leaven the whole lump - And to begin, in small, that which ought to be universal may be the dawn of the Sun of Righteousness -

We find individuals eagerly pursuing one

subject or work, disgusted with another - ~~±~~
~~believe, that t/~~To the well-born & well-developed, no
subject, proper for man's interest, would be 14
without interest to each. Nay, man must always
be wanting in divine comprehensiveness, in pro=
portion to ~~the portion/~~the part of the Divine thought, of
which he has no knowledge or feeling. It is
certain, however, that, in a ~~religious order/~~"Society", the
subjects of study & the objects of work must be
greatly limited. And a wise limitation must be
most carefully sought, Limitations of social
relations, limitations of liberty to follow idiosyn=
cratic tendencies, limitation of study, limitations
of employment must be most carefully consid=
dered. Perpetual mistakes are made, on the
one hand, by not seeking a general principle -
on the other, by not, wisely, modifying it - Never
remain ignorant of a principle, because it can=
not be acted out, because "the hour & the man"
require its modification - It is a principle
(if, by *principle*, we mean an universal truth,
~~one~~ which may be asserted without limitation)
that knowledge, of each separate kind, is capable
of advancing man to comprehensionness of, and
oneness with the Perfect One - that ignorance
of any one subject increases the separation of
the Imperfect from the Perfect. Yet it is very
certain that ~~the/~~any religious "Society" of today must
systematically limit the studies & employments
of its members. ~~While that which exist (±~~
~~mean, (in mankind & among human characters)~~

f189

IX

The idea, prevalent in all ages, of a priest hood directs one's thoughts to the subject, which requires immense thought & practical experiment, how far the many are to be ruled by the few - Past experiment has been mainly founded upon selfish views. We ~~wish~~ would wish, now, to experimentalize with religious & benevolent views. All should be fitted to choose their chiefs, but chiefs, ~~I believe~~, there should probably be, with undisputed authority in various domains - those who obey being at liberty to change their chosen chiefs, not arbitrarily at any time, but at intervals which should allow a fair opportunity to the chosen chief to effect what he has undertaken.

X *Farriday*

~~of~~ Let the Almighty's ~~His~~ thought, His purpose be our daily study, so that ours may accord with it. Instead of ever=reiterated prayers for what will be, if it is right, will not be if it would be wrong, whether man prays or not - instead of reiterated confessions of errors & regrets for errors, from committing which again we take no means to prevent ourselves - let us take to a daily study of God's holy nature & will, to a daily devoting of ourselves to execute the work, which He has given us natures capable of executing. Fellow=workers let us be in One Spirit under One Head, the truthful, the righteous, the wise, the benevolent Spirit of the Universe. He speaketh not to us indeed by words which reach the ear, by writings which reach the eye - His scripture is the past, the present, the future of the Universe, addressed to natures to whom He has given to partake of His own divine qualities. We too can live, we may learn not to love wisely.

17

~~Oh~~ Wisdom! Of secondary Deities ~~thou~~ ~~art~~ the highest! But ~~thy~~/whose existence essentially depends on there being one above, ~~thee~~, i.e. Love - for ~~thy~~/its essence is the pursuit of right means for a right end.

f191

Wheeler

IX VII — 65

~~-121-~~

~~"It seems to me that g/~~Great men who have left behind them discoveries, which have benefited the world, might have prophesied that they would be "rejected" & "despised" - & not have died of disappointment. They would not be disappointed, because they would know it must be so - While the majority of mankind is ignorant, they must misunderstand, & they must persecute that which is beyond their understanding - Let not ~~the~~ great men bring forward that which must be rejected by *all* mankind, because that would be unwise - that would be retarding truth - But let them consider, when they have made a discovery, 'will this bring me honor & appreciation from the world?' In some cases, it will. The Duke of Wellington, Turner, Dickens, Mrs. Stowe, how they are appreciated! If ~~the~~ great men find that they may perhaps make a few disciples, but that they will be 'despised & rejected' by the rest of mankind, let them prepare themselves for it, if they choose to prosecute their undertaking, & not die of disappointment, when it comes - If I could leave behind me that which should benefit the whole world, how little could I die of disappointment! I would say to myself, when the rejection came, This is what I expected, & I would not die but live."

“Experience & moral proof must go together - When David said that he had never seen the “righteous begging their bread”, he went by moral proof - he thought that it ought to be so, & that therefore it was so. The world was not yet old enough - He had not experience enough to see that it was not so - And a juster view of God’s character would also have shewn him that it was not likely to be so - But it is quite natural that, in the early ages, it should have been thought that it was not likely that God should suffer “the righteous” to want for bread.

Again, ‘did this man sin or his parents?’ implying a belief that this man was likely to be sick, because he or his parents had been wicked. This again is moral evidence - They thought it would be so - And, here again, there is a defect, both of moral evidence & of experience - ~~I mean that I~~/It would neither be wise & good, if it were so, - nor is it so - Not but that ill=health *is* very often the consequence of sin, either in a man or in his progenitors, - but it is also the consequence of ignorance of the Physical Laws, as well as of the Moral Laws - It is not a visitation for the infraction of a moral law - It is the consequence of a Physical Law, which physical law may indeed have been brought into action by moral guilt -

The 'ought to be' would tell us what 'will be,' did we always know it perfectly - would reveal to us the whole future - But our knowledge of the character of God must, as yet, be too limited to enable us, without experience, to say what *ought* to be.

67

Faraday The early belief in miracles is right and natural. If a man had observed, more than once, that the seeing three black crows preceded a death, it would be an exercise of right reason for him to conclude that it was always so, that it was a law - & nothing but experience could undeceive him - In ~~this~~/many cases, moral evidence could do nothing for him. For there is nothing in itself more improbable, more miraculous in supposing that, when a man reached a certain pitch of moral goodness, he is able to cure sick men than that the marriage of two people should precede the birth of a human being - It does indeed seem ~~more~~ discordant with the nature of God that the ~~truth~~/touch of a ~~thing~~/King should be able to cure ~~the~~ Erysipelas - Because, what is a King? When the belief in the 'divinity', which 'doth hedge a king,' had/s gone off, we see that he is neither wiser nor better than other men. And moral evidence is therefore against the fable of the King's Evil. But ~~I see~~ nothing but experience ~~which~~ could teach us that some miracles are miracles & not laws, & therefore are *not* - & that other miracles are *laws*. For the generation of a human being

124a

(a) But how much finer is moral evidence than any other! If we can predict what a person will say & do, if we can be sure of what he must have said & done, how much better it is than any letter he may write, about which there may be always quarrelling and mistake - especially such a letter as God is said to have written!

f194

~~-125-~~

would appear a miracle, were it not a law - that is, had it happened but once instead of happening always, whenever certain circumstances precede or co-exist - (a) Insert 124a

68

XI *

~~The last letter I can find of Portia's to my poor Columba is this - It is dated March 28th 1853.~~

~~"You may be sure that t/~~The question of the **[end 8:126]** possibility of a person joining ~~the Roman~~/or remaining in a Catholic Church, without believing in her authority to dictate belief, is ~~one which has~~/very important ~~often occupied me, without my venturing however to proceed further than to query~~ It appears ~~to me~~ that the R. C. Church stands on a different ground from any other in this respect. She claims openly & decidedly to dictate belief, & would not, ~~± suppose,~~ knowingly accept a convert, excepting on the convert's acceptance that she had a right to do so -

What is it to belong to the Church of England? At some places, If you go once on Sunday to church, at others, if you take the Sacrament, you are admitted to her privileges which, to a woman, seem to amount to the not being objected to on account of religion in conventional society - to a man, of not being ineligible to certain employments. ~~I have never felt any~~/No scruple need be felt about thus occasionally appearing to

f195

~~-136-~~

belong to the Church of England, - ~~b/But I should~~
~~think that~~ it wanted a great deal more
consideration ~~whether I could profess myself/~~to remain or to become
a member of a Church who would give me 69
& all to understand, - not merely in a form
of words but in her life & organization, - that,
if I *become* a member of that Church, I am
supposed by ~~the Church/~~her & by mankind to
receive my belief from that Church.

Though this, in fact, applies both to
converts & to those born in the Church - in
feeling ~~I think that~~ it applies ~~most/~~more to the
former. {the rest of the page has an X through it+

~~There appears to me a doubt in theory~~ [8:126]
& in practice - a fear ~~of~~ whether I should not be losing weight in
bringing forward other opinions thro' having
been believed to have adopted those of the
Roman Catholic Church, even if afterwards
leaving her -

These, as I have said, are but queries.
I shall believe in your inward truth, what=
ever course you take, Columba."
It was too late -

On Lady Day my poor Columba had
already joined the Roman Catholic Church. [end 8:126]

f197

Sermons
IV

Add 45839, ff198-232, microfilm

f198 {in another hand: *Hurrruple?*}

~~Sermon IV~~

~~"Lord, I believe, Help thou my(illeg)unbelief."~~

~~Mark IX-24.~~

What is the ground=work of ~~my~~ belief? - ~~I think it is this.~~

~~But first, I would say, I am aware that m/Many would/will exclaim, "you think," as if a religious belief were nothing, unless it were undoubting. To doubt is by many sincere religionists considered to sin. And, if indeed God had taken means to declare to us His nature & His purpose, so that only by wilful blindness we could doubt, to doubt would be to sin. That this is not the case is evident from the variety of opinions, among those who have sincerely entertained their belief, in proof/evidence And I believe that,~~ in this most important subject, this subject which is at the foundation of every other, which is of a nature to influence every part of our being, of our life, of our work, we are to work out the truth for ourselves & for each other - ~~Oh!~~ If we were united in this search, if we would try to live & to be, so as to come to the search in a pure elevated spirit, what truth might dawn upon our hearts & our minds to bless us all!

~~I think, then, that t/~~The ground=work of belief then is this - What such capabilities as ~~±/we~~ have of heart & mind, with such glimpses of knowledge as ~~±/we~~ have gathered, looking forth upon the Universe & all that it manifests -

physical, intellectual, spiritual - ¶/we discern indications of benevolence, of a benevolent spirit, not in man, not in any of the material beings which surround me/us. The more we learn of the various sciences which embody the laws of the universe & the more we understand their mutual relations, tending to man's well-being - the more our affectional nature & our intellect trace a thought, a feeling, a purpose for well-being, for comfort, for enjoyment in various modes of being. ~~I see not how t/~~This cannot be denied.

At the same time, it is certain that, while we perceive that there are arrangements by which, in a healthy state of body, there is comfort - there is liability to derangement, which causes suffering. And so throughout.

The Laws which exist, if kept in a certain manner by all Mankind, would, ~~it would appear,~~ secure well-being, enjoyment - But it is an impossibility that all mankind should so keep them.

What, then, shall we say when we look for consistency in the character, the purpose of the Ruling Spirit? - Great power, great benevolence, great adaptation of means to the end of benevolence we trace - & the more we learn, the more we trace. But we find that the inevitable ignorance of mankind stands between mankind him & the enjoyment he is capable of, besides frequently causing intense suffering. May we not interpret in this way/thus? - Experience shews us that mankind are capable of making

perpetual advances from ignorance to knowledge, are capable of learning how to keep law aright (i.e. so as to effect human well-being.) Sometimes, even before they are conscious of the law, they have learnt practically how to keep it aright. ~~practically~~ May we not interpret, then, God's thought to be this, viz. that mankind shall learn this law & how to keep it - that the suffering & impediment to the enjoyment for which humanity has capability arises from ignorance removable by Humanity's efforts? One of the lessons of experience is that we cannot afford real help or benefit to others in any way, except by ~~wh~~/that which brings into activity some part of their being, or prepares for its activity. Is not this a hint to us, that it may be consistent with a perfect Benevolence & Wisdom to benefit us by calling our natures into activity? The cry of suffering man will be, sooner or later, man's benediction. The blissful spirit will also bless, for it will excite man to communicate, to lead on others to enjoy a being like its own - ~~On this ground=work of observation.~~

On this ground=work of observation, reflection, & experience, do ~~I strengthen my~~/we found our belief that God is good.

But,- granting that for many individuals it is by experience proved well that they *attain* goodness & knowledge - still ~~I~~/we seek for consistency, with regard to those who have suffered much, enjoyed little, ~~of~~/to whom it cannot be said that existence is a boon.

Consistency of purpose & of practice cannot

be found but in the belief of a continued existence, in the course of which all being, capable of improvement & well-being, shall attain it. Is it unreasonable to argue *from what we know* of a character & purpose to *what we do not know*? - Do we not, thus, infer a future with regard to human character? - The argument which we have *for* a continued existence, is it not "positive"? - ~~t~~/This argument being, the expectation that the Spirit of the future will be consistent with the Spirit of the Past & Present. The argument *against* a continued existence, what is it? - that to our physical nature there is no evidence of it. N.P. ~~My~~/Our religious creed, ~~I believe~~, consists in this - belief in an omnipotent eternal Spirit of Love, Wisdom, Righteousness manifesting itself by calling into existence, by definite laws, beings capable of the happiness of Love, Wisdom, Righteousness, - capable of advancing themselves & each other in divine nature - living in an Universe in which, by definite law, the means & inducements are afforded which insure their advance thro' their own activity to Humanity's blessedness - Observation, reflection, experience are that which furnishes the evidence - ~~I~~/We cling to the idea of continued existence, not ~~(if I know myself)~~ from any personal anxiety for existence, which, ~~I believe~~, without the idea of continuity of existence to human beings, ~~I can see~~

there is no consistency between one part of Providence's ways & another - whereas, supposing continuity of existence, with the same purpose of educating divine capability into divine being, a purpose arises to view which turns all suffering into part of a wise & benevolent course to unite man with mankind, mankind with God.

Can we deny this, that every human being born into the world with the ordinary human faculties, has capabilities for a divine nature?- not this our experience? - Where sin & selfishness prevail, can we not trace the maltreatment of the nature whence they have sprung?

Let us strive to look into the object of human existence - let us not be intent alone on an individual temporary object - We shall best pursue each individual temporary object by seeing its relations to all existence, to eternity - To educate human capability into divine nature by the exercise of its own powers is the object of divine Law. There is one invariable Law with regard to each different mode of existence - there is one right way of keeping that Law in each particular instance - To know the law, to know how to keep it aright, to attain the will to keep it aright - this is the object of human life.

Fear not, ye who would sincerely & earnestly devote yourselves to this object - There is around you a Spirit guarding you from all permanent evil, even in your mistakes - Even these mistakes shall be turned to good for you & for all.

{in another hand: Wheeler 7}

It is a part of His righteous & benevolent purpose that ~~you~~/we discover for yourselves His will & His way, & how to incline your hearts to keep them. Mistakes ~~you~~/we must make in your endeavours to fulfil this purpose - He knows your ignorance - In righteousness & love & wisdom He has left ~~you~~/us ignorant - ~~You~~/We may trust Him that all your mistakes even are turned to good. ~~You~~/We may always look to the past & say with confidence, "had the past been different, it had been less well for all" - It is a sort of impiety to the Great Spirit, a want of accordance with His will & way to lament over your mistakes, since they arise from the nature & the circumstances which He has appointed. Let us not ~~S~~/shrink ~~not~~ from being conscious of them, in order that ~~you~~/we may learn experience, but let us trust all to Him who will turn them to good. Let us ~~H~~look onward to your next step - If ~~you~~/we are in spirit set to be & to do your best in the present & future, ~~you~~/we need not fear that ~~you will~~/we shall become indifferent, because ~~you~~/we do not goad yourselves/ourselves by dwelling on past mistakes. There are much truer & higher incentives to a right present than dwelling on any thing wrong in the past. Let us ~~T~~try that the spirit of your feelings to others be the same as to *their* mistakes -let us especially look upon them all as temporary. Let us ~~E~~ndeavour that your spirit to them be in relation with the best ~~you~~/we know of their characters - for

{in another hand: 8}

this is the permanent in them, this is the divine, which, sooner or later, will strengthen & develop while the rest is temporary & will die away - A consciousness that anything wrong, ~~in them,~~ or deficient, is, in them, an inevitable evil, that it must be to them suffering or privation, - an endeavour to set your temper & feelings in relation with what is best in them, let this be your frame of mind with regard to all whom you/we associate with - If ~~you condemn/we them,~~ or feel otherwise to them, if you/we condemn them, - you/we cannot, indeed, consistently comfort yourself,/ourselves, find peace yourself,/ourselves in your mistakes by views which must be universally applied to have any truth or help in them.

Oh the sharpness of the pang of consciousness of one's own mistake! the heaviness of the cloud under which we begin the day which breaks upon us with the feeling that a good has been lost, a lasting evil entailed by a mistake non irremediable!

There is nothing for the pang, the sun may break through the cloud, if you/we will open your hearts to the truths which are always in existence, always within the capability of man's understanding - The will of perfect benevolence, of perfect wisdom - ? how can one conceive it, consistently, to manifest itself, except in the Law, which secures to eternal natures that which is well-being in the view of perfect Wisdom,

{in another hand: 9}

perfect Righteousness - yet secures it by the work, the life, the exercise of each individual for his own individuality, & of each for all? The operation of such Law is to be traced through all existence.

Fear not, all is safe; our mistakes lead us through a winding=road to the blessedness for all being, which could not otherwise be, without supposing contradictions to that divine nature, in ~~w~~Whom may rest our trust & our peace.

When we are conscious of past mistake, whether it arose from ignorance of the right, or whether, ~~had we~~ we had knowledge which might have directed us, but had not will, let us set ourselves at once with all vigour to the life, the work of the present - Let us look upon the past as, not almost but, altogether springing from the righteous law of God. Let us accept the suffering of our mistake, accept our present work. Let trust in the redeeming power of God's Law invigorate us - Let us not spare ourselves the full consciousness of our mistake, let us look at our error as far as it may help us to truth - Let us strengthen our consciousness that there is no good but in the true & the right. Let us work on, even through our own faults & mistakes, with a noble striving for accordance with God's universal work.

Away with regrets, which have no true foundation, - empty your heart of them! Work out the page of today with good will, even

{in another hand: 10}

though the mistake of yesterday may have complicated it. That very mistake shall lead to a brighter page than could have been but that God, while his everlasting law of right secures us ~~you~~ from all lasting evil, & assures ~~you~~/us of all lasting good - gives to ~~you~~/us to work the divine out of the human, to transmute ignorance into knowledge & feeling of truth -

{in another hand: Lemmon}

But shall we have motive to avoid error, if we cease to suffer the pangs of regret & remorse?

There is a higher, better, truer help than those pangs - you will never rise high, goaded by them. Strive to awaken the divine spirit of love in yourself, to awaken it in doing your present work, whatever may have been your past mistakes - this will help you far better than dwelling on your own mistakes - There is nothing elevating or animating in the dissection of *them*. Essentially, in their own nature, they bring suffering or privation. Bear it in a true spirit & work on - Turn your mistakes to as much account as you can for the gaining of experience, - but, above all, work on - yield not to paralysing, depressing retrospection - God gives us the noble privilege of working out His work - He does not work for us - He gives us the means to find the way we should go - An eternal course is before us.

Better indeed to suffer the pangs of regret than to be indifferent - but, in proportion as we are conscious that we are throwing our earnestness into the present, we may dismiss regret for past mistakes. In proportion as we are striving for the path of righteousness, we may cease to look

back on our false steps, except for experience to avoid them in future - And, even for that purpose, we must be careful not to weaken ourselves by feelings of despondence & depression & regret, when {in another hand: 11}

intending only to learn experience - Much of the power for work will depend on the mood, in which we work. We must consult nature & experience as to how best ~~to~~/we can animate & elevate the spirit in which we live - We shall seldom find the Spirit for doing our best in the present by dissecting our past mistakes.

When we talk of the great realities of the Universe, high wishes rise within us, we would strive to make our life divine. But, when we enter the petty details & purposes of our life, that Divine spirit is aggrieved & sinks within us -

~~I would that, t/~~To begin with, some few ~~would~~/must unite in endeavouring to make life & work one with the Divine thought & purpose - & ~~that~~, by degrees, Humanity ~~might~~/may become the working out of God's thought, which is its destination - At present, it is indeed difficult to carry a true spirit into the details of life, such as life is. But we must strive to modify our life, as best we may, so as to keep alive the Spirit of God within us.

~~Oh!~~ Father, ~~I~~/we yearn for Truth, Goodness, Wisdom! Oh for a Guide! how earnestly ~~do~~~~I~~/we desire the right path, yet scarcely a step can ~~I~~/we take in which ~~I~~/we do not afterwards perceive some mistake -

But patience! ~~I~~/We trust in the Spirit of the Universe. ~~I~~/We listen to the tale which Eternity

is telling. †/We strive to interpret it aright.

†/We find that Truth, Goodness & Wisdom are regulating the Universe aright *with relation to Eternity*. †/We find that there is neither

{in another hand: 12}

right nor truth in the feeling of reproach to ~~myself~~ or/ourselves nor to others - ~~I find~~ that such feeling becomes a very rebellion against the divine thought, when ~~I find~~/we gain any comprehension of it.

But ~~am I~~/are we to feel nothing at the folly, the darkness, which ~~I am~~/we are conscious of in ~~myself~~,/ourselves, - the worse than folly & darkness which the history of man, past & present, brings before ~~me~~/us? if so, whence will spring the motive to try for better things?

If we attain ~~truly~~ to estimating truly light & darkness, - wisdom & folly, - good & evil, - ~~no~~/the spur will not be wanting because we do not blame those who, through the laws of the Omnipotent, are undergoing the privations, the sufferings of the race who, in darkness, must work for light. If we attain to a consciousness of what Happiness is, ~~a consciousness of~~ how far from it are all who are not in harmony with God's law for human welfare - ~~of~~ how inevitable has been the past - ~~of~~ what are the possibilities of the future - we shall waste ourselves in no regrets or reproaches, ~~we shall~~/each will try to make ~~our selves~~/himself one of God's *missionaries* to turn darkness into light, folly into wisdom, selfishness into love. What philosopher's stone that was ever dreamt of could be compared to such a

discovery,- yet this is within human grasp!

Truth, - truth! ~~rest not~~/let us not rest satisfied without, at least, striving ~~for a consciousness of/to~~ know when we are, in our thought & our feeling, aliens to it, or dead {in another hand: 13}

to the force & depth. We may not be able, at once, to help feelings most untrue towards those among whom we live. It may be impossible to us to bring home to ourselves a consciousness that, through God's Law, we & they are still in ignorance & imperfection - to estimate ~~to what~~ the degree of distance to which this ~~divides~~/throws us from divine harmony & joy - But let us not pass on without the acknowledgment of our reason to such truth as it can assent to, - & let us be ever striving that our feeling & our life shall become accordant with that to which our reason has assented. When ~~±~~/we say, let us not reproach ourselves & others, ~~oh!~~ how far ~~am I~~/is this from saying, let us keep ourselves unconscious of our & their wrongs against the divine nature! Let us be more & more & more conscious of all that *is* wrong, of the right which is in human possibility. Let us be more & more conscious of the privations consequent upon such wrong, of the blessed possibilities of man through human attainment. As we live through the day, let us ask ourselves, "is this truth of spirit?" - endeavouring with a divine ken to watch our human nature, to watch it, not for self=reproach, but ~~for~~/as a spring to divinise humanity - to ~~W~~/watch that ~~your~~ consciousness of what is wrong in others, - while becoming more & more clear & true, - may become more & more accompanied with the consciousness that, *in that wrong*, we behold the effect of the Law of Right, that, *by that wrong*, they, in whom it exists,

are inevitably separated from divine peace & joy.

{in another hand: Danall? 14}

But how can I dare to look forward? To look back upon my life is to look back upon a tissue of mistakes. ~~I come to my~~ Father, thy poor child comes to Thee penetrated

with

the feeling of ~~my~~/its ignorance -

"Fear not". This ignorance points to one of the main elements of the Divine thought & purpose - In looking truly at human ignorance, I read His mind. Had He guided my course with a cloud by day & a pillar of fire by night, the problem of existence (in the true solution of which, by the exercise of human capability, lies human well-being) could not have been solved aright. Yet am I never left alone in the struggle of ignorance - I am always in presence of the Father, whose Law is security that His problem will be solved.

But what is the problem of life? - Is it not how to change imperfect knowledge into comprehension of truth, how to change imperfect nature, (or mode of being), into that which is perfect, & how to live & act the truth which is thought & felt?

And what assistance does God give in this work which He commits to man?

He assists in two ways - He give Himself & His laws- in consequence of which the end is sure to be attained - He "Himself took our infirmities," - It is the belief common to all professing Christians (except one very small sect, to whom the rest frequently deny the name), that Christ, - even when on the Cross, & feeling Himself "forsaken" of the Father, - partook His nature & Spirit which were incarnate in Him. And yet,

f211

-14-

does it strike us as essentially contrary to truth,
if we say that we believe the nature of God to be
incarnate in *all* men, as it was in Christ?
{in another hand: 15}

But is not this a fanciful notion, grounded
on no more evidence than what we have heard
at church as to what God feels & will do - as to
what the Devil is doing - the only source of such
belief being that the Revd Mr. A., who is preaching, thinks
such feeling & conduct accordant with *his* concep=
tion of the character of God & the Devil?

There is, we agree, the same *kind* of
foundation for our belief & that which the Revd Mr. A.
holds - Each believes in accordance with his
conception of the character of God -

And how ~~am I~~/are we to know which belief is
true? - By the same means by which all truth
is to be attained - by taking the means which exist,
if human capability is exercised aright, to attain
a true conception of the character of God. The
foundation for ~~my~~/our belief that the divine nature
is incarnate in, or exists connected with human
nature, is that, to *disbelieve* this ~~would~~ appears
~~to me~~ essentially contradictory to what ~~I have~~ we
acknowledged as truth. ~~My b~~/Belief ~~of~~/in the divine
presence in man is an inference from ~~my~~ belief
in the omnipotence, benevolence & wisdom of God.

What would be *essentially* the will of omnipotent benevolence? (by
"essentially"
meaning that which does not imply contradiction
to omnipotence or benevolence - ~~what would be~~
~~essentially~~

Undoubtedly Happiness, - well=being, -
welfare to other being -

And what is happiness, what is well=

being, welfare?

Let us look into the natures we have known in life or on record, let us look into our own individual experience, to answer this {in another hand: 16} question.

Looking into experience, does it not accord with our consciousness that a harmonious exercise of the various powers within us for the purpose of constituting & in the way which will constitute the general well-being is our greatest happiness? - ~~(though intermingled with interests of individual contemplation.~~

If we can attain a comprehension of well-being in the abstract, this will help us to a conception of the nature of God's existence -

But may we not be in dangerous error in forming our conception of the nature of God's existence by that which appears to man to be well-being?

If each man, in his present state, imagined the satisfaction of his present inclination to be the mode of God's existence, these would be "vain imaginations-" Such imaginations have had much part in human conceptions of the super-human power which is recognised. Vengeance & a mistaken idea of justice have been attributed to God - & He has been, & is, represented as pursuing a course which would constitute Him a Spirit of Evil, not of Good -

But we are not to look alone at human inclinations, to assist us in conceiving the satisfactions of the Power above us - We are to endeavour to read the "how" & the "why" of the Universe.

We shall then trace the "why" to be the satisfaction of the *highest illeg/satisfactions* of which Humanity is capable. ~~the satisfaction of enjoyment in/of~~ the well-being of others -
{in another hand: 17}

Then come inquiries into that which *constitutes* well-being, in order to help us to conceive the mode of existence of the Being, who is always pursuing it-

Our experience represents well-being to be essentially progressive - Much has been said in prose & in verse of the dissatisfied nature of man - how he never is satisfied with an object attained, but must have ever more & more. But an eternal *development* is essential to good in the abstract, to divine as well as to human good.

It is obvious that, through the whole range of being in its various modes, every present differs from every past, & it will become obvious to the wise interpreter of existence, (of its *how* & of its *why*,) that this ceaseless difference is all development, is all a rendering into successive being of the eternal, unchangeable Thought, Feeling, Purpose of the ONE Supreme -

But since unceasing change of present from past is essential to our well-being, how shall we conceive of the Being who consists in One eternal, unchanging Thought & Feeling?

The more we improve, the more will our thought & feeling become one & unchangeable - The variety consists in rendering this Thought and feeling into other existence than that from which they spring.

{in another hand: Maye 18}

The Perfect thought, the Perfect feeling lead to their own manifestation - God's Thought & Feeling is the Father, - its manifestation is the Son -

For the Son, the Father ensures that which our experience may enable us to say constitutes well-being - individual exercise, communicating & receiving - attainment carried on under a law which ensures success - Whoever can so far read the Will of God as to attain a present well-being, & an assurance of the Law which is securing well-being to all that is, ~~is~~/has arrived at an Oneness with God -

But is there not a selfishness in that search after a present well-being?

No, because, by the benevolent & wise constitution of all that is, individual well-being promotes general well-being,. When we are selfish in pursuing our own well-being, it is because we do not understand in what it consists - *Ourself* is our own instrument for pursuing God's work. If we let ~~deteriorate~~ that instrument ~~illeg/deteriorate~~, ~~deteriorate~~ its work deteriorates.

But, when we say that the Perfect Nature, by His own will, exists limited as the Son, has not the perfect ~~deteriorated~~/caused thus His own nature to deteriorate?

Is that a perfect Being, which has existed *only* as Thought & Feeling? Do we recognise it as such according to our experience, ~~our~~ & consciousness? The Perfect One does not cause Himself to deteriorate - He renders Thought & Feeling into other being - Hence perfect Being -

IF there exists an Omnipotent Spirit of Benevolence,
& there does not exist absolute=well=being for the
capability/ies ~~to enjoy it~~ which he has called forth to enjoy it,
{in another hand: 19}

there must exist *provision* for it. It is not,
essentially, a contradiction to the existence of a
perfectly wise & omnipotent benevolence that, in
the Past & Present, evil & suffering have
existed, & do exist. For it may be a contradiction,
an absurdity, to talk of the greatest possible
happiness, as existing ever in the present for all
existence throughout Eternity. We recognise
God as the Spirit of *what is*. We have to interpret
the purport, the spirit of what is in Eternity -
We look not for a Will that what *is* shall, ~~illeg~~/at
the same time, not be - That would not be the
Will of the Spirit of Truth -

Without a contradiction, without supposing
that to be which is not - the greatest ~~possible~~
happiness which is in possibility will not be always in existence, ~~but~~
but the *provision* for it
will always be in existence, if an omnipotent
Benevolence exists. And any *true* interpreter of
the past & present will, ~~I believe~~, discover
the provision for the greatest truest well=being
for all that is-

~~We have agreed that a/A~~ harmonious *exercise*
of the various powers within us for the purpose
of constituting (& in the way which will
constitute) the general well=being is our greatest
happiness - intermingled it must be with
intervals of individual contemplation - But
by our experience, we come to the conclusion

that contemplation *alone* will not be the satisfaction of any wise & good Being.
{in another hand: 20}

But how may \mp /we venture to speculate upon the satisfactions of a Being of a nature differing from Man?

All that it is possible ~~to~~/for us to trace of a superhuman Spirit is not different, but the same as what is best in Humanity, differing only in degree, & in absence of the ignorance & imperfection essential to Humanity. Suppose a man able to give laws to a community ~~which~~ such as would ensure its well-being, - would you think it satisfactory to that man to spend the rest of his existence in contemplating that community - even though, if he interfered with the effect of his own law, he might do mischief? It is always a proof of imperfection when particular interference or modification of details is required - As human laws for communities or for individuals improve, they will require the less interference or modification - Life is now full of uncertainty. We cannot calculate our circumstances, we cannot calculate upon their effect on ourselves, upon their effect on others - The human ruler cannot say beyond a certain very limited point - "such circumstances shall arise - you shall be & do thus." But the degree in which man, as ruler, will be able to say this, will increase with the improvement of mankind.

The glance of God sees through all the being which His Law calls forth into existence in the eternal succession of present to past.

From experience, ~~then~~, it may be gathered that Perfect wisdom wills a perfect law for all being - from experience that *that* is the best rule for all being - Does it, then, only remain to the {in another hand: 21} perfect Ruler of the Universe to contemplate the Law which is His will - to pass Eternity in that contemplation?

From human experience we may gather that such contemplative existence would not be satisfaction to the best attributes of Humanity, still less to those attributes existing without Humanity's limits. What, then, is the nature of the divine satisfaction, if, ~~consequent~~/consistently with His nature - it is neither to contemplate the working of His law, nor to take part in the work which, for the good of others, He leaves to others uninterfered with?

Will it be considered contradiction to His nature, if we say that we believe Him to *incarnate Himself* in all men?

All that we can estimate of God is Love & Wisdom. These qualities, or attributes, we know by experience - These attributes we may recognise in the Law which regulates all being. The more we attain to comprehending & ~~to~~ feeling the nature of this Law, the greater we find *that* Love & Wisdom to be - We can also discern that it is Love & Wisdom alone which can keep that Law aright. Man may keep Law aright partially, i.e. so as partially to promote well-being, but Law can ~~only~~ be really kept aright by the Spirit of Love & Wisdom alone. It is the Spirit of Love & Wisdom which wills the Law of all existence. It is the Spirit of

Love & Wisdom which alone keeps aright the Law of Love & Wisdom - These are the only attributes of God which man is able to comprehend. To define, to comprehend that nature, which we recognise as {in another hand: 22} effecting that which *is*, is beyond our power, but we can recognise in it Love & Wisdom, because we may have experience of what a wise love is, in ourselves & each other, in some degree - The very want of it, from which we suffer in ourselves & each other, teaches us what a wise love is, & this wise love, -sometimes partially recognised, sometimes feelingly wanted in ourselves, - we recognise ~~to~~/as existing *not* in ourselves - And this is our comprehension of God. {in another hand: Wheeler}

The idea of the Divinity *within* has pervaded various conceptions of Religion.

That nature which we mean when we speak of the Divinity not in man - that nature we also recognise in man. This seems ~~to me~~ all that we can say of the Divinity within. Righteousness, Goodness, Truth, ascribed as attributes to God and Man, are words very vaguely used. All we can comprehend of righteousness is, ~~I believe~~, what ~~must~~/will here be explained of our comprehension of *right*.

With regard, then, to *Right*, to *Ought*, to Goodness or *Godness*, all that we can practically know of it is that it is that which causes well=being to man -

But is not this putting Right at low estimation?

That depends on what *is* well=being to man. ~~I~~/We mean well=being to Mankind for ~~an~~-Eternity. What is right & what is wrong may be tried by this test. No thought, no feeling, no purpose is wrong, which is not contrary to this. No thought, no feeling, no purpose is right which is contrary to it.

Many mistakes which penetrate into the very core of our lives & feelings, arise from erroneous or contracted views of what *is* human well-being. (in another hand: 23)

If all that satisfies the seeking of man after his greater satisfaction could be tried, that would be *right* which afford man the greatest satisfaction.

It has been supposed that inspired books or persons tell us what is right.

The Roman Catholic, hearing that Christ says "Sell ~~all~~/that thou hast & give to the poor," sometimes thinks these words sufficient to direct him to give alms, even though experience prove that alms do mischief.

Whatever by experience shall be proved to be really promotive of the well-being of mankind, *that is right*, that is a test to be trusted. This will not be low estimation of Right, if we put at a true estimation what *is* well-being to Mankind.

When we speak of a man who seeks the highest satisfactions of which human nature is capable, we are not speaking of a selfish man, for the highest satisfactions, of which human nature is capable, are not selfish.

When we say, *that is* a right purpose which tends to the well-being of Mankind, we are not lowering the nature of right - for that which causes the thought, the feeling, the purpose of man to approximate to unity with the thought, feeling & purpose of the Perfect *is* that which tends to the greatest well-being of mankind.

To say, on any occasion, that we know not what is for the well-being of man, is to say that we know not what is right - To say that we

know not what is right is to say that we know not what is for the well-being of Mankind.

It may be that, of the essential, ultimate nature of Right, man is unable to judge.

{in another hand: 24)

Practically - *that* thought, *that* feeling, *that* activity, *that* mode of being, in short, which gives the greatest consciousness of happiness to the being, capable of a consciousness of past, present, future, is the mode of being to be desired - & ~~I believe~~ this is all we know or can know about Right.

One of the elements of well-being to any mode of existence capable of consciousness of past, present & future is an assured conviction that the past, present & future of *all* being ~~is~~/are determined by a righteous, benevolent, wise Law. The satisfaction of loving, venerating, trusting in Perfection, depends on this. And this greatest satisfaction to any imperfect nature ~~appears to me~~ is not ~~to be~~ possible, without believing in an eternity for each being capable of comprehending past, present & future.

~~I know my own feeling,~~ w/With regard to a continuation of this existence, it is not, as respects ~~myself,~~/ourselves or my friends, any eagerness for the enjoyment of life, - any repugnance to the idea, as ~~to myself~~/respects ourselves or them, of ceasing to exist, - but a feeling that it would be satisfactory to be convinced of a continued existence for each identity - *because* such a conviction would accord with our idea of what would be right in the supreme Will.

Through Eternity, that which, in the thought

& feeling of the Perfect, effects well=being for an eternity to each mode of being springing from His will, this would be the will of Love & Wisdom. This would be *right* in the Being whose will calls forth existence.

We feel more satisfaction in saying that that which is right involves well=being than in saying that that which effects well=being is right. Undoubtedly they are one - But what is right?

This sort of confusion arises from not taking into account that *right* is that which promotes well=being in the *eternal* being. That which promotes well=being in any one eternal being will promote it in every eternal being. There will, therefore, be no selfish or unjust principle in the idea that what makes happy is right.

And here we come to a kind of evidence ~~for~~/that immortality is to be ~~given to~~/the portion of every mode of being capable of a consciousness of present, past & future.

{in another hand: Gram}

For it, practically, that which is right is adapted to make happy a mode of being adapted to a never=ending future - if we can trace a Law & a Will adapted to the satisfaction of the nature of beings who are immortal, but not adapted to the satisfaction of beings of finite duration, - this is evidence for the immortal nature of all beings capable of a consciousness of present, past & future.

Do we still feel an inclination to think that, being happy, arises from what we call being right, not that being right arises from being happy? Do we still feel dissatisfaction in

saying that that which makes happy is right - satisfaction in saying that that which is right makes happy?

{in another hand: 26}

To give a definition of Right is, perhaps, not in our power - But, practically, we can still say that *that* is Right which tends to the well-being of an immortal nature.

⊕/And the more we study the Law & Will which may be discerned to regulate all existence, the more we shall find it adapted, ~~I believe,~~ to the well-being of immortal existence.

All that we can comprehend of righteousness is, ~~I believe, what we have here said of our/then,~~ this comprehension of Right. Goodness is *Godness* - *Godness* is Goodness - ~~I now not that w/~~We can say no other of Goodness than of Right or Righteousness - Truth is *that which is*. That which *is* springs from the will of omnipotent Love & Wisdom. A finite being can comprehend Truth, or *that which is*, only imperfectly; for ~~that/whatever~~ is is connected with all else that is & with all that has been in the past & that will be in the future. We may be perpetually advancing in the estimation of what *is*, but no finite or imperfect being can fully estimate it- ~~I say estimate it,~~ because the intellect alone cannot attain truth, *feeling* must join with the intellect to estimate aright what is. Many feel a positive conviction of a truth when they are far from any comprehension of it. They have the assurance of the senses, or of the intellect, or of the feeling, perhaps - And, having this assurance, & not being conscious that other than this is necessary for the estimation

of truth, they have an undoubting belief.

The imperfect can never attain the fulness of truth. Truth is that which is, & none can comprehend that which is, without the comprehension of what has been & is to be; for whatever is, even to the {in another hand: 27}

most minute & apparently insignificant mode of being, is in connection with *all* that is, & with all that has been. If *all* that has been had not been, *nothing* that is would be as it is. No one therefore can fully comprehend any thing that is, except the Being to whom all is "one eternal *Now*" without past or future. But the being who is capable of an increasing comprehension of past, present & future, & the connection between them, may be for ever advancing in comprehension of truth.

If it be that to One alone ~~will~~ the fulness of truth will ever be comprehensible, - is not the best, which the Omnipotent can bestow, (1) a nature to which He furnishes the capability to be ever advancing towards that fulness of truth. (2) means & inducements to advance towards it - His Law being such as to ensure the attainment of such a degree of truth as constitutes well-being, even if the fulness of truth be for One alone?

Happy, at events, is the destiny of Mankind, - - infinite the benevolence & the wisdom which wills that destiny. We have had but slight glimpses of the sunshine of joy which is man's destination, yet enough to reveal its nature.

The happiness of attaining is, as yet, imperfectly estimated - because the objects, ~~for~~ which a man attains, are low & incomprehensible/I've -If he works from attraction for the ~~su~~object of his work, it is well - but, if he has the highest & the most comprehensive object for his work, how will its interest be increased?

f224

~~-27-~~

There is a want of elevation, of comprehension in almost all the objects for which Men work. Co=operation, in one true work, ~~through~~/with various idiosyncrasies would admit of sources of happiness little {in another hand: 28} understood - would call forth a constant giving & receiving of help & sympathy between those of our kind.

But we want the help & sympathy of a Higher than each other. We want to love, to venerate with all the power within us. We want to trust in the love, the sympathy, the help of a power & a wisdom which have not the limits we feel within & around us. We are glad to work, glad to suffer, in order to attain a true thought, a true feeling, a true life for ourselves & others. But we want to be assured that we shall attain it. We want to be sure that we shall find the means, if we will seek them. All these wants shall be supplied by the Omnipotent Spirit of Love & Wisdom, whom, if we seek, we shall find, ever present with us, the Holy Ghost indeed, the Comforter, the God of our Salvation from the evils of ignorance, ~~the~~/which is the true source of all our sufferings & privations. He will save us, by teaching us how to work for ourselves & each other. It is essential to man to seek the satisfaction of his nature - But who now seeks true satisfactions, - who feels, or understands what are true satisfactions? - With a varied idiosyncrasy in every human being, there might be the "Unity of the Spirit" of God & of Man.

f225

V

{in another hand: 6X}

"We love him, because he first loved us."

1 John IV 19

~~"The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb."~~

~~Isa. XL.6.~~

There is only one true ground, on which to look for that love, which is wanted to satisfy the divine nature in God or man - *Be* that which is true, good, wise, loving. Owe any love, which you may receive, to the appreciation, to the feeling called forth by truth, goodness, wisdom, love. If you owe affection to any other source, it is sure to turn into a scourge in one way or other, at one time or other. To be loved is a natural wanting but, if you *cannot* be that which is truly loveable, even though you recognise what that is, if you cannot be where that is which will appreciate what there is in you of loveable - with a great magnanimity wait God's time. Man ~~may~~/can not wait for physical food beyond a certain time, without ceasing to exist as a being of this world. It may be that, without food, ~~for them~~, his affections will become entirely imperceptible to others, ~~quite~~ unknown to himself. But they cannot perish. Nothing indeed perishes. The physical framework of Man changes into other modifications of material being. But it is ever matter, ever accordant with the laws of matter. ~~No~~/We have no experience ~~have we~~ of any material existence which has ever ceased to be accordant with those laws, ~~an accordance with~~ which constitutes what we mean by *matter*.

{in another hand: B5 3.-p 12}
As to other modes of being, not less real - such as thought & feeling, they also are imperishable. We recognise them, as manifested (not modified by matter) in *One* individuality - we recognise them (modified by matter) in many individualities forming one connected race - each individuality being influential on every other.

Nourish yourself with love of Truth, Goodness, Righteousness, ~~Beauty~~ - with reverence & admiration for Wisdom, & Beauty, Order, wherever such attributes are made manifest. When Love to you springs from them, receive it, welcome it as your natural food, - but the only legitimate trying for it is ~~from/by~~ *being* that which is fitted to attain it from the divine. You are in an attitude of unnatural screw, if you strive otherwise for it. Be wise as regards God - & ~~¥~~/you will secure right relations as regards man, as far as depends on yourself.

But I must vary according to the characters I am with, be grave or gay, for instance, as suits my companionship, you say.

A real view of what *is* & a feeling consistent with it would cause a constant flow of cheerfulness, arising from a spring too deep for variations, *provided* the present is healthful to the nature. But. as it is God's will for man that he discover & attain the circumstances, the organization of life, which are calculated to call forth & exercise the divine in him - in circumstances *not* so calculated, it will not be well with him.

f228

Sermon VIII

{in another hand: Hurrull x 15}

"God is Love."

1 John IV. 16.

It is all *One*, one unvarying principle from which spring ever-varying manifestations. The One Invariable Principle is indeed the spring of other invariable principles, adapted to various modes of being - All, however, there is reason to believe, will prove traceable to One Will - the will for the greatest ~~possible~~ degree & the highest kind of well-being (in the course of Eternity) which ~~is~~/are possible without admitting of any contradictory volitions in the mode of effecting it.

From perfect Wisdom & Benevolence springs the Will for the various invariable ~~unconditional~~ co-existences & successions which are found to exist - the knowledge of which is attainable by Man - & from this knowledge, which must spring from the exercise of his own nature, comes his power - his power to create, to develop, to destroy. Nothing indeed is destructible,

XL ~~mentioned,~~ There can be no cause for anything which exists, but that it

is the Will of the

Spirit of the Universal - the Righteous, the Wise, the Good - This Spirit wills the same {in another hand: 18} co-existences, the same successions through Eternity. This we call Law. Hence springs infinite variety. Hence springs development, evolution. There is nothing dull in the operation of invariable Law. The Universe varies throughout, in every part, in each present from every past - The Almighty repeats Himself in His wonderful work. Yet His Law, whence it springs, never varies. The Thought, the Feeling whence all springs are ever the same, the activity, His manifestation, every varying. Is it dull to trust & love? - Yet whom can we trust & love like Him, whose thought never varies, because it is always the thought of Perfect Love, Perfect Wisdom? Is it dull to work with certainty of success for every righteous wish, for those we love as well as for our poor selves? - Yet what nature shall inspire such certainty ~~but~~/as the One whose Wisdom is such that in Him "is no variableness nor shadow of turning"?

f230

~~open our eyes, illeg our hearts - illeg on~~

XII

Oh that again some one would cry, in a voice that might reach the human heart, "prepare ye the way of the Lord."!

"Woe unto Jerusalem" is a cry ~~we~~/some read with a kind of religious feeling - we condemn those sinful Jews who crucified the tabernacle of that bright spirit - we have a sort of satisfaction in condemning them, as if thereby we were manifesting in ourselves a religious spirit - but suppose one says, Woe to London! - suppose one says, how much worse not to strive to save ~~others~~/thousands from a crucified *spirit* than to crucify one body, thereby transferring that lofty spirit to some other region of God's Universe! Woe indeed to those who did it - their state must entail woe. But what is not entailed to multitudes by present modes of life, general even among those accounted the first of the land!

~~What, then, to do?~~

f231

8 Keeping to these ~~three~~ principles, when the
"hour & the man" come, fear not to declare {in another hand: x 7}
them & to strive to live & act them, but
look to do it wisely or the time when such
truth shall be acknowledged & shall bless
mankind is made more distant.

But is this time of materialism, of comfort
& luxury - seeking, of conventionality a time in
which the Apostle of such Truth may hope
that any will join him? - Yes. Thought, &
feeling are, (& will be more & more,) afloat,
especially among women. Within half a
century, most decided is the change of the
relations of women in society - ~~I heard the~~
~~other day a brother & sister reading/~~In looking over the
passage of Eve's expression of her feelings
of submissive devotedness to Adam in Milton's
~~They both agreed afterwards, talking over the~~
~~subject,~~ with what different feelings they/we
read it now & 30 years ago, w/What a
general change there w/is in feeling!
Families are no longer monarchies. House=
hold occupations are withdrawn from the
middle classes. Yet, at the same time,
servants educated in the best schools
decline to scour. There is higher & higher

mental cultivation & cultivation of the Arts. Music & singing & drawing, passable 30 years ago, would not be produced now. But there is more discontent as well as more speculation. It *is* the time for a few among the speculative & discontented to listen to more enlarged views of religion & to a life ~~dr~~/consistent with these.

The word "matter" invariably implies *limit*. The study of matter is the study of various kinds & degrees of limit, & of their development of these towards the unlimited. See the wisdom & benevolence of the Spirit of the Universe. In & through Matter arise enjoyments which, without a contradiction, could not *be*, except with such a mode of existence - Some enjoyments are impossible except to the material, & these are both in themselves good, & also enhance the excellence of the spiritual being, towards which all is tending. The feeling of vigour after a cold bath is a thing ~~what~~/which we should be sorry to part ~~with~~ out of existence & for which we thank God. This brings to our consciousness in a small matter that which we expect will prove true throughout. viz.

Add Mss 45839 ff236-89, microfilm

f236

Cassandra R.N.

I

"The voice of one crying in the "crowd,
"Prepare ye the way of the Lord."

f237

Dartnell I.

~~The night was mild & dark & cloudy Nofariari was walking to & fro before the beautiful façade of a Palladian palace — All was still, not one light shining through the windows betrayed the existence of any life stirring within. "I, I alone am One often comes to be wandering alone in the bitterness of life without~~

~~she said — (She went down where, on the glassy dark pond, the long shadows of the girdle of pines, whose tops of which seemed to touch heaven, were lying. The swans were sleeping on their little island — Even the Muscovy ducks were not yet awake — But she had suffered so much that she had outlived even the desire to die. For such an one all must be gone through, "she said "why not this side the grave as well as the other? Perhaps, if prematurely we dismiss ourselves from this world, all may even have to be suffered through again — the premature birth may not contribute to the production of another being, which must be begun again from the beginning."~~

~~She resumed her walk on the terrace, by the/~~Such an one longs to replunge into
~~struggling light of the moon, which at this moment shone out from between the clouds — The sharp cornice of the Venetian palace/building stood out clear against it in the clear pale blue of the morning {illeg}~~

~~"Would, she said, that I could replunge myself~~

f238

in the happily unconscious sleep of ~~all my/the~~ rest of the race! they slumber in one another's arms - they are not yet awake - To them evil & suffering are not, for they are not conscious of ~~it/evil~~. While ~~I,/one~~, alone, awake & prematurely alive to it, must wander out in silence & solitude - ~~I have/~~Such an one has risen up too soon, ~~I have/has~~ awakened too early - ~~I have/has~~ rejected the companionship of ~~my/the~~ race - ~~I am/~~ unmarried to any human being - ~~I/~~Such an one sees the evil they do not see yet ~~I have/has~~ no power to discover the remedy for it. ~~Would that I were back again warm & innocent in sleeping ignorance, but not alone!~~

~~She re-entered the palace, & reached her balcony - where, she throwing/threw herself down on its cold pavement, & resting her arms upon the stone/forehead on the stone balustrade & her long hair, of the golden tint which the Venetian painter delighted to honour, bound with gems, radiant gems which sparkled in the moonlight, fell upon/over her bare arm on to the rough stone. But hardly~~

~~for a moment could her energetic nature acquiesce in this humiliated despairing posture - She started up, like the dying lioness who fronts her hunters - & standing at bay, as it were, she bared her forehead to the night breeze, & stretching out her arms, she cried~~

~~"God, to Thee alone can I say all - God, hear me. Why didst Thou/God create us/women with passion, intellect, moral activity - these three - & place us/them in a state of society, where no one of the three can be exercised? God, to none else can I make my complaint, without being rebuked for complaining, scourged for suffering! There are~~

f239

~~who/Men say that Thou too dost/God punishes for complaining
I do not believe it/- No, but Men are angry with misery
They are irritated with us/women for not being happy -
They take it as a personal offence - To Thee, to Thee
God alone may we/women complain, without insulting Thee,
Oh Eternal Patience of God!~~

~~God, how passionate hast Thou created us!
And the women, who are afraid to own that God's
work is good & wish to say, Thy will be not done,
(declaring another order of society from that which
Thou/He hast made,) go about maudling to each other
& teaching to their daughters that "women have no
passion" - In the conventional society, which men
have made for women, & women have accepted,
they must have none, they must act the farce
of hypocrisy, the lie that they are without Passion -
& therefore what else can they say to their
daughters, without giving the lie to themselves?~~

~~"Oh! Miserable "Suffering, sad" female "humanity"!
& what are these feelings which you/they are taught
to consider as disgraceful, to deny to your/themselves?
Let us see what from do the Chinese feet assume
when denied their proper development? Speak,
If the young maidens/girls of the "higher toned classes," ye who
never commit a false step, whose justly earned
reputations were never sullied even by the stain
which the fruit of the mere "knowledge of good
& evil" leaves behind, were to speak, ye & say, what are your/their
thoughts employed upon, & your/their thoughts, which
alone are free," what would they say?~~

~~{in another hand 4} And moved by the spell of the enchantress,
there appeared the phantoms, the larvae of the most~~

f240

~~beautiful race of the world, the maidens of the rank
whose white hands have never been made hard
by toil =Graceful & lovely, pure & ethereal they
floated by -- & their thoughts & fancies took shape
& form at the word of the Magician -- With each
maiden there was a Phantom one! there were two,
three, twenties, hundreds ever varying, ever changing
but never was she alone That w/with the Phantom
companion of her/their fancy, they talked (not love, she was/they are
too innocent, too pure, too full of genius & imagination
& high toned feeling for that - but) she/they talked, in
fancy, of that which interested her /them most - they
sought seek a companion for their every thought - the companion
she found/they find not in reality she sought/they seek in fancy - or,
if not that, if not absorbed in endless conversations,
she saw herself/they see themselves engaged with him in stirring
events, circumstances which called out the interest
wanting to them - Yes, fathers, mothers, you who
see your daughter proudly rejecting all semblance
of flirtation, primly engaged in the duties of the
breakfast table, you little think how her fancy
compensates itself by endless interviews & sym=
pathies (sympathies either for ideas or events)
with the fancy's companion of the hour! And
you say, 'she is not susceptible - women have no
passions!' Ah! Mothers, who cradle yourselves in
visions about the domestic hearth, how many of
your sons & daughters are there, do you think,
while sitting around under your maternal compla=
cent eyes? Were you there yourself during your
own (now forgotten) girlhood?~~

~~Tell your thoughts for once, maidens while one~~
What are the thoughts of these young girls while one

f241

is singing that divine music, another is reading the Review, & a third is ~~doing~~ ~~crochet~~/busily embroidering? ~~where are your thoughts?~~ Is not one fancying herself the nurse of some new friend in sickness, - another engaging in romantic dangers with him, such as call out the character & afford more food for sympathy than the monotonous events of domestic society - another undergoing unheard-of trials under the observation of some one whom she has chosen as the companion of her dream? another have a loving & loved companion in the life she is living, which many do not want to change?

And is not all this most natural, inevitable? Are they, who are too much ashamed of it to confess it even to themselves, to be blamed for that which cannot be otherwise, the causes of which stare one in the face? *if one eyes were not closed* Alas! ~~"Oh" cried poor poor Nofriari)~~ ~~"how I too have~~ Many struggle against this as a "snare"! ~~how I have martyred myself, put myself to the torture!~~ No Trappist ascetic ~~has done so~~ watched & fasted/s more in the body than ~~I have done/they do~~ in the soul! ~~Oh! how well I can/They~~ understand the discipline of the Thebaïd, the life=long agonies to which those strong moral Mohicans ~~put/subjected~~ themselves through! How cordially ~~I/they~~ could do the same, ~~if I believed in their effect of such,~~ in order to escape the worse torture of ~~filleg~~/wandering & vain imaginations"! But ~~I know~~

that the laws of God for moral well-being are not thus to be obeyed. ~~thus.~~ ~~How I have/We~~ fasted mentally, scourged ~~myself/ourselves~~ morally, used the intellectual hair-shirt, in order to subdue that perpetual day=dreaming, which ~~I know was/to be/is~~ so dangerous! ~~I have/We~~ resolve, 'this day month I will be free from it! twice a day

f242

with prayer & written record of the times ~~which I/when~~ we have indulged in it, ~~I have/we~~ endeavoured to combat it - Never, ~~never~~ with the slightest success. Then ~~I thought, 'through Vanity it comes - through vanity it must be conquered' -~~ And I selected a person/women to whom to make my confession, ~~the confession of my whole life of dreaming - I remember the day. It was like a day of Crucifixion to me - It was like death - As each confession came out, I feared I should not have strength to make the next confession - to drive the next nail. But I did - I went through the whole. And when it came to piercing the side, I did it too. For a fortnight it delivered me. Then all was as bad as ever -~~ By mortifying vanity, ~~I had done myself/~~ we do ourselves no good. ~~I did not see that I was /~~ It is the want of interest in my/our life which produced it - ~~that,~~ by filling up that want of interest in my/our life, ~~I could/we~~ can alone remedy it. And ~~had I/did~~ we even seen this, how ~~could I/can~~ we make the difference? How ~~could I~~ obtain the interest which Society declares ~~she did/~~ does not want, & ~~I could not/we~~ cannot want

~~But n/Now it seems to me that~~ no one cares about sin, no one feels it, no one thinks it a matter of much importance.

{in another hand: Dennison}

What are novels? what is the secret of the charm of every romance that ever was written? The first thing ~~that you observe~~ in a novel is ~~that~~ to place the persons ~~are placed~~ together in circumstances which naturally call out the high feelings, & thoughts of the characters, which afford food for sympathy between them on these points. 'romantic events' they are called - The second is that the heroine

f243

has *generally* no family ties, ~~but~~ (almost *invariably* no mother)- or, if she has, these do not interfere with her entire independence -

These two things constitute the main charm of reading novels. Now, in as far as these are good & not spurious interests, let us see what we have to correspond with them in real life. Can the high sympathies be fed on the Opera, the Exhibitions, the ~~debate in~~/gossip of the House of Commons & the political caricature ~~in Punch~~? If, together, man & woman approach any of the high questions of social, political or religious life, they are said & justly to be going "too far"! ~~God, that such things can be!"~~ That such things can be!

~~And again she threw herself down in the extremity of her suffering. It seemed a little thing to awaken such anguish. But it was the fermenting of a life/whole years of inaction & solitude. Again she raised herself up & looked abroad. The moon was shining brightly. A heavy shower of rain, which had just fallen (upon her all unconscious head) had moistened the pavement of the noble terrace - The moon was reflected from the moisture below - doubling the light. Above her head & beneath her feet there was a flood of radiance. The swollen river at the bottom of the valley rushed & roared from afar. The distant circle of mountains gave liberty to the thought, which seems fettered by a circumscribed horizon. She fixed her eyes upon the splendid moonlit expanse beneath her, when suddenly~~

f244

~~there came that darkening of the world, which we have all observed on a night when fleecy clouds veil unexpectedly the face of the moon — & which is like the wings of the Almighty overshadowing suddenly the world. — as in that inspired representation of Him in Michael Angelo's Sistine chapel. — She felt the overshadowing wings above her, which had darkened her lower world, & she said, ["Is it Thou, Lord?" And He said, "It is I" & her heart [Let our hearts be/was still.~~

~~"Yes, I would spare no pang, II The more the anguish racks,
Would wist no torture less, The earlier it will bless."~~

~~Nofriari & Fariseo sate sobbing together in the shadows of the cypress a illeg by the side of a lake whence rose a fountain shot up its single solitary spire towards Heaven. — The heat was intense — they had agreed to spend there together the hours when every man is idle — Little fountains played all around them in the beautiful Italian garden. — The~~

~~& shining green of the orange trees glistened among the cypress. white blossoms~~

~~—"But why, my sister," said Fariseo "have you quarrelled with the world? Enjoy it as I do, & do not complain of it."~~

~~— Nofriari was speechless/silent. — What could she say? A crowd of thoughts rushed into her mind at this moment. — "Oh! give me, Give me/us back my/our suffering, she cried/we cry to Heaven in her/our hearts, " Suffering rather than Indifferentism! For out of nothing comes nothing. But out of suffering may come the cure. Better have Pain than Paralysis! A hundred struggle & drown in the breakers. One discovers the New World. But rather ten times rather die in the surf, heralding the way to that new world, than stand idly on the other shore!"~~

~~Fariseo scarcely remarked her silence. — "You have every thing to make a woman happy," he said, "why are you so cast down?"~~

~~—"I cannot answer the question, it is too long.~~

f245

~~an one.~~ Passion, Intellect, Moral Activity, these three have never been satisfied in ~~me~~/woman. In this cold & oppressive & conventional atmosphere, they cannot be satisfied. To ~~go farther~~/say more on the subject would be to

enter into

the whole history of society, of the present state of civilization -"

~~"But let us do so. We have nothing else to do this hot morn," said Fariseo. "Only be as short/brief as you can."~~

~~—This morning Nofriari was so discouraged, that she did not wish even for the power of expression. "Look, brother," she said, "at that lizard. "It is not hot," he says, "I like it. The atmosphere which enervates you is life to me." The state of society which I/we complain of makes you/others happy. Why should I/these complain to you/those? You/They do not suffer. You/They would not understand it, any more than that lizard would comprehend the sufferings of a Shetland sheep."~~

~~—"Never mind," said Fariseo, "try, & I will do my best."~~

~~—It was not pride — unless pride is the fear of not finding sympathy — It was the reluctance of wounded feeling which kept Nofriari silent.~~

~~—"Speak," said Fariseo, "I am ready. With all the gifts which heaven has bestowed on your ingratitude, I cannot understand your suffering. & I want to understand it."~~

~~—"Must I enter into all the history of my life?" said Nofriari. "Cui bono? I do not quarrel with you, as you often accuse me of doing. — The progressive world is necessarily divided into two classes- those who take the best of what there is & enjoy it - those who wish for something better & try to create it. Without both these {in another hand: 10}~~

two classes, ~~both the one & the other,~~ the world would be badly off - They are the very conditions of progress both the one & the other. Were there none who were
discontented

with what they have, the world would never reach anything better. And through the other class, which is constantly taking the best of what the first is creating for them, a balance is secured, & that which is conquered is held fast - But with neither class must we quarrel for not possessing the privileges of the other - The laws of the nature of each make it impossible."

~~"Then you do esteem~~ Is discontent a privilege? said Fariseo, ~~with a smile which chilled poor Nofriari's blood.~~

"Yes it is a privilege to suffer for your race - a privilege not reserved ~~alone~~ to the Redeemer & the Martyrs alone - but one enjoyed by numbers in every age - ~~But if you will hear what I have been doing, listen - It is a vulgar~~ The common=place life ~~enough~~/of thousands - And in that is its only interest, its only merit as a history - viz. that it is the type of ~~vulgar~~/common sufferings - the story of one who has not the courage to resist nor to submit to the civilization of her time - [is this

Poetry & imagination ~~begain~~ life ~~in me, as they do in most, I remember, when I was/~~ Many a child will falling on my knees on the gravel walk at the sight of a pink hawthorn in full flower, ~~to one day when I was/~~it is by ~~my~~/itself, to praise God for it.

Then ~~came~~/comes Intellect. It wisheds to satisfy the wants which ~~my~~ Intellect createds for ~~me~~/it - But there is a physical, not moral, impossibility {in another hand: 11}

of supplying the wants of the Intellect in the state of civilization at which we have arrived. The stimulus, the training, the time are, all three, wanting to us - or, in other words, the means & inducement are not there.

{in another hand: Wheeler}

Look at the poor lives which we lead. It is a wonder ~~to us~~ that we are so good as we are, not that we are so bad. In looking around ~~me~~, ~~I am~~/we are struck with the power of the organizations ~~about me~~/we see, not with their want of ~~it~~./power. Now & then, it is true, ~~I am~~/we are conscious that ~~I am in there~~ is presence of an inferior organization - but, in general, just the contrary - ~~Your sister in law~~ Mrs. A. has the imagination, the poetry of a ~~illeg~~/Murillo - & a sufficient power of execution to shew that she might have had a great deal more - why is she not a Murillo? From a ~~physical~~/material difficulty, not a mental one - If she has a knife & fork in her hands during three hours of the day, she cannot have a pencil or brush - Dinner is the great sacred Ceremony of this day, the great Sacrament. To be absent from dinner is equivalent to being ~~at the point of death/ill~~. Nothing else will excuse us from is. Bodily incapacity is the only apology valid - If she has a pen & ink in her hands during other three hours, writing answers for the Penny Post, - again she cannot have her pencil - & so *ad infinitum* through life. People have no type before them in their lives - neither fathers & mothers - nor the children themselves - They look at things in detail - they say, 'It is very desirable that A, my daughter, should go to such a party, should have such a lady, should sit by such a person' - It is true {in another hand: 12}

But what standard have they before them? - of the nature of destruction of Man? - The very words are rejected as pedantic - But might they not, at least, have a type in their minds that such an one might be a discoverer through her intellect, such another through her art, ~~such~~ a third through her moral power?

Women often try/~~I tried~~ one branch of Intellect after another in ~~my~~/their youth ~~I tried~~ e.g. Mathematics- But that, least of all, is compatible with the life of ~~our~~ "society". It is impossible to follow up any thing systematically. ~~I thought seriously at one time of running away & putting on men's clothes & Women often long to entering myself into College/in some man's~~

~~should have found/would find~~ direction, - competition, (or rather the opportunity of measuring the intellect with others), - & above all, time -

In those wise Institutions, - mixed as they are with many follies, which will last as long as the human race lasts, because they are adapted to the wants of the human race - those Institutions which we call monasteries & which, embracing much that is contrary to the laws of nature, are yet better adapted to the union of the life of action & that of thought than any other mode of life with which we are acquainted - in many such, 4½ hours, at least, are daily set aside for thought - rules are given for thought - training & opportunity afforded - Among us, there is no time appointed for this purpose- & the difficulty is that, in our Social life, we must be always doubtful whether we ought not to be with somebody else, or be doing something else.

Are men better off than women in this?

{in another hand: 13}

Turn over.

~~But do you fancy, I/ said Fariseo that men are so much better off than women?"3~~

~~"It happened to me, calling twice/If one calls upon a friend in London, to see & sees both times her son in the drawing room, it struck me/strikes one as so odd to find a young man sitting idling in his mother's drawing=room in the morning. For men, who are seen much in those haunts, there is no fend of the epithets we have 'knight of the carpet', 'drawing room heroes,' 'ladies men', beneath our contempt. But suppose we were to see a number of men in the morning sitting round a table in the drawing room, looking at prints, doing worsted work & reading little books, how we should laugh! I knew a man once, an Hon A Member of the House of Commons, who did a great deal of/was known once to do worsted work. Of another man a friend was said to me once, 'His only fault is that he is too good - he drives out with his mother every day in the carriage & if he is asked anywhere, he answers that he must dine with his mother, but, if she can spare him, he will come in to tea' - & he does not come'-~~

Now why is it more ridiculous for a man than for a woman to do worsted work & drive out every day ~~with his wife~~/in the carriage? why should we laugh, if we were to see a parcel of men sitting round a drawing=room table in the morning - & think it all right if they were women?

~~have women confessedly nothing to do? is man's time essentially more valuable than woman's? or is the difference between man & woman this that woman has confessedly nothing to do?~~

f249

Women are never supposed to have any occupation of sufficient importance *not* to be interrupted - except "suckling their fools". & ~~the next curious part of it is that~~ women themselves have supported this - have written books to support it- & have trained themselves so as to consider ~~nothing that~~/whatever they do as *not* of sufficient value to the world or to others, ~~but to~~/that they can throw it up at the first "claim of social life" - They have accustomed themselves to consider intellectual occupation as a merely selfish amusement, which it is their "duty" to give up for every trifler more selfish than themselves -

A young man, (who was afterwards useful & known in his day & generation), when busy reading & sent for by his proud mother, & ~~sister~~ to shine in some ~~social occasion~~/morning visit, came, but, after it was over, he said, "now remember - this is not to happen again - I came that you might not think me sulky - but I shall not come again-" But for a young women to send such a message to her mother & sisters, ~~think/would be considered~~/how impertinent & ~~impossible~~/it would be! A woman of great administrative power ~~told me~~ once said that she never undertook anything which "she could not throw by at once, if necessary."

~~"But h/How do you/we explain then said I (if I am Fariseo)"~~the innumerable/much cases of women who have distinguished themselves in Classics, Mathematics, even in Politics?"

"Widow=hood, ill=health, or want of bread, these three explanations - or excuses are supposed to justify a woman in taking up an occupation - In some cases - no doubt - an indomitable force of character will suffice without any of these three - but such are rare -
{in another hand: 14}

But see how society fritters away the intellects of those committed to her charge! It is said that society is necessary to sharpen the Intellect - But what do we seek society for? It does sharpen the intellect, because it is a kind of *tour=de=force* to say something at a pinch - unprepared & uninterested with any subject to improvise something under difficulties - But what "go we out for to seek?" To take the chance of some one having something to say which we want to hear - or of our finding something to say which *they* want to hear? You have a little to say, but not much - you often make a stipulation with some one else - 'Come in ten minutes, for ~~I am sure~~ I shall not be able to find enough to spin out longer than that' - You are not to talk of anything very interesting for the essence of society is to prevent any long conversations & all *tête-à-têtes*- "Glissez, n'appuyez pas" is its very motto - The praise of a good "*maîtresse=de=salon/maison*" ~~so~~/consists in this that she allows no one person to be

too

much absorbed in, or too long about, a conversation - she always recalls them to their 'duty' - People do not go into ~~society, because~~ the company of their fellow=creatures for what would seem a very sufficient reason, namely, that they have something to say to them, or something that they want to hear from them - but in the vague hope that they may find something to say -

~~Now for our~~/Then as to solitary opportunities - ~~¶~~/Many women never ~~had~~/have an hour in all ~~my life~~/their lives - (excepting before anybody ~~was~~/is up in the house) that ~~¶~~/they ~~could~~/can call ~~my~~/their own without fear of offending

or of hurting some one - Why do people sit up so late or, more rarely, get up so early? Not because the day is not long enough, but because they have "no time for themselves."

{in another hand: Jones}

~~"But can't you do anything when any body else is in the room?" I/he said. "If not the best advice I can give you is to learn as soon as possible - School boys do"~~

~~And, I/If we do attempt to do anything in social or domestic company, what is the system of literary exercise which we purchase? Every body reads aloud out of their own book or newspaper - or, every five minutes, something is said - And what is it to be "read aloud to"? The most miserable exercise of the human intellect - or rather, is it any exercise at all? To me I/It is like lying on my/one's back, with my/one's hands tied, & having food poured down my/one's throat - worse than that, because suffocation would immediately ensue & prevent that -/put a stop to this operation - But no suffocation would stop the other -~~

So much for the satisfaction of the Intellect - Yet for a married woman in society, it is even worse - ~~I once heard a/A~~ married woman was once heard to wish that she could break a limb that she might have a little time to herself - ~~I am sure I~~ Many have ~~often wished the/~~taken advantage of the fear of "infection" to do

the same -

It is a thing so ~~set down/~~accepted among women that they have nothing to do that a woman has not the least scruple ~~of/in~~ saying, 'I will come & spend the morning with you' - And you would be thought quite surly & absurd, if you were to refuse it. Nay, it is thought a mark of amiability & affection, if you are "on such terms" that you can "come in" "any morning you please." ~~The last time I was in the country, in~~
in another hand: 16}

f252

~~-16-~~

~~the next/a neighbouring~~ In a country=house, if there ~~was/is~~ a large party of young people - 'You will spend the morning with us', they ~~said/say~~ to the neighbours - 'we will drive together in the afternoons' - ~~'we will walk together'~~ 'tomorrow we will make an Expedition' & we will spend the evening together.' And this ~~was/is~~ thought friendly & ~~pretty & they went away,~~ at the end of some weeks, without the smallest idea that they had not been perfectly acceptable, & thinking that their /& spending time had been spend in a very pleasant manner, & that ~~'we had seen each other every day.'~~ So women play through life - Yet time is ~~± suppose,~~ the most valuable of all things. If they had come every morning & afternoon & robbed ~~me/us~~ of half=a=crown, ~~±/we~~ should have had redress from the Police - But it is laid down, ~~among us,~~ that our time is of no value - If you offer a morning visit to a professional man, & say, 'I will just stay an hour with you, if you will allow me, till So & so comes back to fetch me,' it costs him a guinea - & therefore he has a right to complain - But women have no right, because it is "only their time."

~~"Well, but do you mean to say that you can't resist?"~~ said Fariseo.

~~"Women have no means given them, whereby they can resist the "claims of social life," as they are called."~~ she answered" - They are taught from their infancy upwards/~~that~~ that it is wrong, ill=tempered, & a misunderstanding of 'w/Women's Mission,' (with a great M), if they do not allow themselves, *willingly*, to be interrupted at all hours - If a

f253

~~-17-~~

woman has once ~~justified~~ put in a claim to be treated as a man by some work of Science or Art or Literature, which she can *shew* as the 'fruit of her leisure,' then she will be considered justified in *having* leisure - (hardly perhaps ~~even~~ then). But, if not, not. If she has nothing to shew, she must resign herself to her fate."

go on to III - P. 21

~~Nofriari was silent & so was I for It did not/her brother for, in truth~~

f254

~~he knew not what to say. They sat looking at the fountain
& its/ the beautiful solitary spire of water. At last she
said in a low voice,~~

"See, how it strives & strives & strives ~~to~~/towards heaven -
It cannot reach it. It is shedding tears of grief & of
disappointment. And now it makes another & another
spring. Alas! it has chains about its wings & about
its feet. And, it falls, falls, falls heavily to the ground-
& is lost upon the earth. And that which escapes is
scattered among the clouds & before the wind & never
finds its way again.

See, it struggles up towards heaven again. And
this time it will succeed - Behold it scales Infinity -
It is rising higher & higher. That mighty heart will
climb to heaven. Now, it has conquered Earth. It is out
of the sphere of its attraction. Oh! it is rising now!
It has ascended up on high. It is leading Gravitation
captive. The earth cannot reach it to pull it down
again. Shoot up, brave spirit - brave spirit, soar
higher! Thou hast mastered matter. Be of good cheer,
thou hast overcome the world!

Alas! the wind has carried away large fragments
of its column. It has made wide gaps in its shaft. Will
it fall? will it fall? It has no support - & it has but a
cloud to cling to.

No, it does not fall, brave spirit. It soars higher
& higher. Oh! living soul, oh unconquerable heart! though

f255

it has lost its foundation, by its own impulse it has
struggled on -

Alas! where is it now? its impulse is exhausted, its
strength is at an end; its life is blasted - its struggle
done; its hope destroyed. And it falls lifeless on the
grass - it, which had so lately been striving to Heaven- For it
is dead -

And is there no comfort? were all its struggles vain?
Did that noble heart seek heaven in vain?

The ungrateful ground has been fertilized by it- It
struggled to the skies - & it watered a weed - It thought
to scale Infinity - & it made verdant a blade of grass -"

And Nofriari positively shed tears, Her companion(† had never
seen her ~~cry~~/weep for herself. And now she was actually in
tears for the fountain. ~~I did not~~ Seeking how to answer
her. ~~So I attracted~~/ & calm her, he drew her attention to the other
little

sparkling fountains which were playing in the sun,
& though ~~I am~~/he was nothing of a Mysticist ~~my~~/himself, †/he made
shift to improvise a 'Ballata' for her benefit - to
shew her that her sick fancies were not those of all
the world.

"See, how the infant founts spring & gambol &
dance in the sun=beams! There is one! He is shooting
with his tiny arrow at the Sun. He stands, the mimic
Apollo, erect & fearless - & laughing sends the missile at the
mark - and when the harmless arrow falls playful at his
foot, he runs, with joyous laughter, back, & hides his merry
face in his mother's fountain, while he tells her how the Sun
held out his noble hand to catch the infant's spear, & could
not.

See, there is a brother plashing in the bright waters
below - he spreads out his little arms & feet in exulting
sport - he thinks he is swimming- And another stands
by the edge already reached & cries, Thou canst not come
so far -

And here are young spirits in merry multitudes,
playing shuttlecock with drops of water - Two, tired with
the long summer's holiday, have laid their dimpled cheeks

f256

on one another & are dreaming of the ~~mr~~ rich marvels
in the upper air. What flushes his cheek like a bright
rose=leaf - in sleep? He sees a snowy cloud tinged with
pomegranate, & thinks how wonderful it must all be up
there. Shall he not fly thither & see those dazzling white &
purple walls? He climbs with his tiny foot upon his
companion to help him a step higher - & his rosy wing
pinions are all too small to carry up the aspiring fount -
till a bright sun=beam leaves his ethereal home &
shoots down with out=stretched helping hand - And he
catches the kindly ray, & reaches the top=most spring by
that sweet brother's arm. There, pouring his joyous
soul in song, he waves his little lance on high. Glad
morning vision of *light* & merry *life* as brothers! Not
long does he remain there, but eager to rejoin his
Mother Earth, down he springs - & his sister fount wel=
comes him back with her glad eyes. In loving triumph,
she holds up her watery mirror, while he, the daring
little soarer, successful Icarus, admires his scatheless wings.

And now they all unite in merry ring, to gather the
sunny drops which fall from on high - one, more eager
than the rest, darts from the circle to collect a heap in his
infant lap - But see, tis but to throw again the sparkling
fruits among his brothers! And here, a fairy sister
spirit riding in a little boat, while a stout young fount
pushes behind with exulting voice - & two brother springs
harness themselves in front with wreaths of Childhood's
own heavenly colour, blue chains of Forget=me=not.

And lo! one solemnly teaching a fraternal fount
the principles of the circle on the watery surface - & while
his circle spreads & spreads & escapes beyond his little
compasses & vanishes out of the reach of his eyes, the other
laughs with joyous glee - & trying to stop the runaway,
tumbles headlong into the circle's midst, scattering all the
glittering fragments into water - And see (oh wonder of
wonders!) the little Archimedes stands amazed! the solid
walls of his marble home are broken into a thousand glistening
jewels, wavy lines, sparkling gems of light - while the
commotion lasts which the little Diver has made in the
reflecting mirror.

And fresh sport succeeds, as they dance round their King - their smiles light up the very sky. Blest spirits! glad, sunny fairies every one! But their King, the boldest, the loveliest of them all! Joy to thee, glorious Child - for lo! the bird of Jove, the noble Eagle, floating, descending, not swooping from the skies, paternal in his might, fondly raises the little Ganymede clinging round his neck & looking confidingly in his face - & bears him to the feet of Jove, where Innocence & Power have kissed one another, & are for ever hand in hand."

III

Nofriari sate alone, in her pale cold arid life - She sate, looking at the falling snow, which came down silently, silently, ever slowly & silently falling, till it had covered up all her spring flowers, all her evergreens. And there was nothing but one dreary expanse of untrodden white. The air was full of snow & fog, so that, a few yards off, even that white sheet was lost in a wall of dirty mist. She thought of the consolations which she had so lately received, - the advice to "come to a compromise with Society" - to "let Society have its share & take the other herself" - not "to quarrel with the world" - to "take things as they were" &c And she felt that it was like telling the bending bush "not to quarrel" with the heavy load which overpowered it & crushed it down - that it was like telling the snow-drop to "make a compromise" with the superincumbent weight.

"My life is like that snow-oppressed land=scape," she said. "There is nothing to be seen but snow & mist on all sides - They say God intended it. Did God intend that waste of snow to press down, all life & green spring beneath it? ~~Yes, I~~ ~~suppose~~/Perhaps He did - But only for a time. 'You must look at life cheerfully,' they say. Say to a wretch

~~writhing on his bed in horrible spasm, "God intended it - you must take life cheerfully."~~

III

~~"Well, but you are at ease now," they say, "such & such a grievance is not here. "I like riding about this beautiful place, why don't you? I like walking about the garden, why don't you?" is the common comfort.~~

As if ~~†/we were a child/children~~, whose spirits rise during a fortnight's holidays, who thinks that they will last for ever - & ~~who looks~~ neither backwards nor forwards -

~~Oh! pale & cold existence of a broken heart! I heard her saying.~~

~~"And why are thou broken," I asked, "thou that hast everything that Earth can give?"~~

~~"I everything!" she said, "I who have now nothing I can desire & nothing I can rejoice in on this Earth."~~

~~"How can that be?" I said.~~

~~"Do you wish to know? Listen & you will see. Society has triumphed/s over many. †/They wished to regenerate the world with my/their Institutions, with my/their Moral Philosophy, with my/their Love. Now I am satisfied/Then they sink to living from breakfast till dinner, from dinner till tea, with a little worsted=work - & to look forward to nothing but my bed.~~

~~Oh! When shall †/we see a life full of steady enthusiasm, walking straight to its aim, flying home, as that bird is now, against the wind - with the calmness & the confidence of one who knows the laws of God & can apply them? when shall I see it?~~

~~And w/What do †/we see? †/We see great & fine organizations deteriorating - †/We see girls & boys of 17, before whose noble ambitions, heroic dreams & rich endowments †/we bow my/our heads, as before God incarnate in the flesh. But, before/ere they are 30, they are withered, paralysed, ankylosed/extinguished - "Oh! I have forgotten {in another hand: 18}~~

~~all my~~ /"We have forgotten our visions," they say themselves-

The 'dreams of youth' have become a proverb.

That organizations, early rich, fall far short of their promise has been repeated to satiety. But is it

extraordinary that it should be so? For do we ever utilize this heroism? Look how it lives upon itself

& perishes for lack of food - We do not know what

to do with it - We had rather that it should not

be there - Often we laugh at it. Always we find it troublesome. Look at

the ~~poor~~/poverty

~~ness~~ of our life! Can we expect anything else but

poor creatures to come out of it? Did Michael

Angelo's genius fail, did Pascal's die in its bud, did

Sir Isaac Newton become a common=place sort of man?

Yes. ~~I~~/In two of these cases the knife wore out the

sheath. But the knife itself did not become rusty,

till the body was dead or infirm.

Why cannot we *make use* of these noble rising heroisms of our own day, instead of leaving them to rust?

They have nothing to do -

Are they to be employed in sitting in the

Drawing=Room, saying words which may as well

not be said, which they could say as well if *they*

were not there?

~~Oh Love! oh Intellect! oh Activity! ye sun,~~

~~moon & stars of human existence! are ye all set?~~

~~departed from my sky?~~

Women often strive to live by Intellect.

~~For seven years I lived in the light of the~~

~~moon. She was pale, it is true -~~ The clear, brilliant

sharp radiance of Intellect's moonlight rising upon

the expanse of snow ~~was~~/is dreary, it is true. But ~~±~~/some loved its

solemn desolation - its silence - its solitude -

if ~~I had been~~/they are but *allowed* to live in it - if ~~I had~~/they are

not

perpetually ~~been~~ baulked, & disappointed. But a

woman cannot live in the light of Intellect. Society

forbids it. Those conventional frivolities, which are

{in another hand: 19}

called her 'duties', forbid it. Her "domestic duties", high-sounding words, which, for the most part, are but bad habits, (which she has not the courage to enfranchise herself from, the strength to break through)- forbid it. What are these duties (or bad habits) - Answering a multitude of letters, which lead to nothing, from her so-called friends - keeping herself up to the level of the world that she may furnish her quota of amusement at the breakfast-table - driving out her company in the carriage. And all these things are exacted from her by her family which, if she is good & affectionate, will have more influence with her than the world.

{in another hand: illeg Numlauff?}

What wonder if, wearied out, sick at heart with hope deferred, the springs of will broken, not seeing clearly *where* her duty lies, she abandons Intellect as a vocation & takes it only, as we use the moon, by glimpses through her tight-closed window-shutters?

The family? It is too narrow a field for the development of an immortal Spirit, be that spirit male or female - The chances are a million to one that, in that ~~minute~~/small sphere, the task, for which that immortal spirit is destined by the qualities & the gifts which its Creator has placed within it, ~~should~~/will be found -

The family uses people, *not* for what they are, nor for what they are intended to be, ~~f~~ but for what it wants them for - for its own uses - It thinks of them not as what God has made them - but as the something which *it* has arranged that they shall be - If it wants some one to sit in the Drawing Room, *that* some one is to be supplied by a member of the family - though that member may be destined for Science or for Education or for active Superintendence by God, i.e. by the gifts within.

This system dooms some minds to incurable infancy, others to silent misery.

{in another hand: 20}

And family boasts that it has performed its mission well, in as far as it has enabled the individual to say, 'I have *no* peculiar work - nothing but what the moment brings me - nothing that I cannot throw up at once at any body's claim' - in as far, that is, as it has *destroyed* the individual life. And the individual thinks that a great victory has been accomplished, when, at last, she is able to say that she has "no personal desires or plans." What is this but throwing the gifts of God aside as worthless, & substituting for them those of the world?

Marriage is the only chance (& it is but a chance) offered to women for escape from this death - & ~~oh!~~ how eagerly & how ignorantly it is embraced!

At present, we live to impede each other's satisfactions - Competition, Domestic Life, Society, what is it all but ~~that~~/this? We go somewhere where we are not wanted & where we don't want to go. What else is Conventional Life? *Passivity* when we want to be active. So many hours spent every day in passivity doing what Conventional Life tells us - when we would so gladly be at work.

And is it a wonder that all individual life is extinguished?

{in another hand: out}

~~I lived seven years by the wax-lights of Conventional Society, striving to see the moonlight of Intellect. She does not warm - she is cold & dreary, with sharp harsh lights & blackest shadows - but oh! she is fair & brilliant, compared with the glare of the candles. — At the end of that time, I gave up the point, or rather, the point gave up me. And I began the dream of the lights.~~

{in another hand" 21}

~~I dreamt~~/Women dream of a great sphere of steady, not sketchy benevolence - of Moral Activity - for which ~~I should be~~/they would be trained & fitted - instead of working in the dark - ~~not~~/neither knowing & ~~not~~/nor registering whither ~~my steps led me~~,/their steps lead, whether farther from or nearer to ~~my~~/the aim.

For how do people exercise their moral activity now? We visit, we teach, we talk, among "the poor" - we are told 'don't look for the fruits, cast thy bread upon the waters: for thou shalt find it after many days.'

~~I say too~~,/Certainly "don't look", for you won't see - you will not find it'- & then you would strike work.

{written in a large circle in another hand: out}

Oh! How different would be the heart for the work, & how different would be the success! - if we learnt our work as a serious study & followed it out steadily as a Profession.

Were the Physician to set to work at *his* trade, as the Philanthropist ~~at his~~ does at his, how many bodies would he not spoil before he cured one?

Oh! True, ~~I had forgotten~~. We set the treatment of bodies so high above the treatment of souls that the Physician occupies a higher place in society than the Schoolmaster. The governess is to have every one of God's gifts - she is to do that which the mother herself is incapable of doing - but our son must not degrade himself by marrying the governess, nor our daughter the tutor, though she might marry the Medical Man.

{in another hand: Jones}

But my medical man does do something for me, ~~you say~~,/it is said, my tutor has done nothing. This is true, ~~that~~/this is the real reason. And what a condemnation of the state of Mental Science it is! ~~here!~~ Low as is Physical Science, that of the Mind is still lower.

Well, ~~I dreamed~~/Women long for an education (~~it was but a dream~~) to teach ~~me~~/them to teach, to teach ~~me~~/them the laws of the human mind & how to apply them - & knowing {in another hand: 22}

how imperfect, in the present state of the world,
 such an education must be - ~~I dreamed of/they long for experience,~~
 not patch=work experience - but experience followed
 up systematically to enable ~~me/~~them to know what ~~I was/~~they were
 about & ~~where I was/they are~~ "casting ~~my/~~their bread' & whether it
~~was/is 'bread' that I was 'casting'~~ - or a stone -

~~But vain, vain were all my dreams - killing/bitter my
 disappointments - heart sickening my struggles.~~

How ~~should you/should we~~ learn a language, if ~~you/we~~ were to give
 it

an hour a week? A fortnight's steady application
 would make more way in it than a year of such
 patch=work. ~~So was it with all my plans.~~ A "lady"
 can hardly go to "her school" two days running. She
 cannot leave the breakfast=table,- or she must be
 fulfilling some little frivolous "duty", which others
 ought not to exact, or which might just as well
 be done some other time.

~~Thus I lived for other seven years - d/Dreaming
 always - never accomplishing, thus women live - too much ashamed
 of my/their dreams, which I thought were/they think 'romantic', to
 tell them where I knew that they would to be laughed
 at, if not considered wrong. So I lived till my
 heart was broken. I am now an old woman at 30.~~

~~I do not say that, w/With greater strength of
 purpose I could not have/they might accomplished something -
 But if I had been a hero, I should not need to tell my
 story/if they were strong, all of them,
 they would not need to have their story told, for ~~then~~ all the world
 would~~

~~have~~ read it

in the mission ~~I should have/~~they have fulfilled - It is ~~because~~
~~I am a/~~for common=place, every=day characters that we
~~I~~ tell ~~my/~~our tale - because it is the sample of hundreds
 of lives (or rather deaths) of persons who cannot fight with
 Society, or who, unsupported by the sympathies about
 them, give up their own destiny as not worth the
 fierce & continued struggle necessary to accomplish
 it - One struggle they *could* make & be free - (&, in the
 {in another hand: 23)

Church of Rome, many, many, unallured by any other motive, make this one struggle to enter a Convent)- but the perpetual series of petty spars, - with ~~doubts & discouragements~~ between, & doubts as to whether they/~~you~~ are right, - these wears out the very life necessary to make them.

{in another hand: Grau}

~~So I lived then, for 7 years And, at the end of that time, I was dead. My pole=star was still in the sky - for it could not set. But my eyes were too dim to see it. I lost my way & perished.~~

If a man were to follow up his Profession or Occupation at odd times, how would he do it? Would he become skilful in that Profession? It is acknowledged by women themselves that they are inferior in every occupation to men. Is it wonderful? *They do everything at odd times* at "odd times" -

And, if a woman's music & drawing are only used by her as an amusement, - (a *pass=time*, as it is called), - is it wonderful that she tires of them, that she becomes disgusted with them?

~~During all these fourteen years, I had been waiting for my sun to rise - the sun of a perfect human sympathy - the Sun of Passion, as it is called not consciously looking out for it - our pride & our ignorance are alike too great for that - but unconsciously shadowing it in idea. - In every dream of the life of intelligence or that of activity, I was/women are accompanied by a phantom, or the phantom of Sympathy, nay warming me, guiding, me, lighting me. It was only {illeg mildew?}/the way even if they do not marry~~
it never reached, even in my own mind, reality

Some fear sacrifice/~~I sacrificed~~ marriage - because I-/they must ~~have~~ sacrificed all their life, ~~had I~~/if they accepted that. That man & woman have an equality of ~~right is even~~ duties & rights is accepted by woman even less than

by man. Behind *his* destiny woman must annihilate herself. ~~I felt that I knew that~~ I must be only his complement. A woman dedicates herself to the vocation of her husband. She fills up & performs the subordinate parts in it. But, if she has any destiny, any vocation of her own, she must renounce it, in nine cases out of ten. Some few, like Mrs. Somerville, Mrs. Chisholm, Mrs. Fry, have not done so - But these are exceptions. The fact is that woman has so seldom any vocation of her own that it does not signify. She has none to renounce. A man gains everything by marriage - He gains a "help=mate." But a woman does not.

~~I felt that I must choose, either to hold myself ready for sacrifice, if called upon, feelings, religious, social political (but when these were all gone, there would not be that much ----- of me left.) or I must sacrifice love & marriage. I preferred the latter. And now I have lost all - the prize is the penalty - the crown I ran for & the way-side happiness I despised - And I am dead -~~
~~I dared presumptuously to measure my strength - And it has been found wanting.~~
~~I have fallen so that I now regret even the conventional importance of marriage.~~
~~The glory has departed. The life is gone out of me.~~
~~I now only recognise my existence but by suffering. Otherwise I should believe that I was dead. I cannot even remember the motives which caused me to overstep the easy landing-place of marriage -~~
~~I have lost even the memory of my former self.~~
 {in another hand: 25}

~~— Once only did I recover the sentiment of my vocation
the recollection of former springs of action.~~

~~— Those dreams of a human sympathy had pursued
me day & night - tortured & driven me to within a hair's
breadth of losing all consciousness of actual existence.
I now think that I should have done better to satisfy
them at any price - But it was too late.~~

~~— When all was lost, I was called for three months
(it was the only romantic incident of my life) to~~

~~see & nurse~~ But if ever woman ever comes into contact with sickness &
crime & poverty in masses,
how the practical reality of life revives/d me. ~~I was/~~they! They are
exhausted, like ~~a man,~~/those who ~~has~~ lived on opium or
on novels - all ~~his life/~~their lives - exhausted with feelings
which ~~led/lead~~ to no action. ~~Here I came in contact with/~~If they see &
enter into

a continuous line of action, with a full & interesting
life, ~~but~~ with training constantly kept up to the
occupation, occupation constantly testing the training,
It ~~was/~~is the beau ideal of practical, not theoretical
education - ~~I was/~~they are re-tempered - ~~my intellect & activity~~
~~satisfied - I had/~~they have found ~~my/~~their work, & the means to do
it.

~~I remember when I was/~~ Women, when they are young, ~~I used to/~~often think
that an actress's life ~~might be~~ a very happy one-
Not for the sake of the admiration, not for the sake
of the fame, - ~~I did not think of that -~~ But, because
in the morning she studied, - in the evening she
embodied those studies - She had the means of
testing them by practice, of correcting them by
incarnation - & of resuming her studies in the
morning, to improve the weak part, remedy the
failures - {illeg} &, in the evening try the corrections again.

~~In this way, I thought,~~/It is indeed true that, even after middle age with
such exercise of faculty there ~~was/~~is no end to the
progress which ~~might/~~may be made."
{in another hand: 26}

~~“But why, why,” said I at last “can’t you be satisfied with this life, which so many love & enjoy? I never wanted five minutes’ solitude, I wanted a profession, why do you?”~~

~~“And I (a pause) to stop this little breath & with it all this load of misery, — how often have I been tempted to do it?”~~

~~“And why don’t you?” — “what has held you back?”~~

Many are only deterred from suicide because it is more than anything else to saying to God “I won’t — I won’t/I will not - I will not do as you/Thou wouldst have me” - & because it is “no use”.

~~“Well, but tell me, tell me the cause of this misery — I can’t understand it. You have told me a great deal, & yet I can only say, ‘Is that all?’”~~
{in another hand: p. 3 D 3. d}

To have no food for my/our heads, no food for my/our hearts, no food for my/our activity - ~~And you call~~ is that ~~not enough/nothing?~~ Oh! †/If we have no food for the body, how we cry out, how all the world hears of it, how all the newspapers talk of it with a paragraph headed in great capital letters, DEATH FROM STARVATION! But §/suppose †/one were to put a paragraph in the “Times”, *Death of the Mind/Thought from Starvation or Death of Moral Activity from Starvation*, how people would stare, how they would laugh & wonder! One would think we had no heads or hearts, by the total indifference of the public towards them. Our bodies are the only things of the least consequence.”

~~“Well, but just tell me what you complain of,” said I — “I am sure I don’t know.” — Still I cannot see.”~~

†/We have nothing to do which raises me/us - no food which agrees with me/us. †/We can never pursue any object for a single two hours! for †/we can never command any regular leisure or solitude” — and

in Social or Domestic Life,

{in another hand: 27}

~~"But cannot you do anything with anybody in the room? If not, the best advice I can give you is to learn as soon as possible - School-boys do"~~

~~"But in Social or Domestic Life, every body reads aloud out of their own book or newspaper & one is bound, under pain of being thought sulky, to make a remark or to speak every two minutes."~~

~~"Yes, to be sure, one might as well be alone if one is to sit mute."~~

~~"You see, you/Men are on the side of Society, You/They blow hot & cold- you/they say, 'why can't you employ yourself in Society?' and then, 'why don't you talk in Society?' I can pursue a connected conversation, or I can be silent - but to drop a remark, as it is called, every two minutes, how wearisome it is! It is impossible to pursue the current of one's own thoughts because one must keep oneself ever on the alert 'to say something' - & it is impossible to say what one is thinking, because the essence of a remark is not to be a thought, but an impression. With what labour I/women have laboured to break down all individual & independent life in order to fit myself/themselves for this social & domestic existence, thinking it right. And now that I/when they have killed myself/themselves to do it, I/they have awakened (too late) - to think it wrong.~~

~~For now I/after in life women could not make use of Leisure & Solitude, if I/they had it! Like the Chinese woman - who could not make use of her feet, if she were brought into European life.~~

~~I was born with/Many women have an attention like a battering=ram which, slowly brought to bear, could/can work upon a subject for any length of time. I could {in another hand: 28}~~

They can work ten hours as well as two upon the same thing. But this ~~age is~~/age would have men like the musket which you can load so fast that nothing but its taking fire puts any limit to the number & frequency of times of firing - & at as many different objects as you please -

{in another hand: Herriday}

~~Now I~~/So, later in life, people cannot use ~~my~~/their battering=ram.

~~My~~/Their

attention, like Society's, goes off in a thousand different directions. ~~I~~/They are an hour before ~~I~~/they can fix it, & by the time it is fixed, the leisure is gone. ~~I~~/They become incapable of consecutive or strenuous work.

What ~~I~~/they suffered from the want of such work no one can tell - Even physically. The accumulation of nervous energy, which had had nothing to do during the day, ~~made me~~/makes them feel every night, when ~~I went~~/they go to bed, as if ~~I~~/they were going mad, And ~~I was~~/they are obliged to lie long in bed in the morning to let it evaporate & keep it down.

~~Now I am~~/At last they are suffering at once of disgust of the one & incapacity for the other, from loathing of conventional idleness & powerlessness to do work when ~~I~~/they have got it. 'Now go, you have several hours' say people, 'you have all the afternoon to yourself.' Yes, ~~w~~/When ~~I am~~/they are all frittered away, ~~I am~~/they are to begin to work - when ~~I am~~/they are broken up into little bits, ~~I am~~/they are to hew away.

~~Oh! call me no more Nofriari, call me Cassandra. For I have preached & prophesied in vain. I have gone about crying all these many years Woe to the people! And no one has listened or believed. And now I cry, Woe to myself! For upon me the destruction has come."~~

{in another hand: 29}

~~"Oh world! oh life! oh time.~~

~~On whose last steps I climb,~~

~~Trembling at the where I had stood before-~~

~~When shall return the glory of your prime?~~

~~No more - oh never more!"~~

~~"Yes," she said to me one day, "I feel that my youth is gone. I used to laugh at the poets' {illeg} description of the {illeg} of youth & say that I had never felt anything like that. But now I see the great difference between Youth & Middle Age - Before, I suffered - but I always thought that I *should* carry out my scheme - I lived but for that. I lived upon desire, upon the dream of my hopes fulfilled. Now I see that I never shall fulfill them - I have lost the vigour to hope - the zest to desire - the sap to dream. I have come even to regret the enjoyments which I thought unworthy of me, even to pick up as I went by.~~

Moral Activity? why there is not/scarcely such a thing possible! Every thing is sketchy - The world does nothing but sketch. One Lady Bountiful sketches a school - but it never comes to a finished study - she can hardly work at it two weeks consecutively - Here & there a solitary individual, it is true, makes a really careful study- as Mrs. Chisholm of Emigration - ~~as Mrs. Dawes of a school Education as Mrs. Fry of Prisons/Miss Carpenter of Reformatory Discipline - But general~~ a "lady" has too many sketches on hand- she has a sketch of Society - a sketch of her children's education - sketches of her 'charities' - sketches of

reading - She is like a painter who should have five pictures in his '~~{illeg}~~/Studio' at once, & giving now a stroke to one, & then a stroke to another - till he had made the whole round should continue this routine to the ~~would he paint,~~ do you think?

~~Alas!~~ a/All life is sketchy - the Poet's verse - (compare Tennyson, Milnes & Mrs. Browning with Milton or even Byron - it is not the difference of genius which strikes you/one so much as the unfinished state of these modern sketches, compared with the studies of the old Masters). The artist's picture - the author's composition - all are rough, imperfect, incomplete, even as works of art?

And how can it be otherwise? A 'Leader' out of a newspaper, an article out of a Review, five books read aloud in the course of an evening, such is our literature - What mind can stand three leading articles every morning as its food?

~~Alas! for Moral Activity!~~ w/When shall we see a woman making a *study* of what she does? Married women cannot - for a man would think, if his ~~woman~~/wife undertook any great work, with the intention of carrying it out, - of making anything but a sham of it, - that she would 'suckle his fools' & 'chronicle his small beer' less well for it - that he would not have so good a dinner but that she would destroy, as it is called, his domestic life.

~~And I, who dreamed of Institutions to shew women their work & to train them how to do it - to give them an object & to incline their wills to follow it - I, in whom thoughts of this kind put aside the thought of marriage, who sacrificed my individual future for great hopes, glimpses of~~ {in another hand: 31}

~~a great general future, I have fallen so low that I can only/look back with a sigh even after the conventional dignity of a married woman, the vulgar incident of the pomp & circumstance of marriage & say with a sigh, 'Such might have been mine, if I had chosen!'~~

~~Yes, I thought that I could despise Passion - I thought t/The intercourse of man & woman, how frivolous, how unworthy it is! Can you/we call that the true vocation of woman, her high career? I †/Looked round at the marriages which †/you know; & I said, t/The true marriage, that noble union by which a man & woman become together the one perfect being, probably does not exist at present upon earth~~

~~I am/It is not surprised/ing that husbands & wives seem so little part of one another, I am surprised/it is surprising that there is so much love as there is. For I see/there is no food for it. I don't know w/What does it lives upon, - what nourishes it? Husbands & wives never seem to have anything to say to one another - What do they talk about? Not about any of the great religious, social, political questions & feelings. They talk about who shall come to dinner, - who is to live in this lodge & who in that - about the improvement of the place - or when they shall go to London. If there are children, they form a common subject of some nourishment - But, even then, the case is oftenest thus - the husband is to think of how they are to 'get on' in life, the wife of bringing them up at home -~~

But any real communion between husband & wife - any descending into the depths of their being & drawing out thence what they find
{in another hand: 32}

there & comparing it, do we ever dream of such a thing? Yes, we may dream of it during the season of "passion", but we shall not find it afterwards. We even expect it to go off, & lay our account that it will. If the husband has, by chance, gone into the depths of *his* being & found anything there unorthodox, he, oftenest, conceals it carefully from his wife, he is afraid of "unsettling her opinions" - of ~~'shocking her feelings.'~~

What is the mystery of Passion, spiritually speaking? For there is ~~what is~~ a Passion of the spirit - *Blind* passion, as it has most truly been called, ~~it~~ seems to come on, in man without his exactly knowing why, without his at all knowing why for *this* person rather than for *that*, and (whether it has been satisfied or unsatisfied) to go off again after a while, as it came, also without his knowing why.

[in another hand: Mays]

The woman's passion is generally more lasting. It is possible that this difference may be, because there is really more in man than in woman. There is nothing in her for him to have this intimate communion *with*. He cannot impart to her his religious beliefs, if he have any, because she would be "shocked". Religious men are & must be heretical now - for we must not pray, except in a "form: of words, made beforehand - or think of God but ~~in~~/with a pre=arranged idea.

With the man's political ideas, if they extend beyond the merest Party Politics, she has no sym= pathy.

His Social ideas, if they are "advanced", she will probably denounce without knowing why, as savouring of "Socialism" (a convenient word, which covers a multitude of new ideas & offences) & feel that they will lead to a "community of women". For woman is "born a Tory" as has been often said.

Woman has nothing but her affections - & these at once make her more loving & less loved.

{in another hand: Crimmon}

But is it surprising that there should be so little real marriage, when we think what the process is which leads to marriage?

Under the eyes of an always present mother & sisters (of whom even the most refined & intellectual, cannot refrain from a jest on the subject, & ~~who~~ ~~the mother at least,~~ who thinks it their *duty* to be anxious, † to watch every germ & bud of it-) the acquaintance begins. It is fed - upon what? - the gossip of Art, musical & pictorial - the party politics of the day - the chit=chat of Society - & people marry - or sometimes they don't marry, discouraged ~~by~~/with the impossibility of knowing any more of one another than this will furnish.

They prefer to marry in *thought*, to hold imaginary conversations with one another in idea, rather than, on such a flimsy pretext of communion, to take the chance (*certainty* it cannot be) of having more to say to one another in marriage.

Men & women meet now *to be idle* - is it extraordinary that they do not know each other, & ~~so~~/that in their mutual ignorance, they form no surer friendships? Did they meet to *do* something together, then indeed they might form some real tie.

But, as it is, *they* are not there, it is only a mask, which is there, ~~a talker~~ a mouth=piece of ready=made sentences about the "topics of the day," ~~which you see~~. And then people rail against men for choosing a woman "for her face' - why what else do they see?

It is very well to say 'be prudent, be careful, try to know each other'- But how are you to know each other?

{in another hand: 34}

Unless a woman has lost all pride, unless she has the impudence of that which we must not name, how is it possible for her, under the eyes of all her family, to indulge in long exclusive conversations with a man? Such a thing must not take place till after her 'engagement'. And how is she to make an engagement, is such a thing has not taken place?

Besides, young women at home have so little to occupy & to interest them- they have so little reason for *not* quitting their home that a young & independent man cannot look at a girl, without giving rise to 'expectations' - if not on her own part, on that of her people. Happy he, if he is not said to have been 'trifling with her feelings,' or 'disappointing her hopes'! Under these circumstances, how can a man, who has any pride or any principle, become acquainted with a woman in such a manner as to *justify* them in marrying?"

~~"Yet people do marry," said I,~~

~~"Yes, people have married," said I, "& we do see them marrying even now."~~

-There are four ways in which people marry - First, accident or relationship has thrown them together in their childhood - & acquaintance has grown naturally & unconsciously- Accordingly, in Novels, it is generally cousins who marry - And ~~I confess that~~ now it seems ~~to me~~ the only natural thing - the only possible way of making an intimacy. And yet, we know that intermarriage between relations is in direct contravention of the laws of nature for the well-being of the race - vide the Quakers, the Spanish grandees, the royal races, the secluded vallies of mountainous countries - {in another hand: 35}

where madness, degeneration of race, defective organization & Cretinism flourish & multiply.

~~The laws of Nature have said, 'Marry your cousin, be happy, & cause the race to degenerate.'~~"

~~— "And have they said, Marry a foreigner & be miserable & improve the race?"~~

~~— Something like it, I believe/I believe so, or pretty nearly so. The~~

second

way, & by far the most general, in which people marry, is this - A woman, thoroughly uninterested at home, & having formed a slight acquaintance with some accidental person, accepts him, if he 'falls in love' with her, as it is technically called, & takes the chance - Hence the vulgar expression of Marriage being a lottery, which it most truly is - for, that the *right* two should come together has as many chances against it as there are blanks in a Lottery -

The third way is that some person is found sufficiently independent, sufficiently careless of the opinions of others, or sufficiently without modesty to speculate thus, 'It is worth while that I should become acquainted with so & so. I do not care what his or her opinion of me is, if, *after* having become acquainted, to do which can bear no other construction in people's eyes than a desire of marriage, I retreat - ~~I do not care what others think of me - It is worth while.'~~ But there is this to be said that it is doubtful whether, under this unnatural tension which, to all susceptible characters, such a disregard of the opinions which they care for, must be - a healthy or a natural feeling can grow up -

And now they are married - that is to say, two people have received the license of a man {in another hand: 36}

in a white surplice - But they are no more man & wife for that than Louis XIV & the Infanta of Spain, married by proxy, were man & wife - The woman is as often a prostitute as a wife - She prostitutes herself, if she has sold her person for an establishment, as much as if she had sold it in the streets. ~~She prostitutes herself, if, knowing so little of her husband as she does, she begins, immediately, without further acquaintance, to allow him the rights of a husband over her person.~~ - She prostitutes herself ~~later~~ if, against her own desire, she allows herself to be made the blind instrument of producing involuntary children - It will be said - & truly - that, when she marries, her husband understands all these privileges as granted - & that she would drive him mad & deceive his understood expectation, if she did not grant them - But how is she to ascertain her husband's opinion on these points before marriage?

{in another hand: Dartnell}

Lastly, in a few rare, very rare cases, such as circumstances, always provided in Novels, but seldom to be met with in real life, present ~~or~~ -whether the accident of parents' neglect, or of parents at all, which is ~~again~~ generally the case in Novels - or marrying out of the person's rank of life, by which the usual restraints are removed, & there is room & play left for attraction - or extraordinary events, isolation, misfortunes, which ~~I am sure that~~ many wish for, even though their imaginations be not tainted by romance-reading - such alternatives as these give food & space for the development of character & mutual sympathies.

{in another hand: 37}

But a girl, if she has any pride, is so ashamed of having something she wishes to say out of the hearing of her own family, she thinks it must be something so very wrong that it is ten to one, if she ~~have~~/has the opportunity of saying it, that she will not.

And yet, she is spending her life, perhaps, in dreaming of accidental means of unrestrained communion.

And then it is thought ~~chastely~~ pretty to say that 'women have no passion' - If passion is excitement in the daily social intercourse with men, ~~I am sure that~~ women think about marriage much more than men do - it is the only event of their lives - It ought to be a sacred event, but surely not the only event of a woman's life, as it is now - ~~when~~ many women spend their lives in asking men to marry them, in a refined way. Yet it is true, ~~I believe,~~ that women are seldom in love - How can they be?

~~Oh! h/~~How cruel are the revulsions which high-minded women suffer! ~~I remember, on the ruins of Palmyra, amid the wrecks of worlds & palaces & temples, thinking of/~~There was one ~~I had~~ who loved, in connection with great deeds, noble thoughts, devoted feelings. She saw ~~him/the~~ man again. It was at one of those crowded parties of Civilization which we call Society- His ~~words were,~~ only careless, passing remark way, "The bar tonight is like a
manufactory

~~Yet that man loved me still --~~ Yet he loved her -

~~And now, I have soon done with this world -
The life of it has departed from me."~~
{in another hand: 38}

"L'enthousiasme & la faiblesse
d'un temps où l'intelligence
monte très haut, entraîné"

V. par l'imagination, & tombe
très bas, écrasé par une
réalité, sans poésie & sans
grandeur."

~~And now I/Women dream till they have no longer the strength to dream,~~
those dreams, against which ~~I did/they~~ so struggle, so
honestly, vigorously & conscientiously & so in vain -
which ~~I did/they~~ do so curse in their time - & which ~~I now~~
~~know were my life/are~~ their life, without which ~~I/they~~ could not have
lived. those dreams ~~are gone/go~~ at last - all ~~my/their~~ plans &
visions seem vanished - & ~~I/they~~ know not where - gone
& ~~I/they~~ cannot recall them. ~~I/They~~ do not even remember
them - and ~~I am/they~~ are left without the food either of
reality or of hope.

Late in life, ~~I/they~~ neither desire nor dream ~~now~~ - neither of
activity, nor of love, nor of intellect - ~~Yes t/The~~ last often
~~has~~ survived the longest. ~~I should like,/They~~ wish, if ~~my/their~~
experiences would benefit anybody, to give them to
some one. But ~~I/they~~ never find an hour free in which
to collect ~~my/their~~ thoughts - & so discouragement becomes
ever deeper & deeper - & ~~I/they~~ less & less capable of
undertaking anything -

~~Oh! m/Miserable fate of the woman/women! It seems~~
~~to me, when I hear that eternal wind sighing &~~
~~lamenting I know not where as if it were the~~
female spirit of the world were mourning everlastingly
over blessings - not lost, but which she has never
had, - & which, in her discouragement, she feels that
she never will have, they are so far off."

~~"But why do not other women feel this?"~~

"The more complete ~~her/woman's~~ organization, the more
she will feel it - till at last there ~~will come/shall~~ arise a
woman, who will resume, in her own ~~person/soul~~,
all the sufferings of her race - & that woman
will be the Saviour of her race -

Jesus Christ raised ~~us/women~~ above the condition of
mere slaves, mere ministers to the passions of the man
{in another hand: 39}

raised ~~up~~ them by His sympathy, to be ministers of God - He gave them "Moral Activity" - But the Age, - the World - Humanity must give ~~us~~/them the means to exercise this moral activity, must give ~~us~~/them intellectual cultivation, spheres of action.

There is perhaps no century where the woman shews so meanly as in this - Because her education seems entirely to have parted company with her vocation. ~~I mean that~~/There is no longer unity between the woman as inwardly developed, & she, as outwardly manifested, ~~no longer any parallel.~~

In the last century, it was not so. In the succeeding one, let us hope that it will no longer be so -

But now she is like the Archangel Michael as he stands upon Sant'Angelo at Rome. She has an immense provision of wings, which seem as if they would bear her over earth & heaven - but when she tries to use them, ~~to~~ she is petrified into stone, her feet are grown into the earth, chained to the bronze pedestal.

Nothing can well be imagined more painful than the present position of woman - unless, on the one hand, she renounces all outward activity & keeps herself within the ~~sphere~~/magic sphere, the bubble of her dreams - or, on the other, surrendering all aspiration, she gives herself to her real life - soul & body. For those to whom it is possible, ~~I~~ ~~recommend~~ the latter is best. For out of activity may come thought. Out of mere aspiration can come nothing.

But now, - when the young imagination is so high & so developed - & reality is so narrow & conventional, - there is no more parallelism between life in the thought & life in the actual than between the {in another hand: 40}

corpse, which lies motionless in its narrow bed, & the Spirit, which, in our imagination, is at large among the stars.

The ideal life is passed in noble schemes of good consecutively followed up, - of devotion to a great object - of sympathy given & received for high ideas & generous feelings - The actual life is passed in sympathy given & received for a dinner, a party, a piece of furniture, a house built or a garden laid out well - in devotion to your guests, - (a too real devotion, for it implies that ~~sacrifice~~ of all your time) - in schemes of schooling for the poor, which you follow up perhaps in an odd quarter of an hour, between luncheon & driving out in the carriage - broth & dripping are included in the plan - & the rest of your time goes in ordering the dinner, hunting for a governess for your children, & sending pheasants & apples to your poorer relations. Is there anything in *this* life which can be called an Incarnation of the ideal life within? Is it a wonder that the ~~unfortunate~~/unhappy woman should prefer to keep them entirely separate? not to take the bloom off her Ideal by mixing it up with her Actual - not to make her Actual still more unpalatable by trying to *inform* it with her Ideal? And then she is blamed, & her own sex unites against her, for not being content with the "day of small things" - she is told that "trifles make the sum of human things" - they do indeed - she is contemptuously asked, "would she abolish domestic life?" Men are afraid that their ~~dinners~~/houses will not be so comfortable, that their wives will make themselves {in another hand: 41}

~~so good~~/*'remarkable'*, women that they will make themselves distasteful to men - they write books (& very wisely) to teach themselves to dramatize "little things", to persuade themselves that "domestic life is their sphere" to idealize the "sacred hearth" - Sacred it is indeed ~~virgin~~/sacred from the touch of their sons almost as soon as they are out of childhood - (f/From its dulness & its tyrannous trifling *these recoil*-)~~virgin~~/sacred from the grasp of their daughters' affections, upon which it has so light a hold that they seize the first opportunity of marriage - *their* only chance of emancipation - the "sacred hearth", sacred to their husbands' sleep, their sons' absence in the body & their daughters in mind.

{in another hand: Gran}

Oh! mothers, who talk about this hearth, how much do you know of your sons' real life-how much of your daughters' imaginary one? Awake, ye women, all ye that sleep. awake - if this domestic life were so very good, would your young men wander away from it, your maidens think of something else?

The time is come when women must do something more than the 'domestic hearth', which means nursing the infants, keeping a pretty house, having a good dinner & an entertaining party -

You say, 'it is true, our young men see visions, & our maidens dream dreams, but what of? Does not the woman intend to marry & have over again what she has at home? & the man ultimately too? Yes, but not the same - she *will* have the same - that is, if circumstances are not

{in another hand: 42}

altered to prevent it - but her *ideal* is very different - though that ideal ~~will never come~~ & that reality will never come together to mould each other.

VI

~~"Well," said I, "We are now going into the world/We live in the world, it is said, & walk in its ways. & if you would cease quarrelling with it, & would open your eyes to its joys, which you don't seem inclined to do, I think you might make yourself very tolerably happy."~~

~~— This was a cruel speech, I admit, - to such deep discouragement, such old griefs as hers - But it was my true one/impression, & good advice too. She answered me never a~~

~~word~~
but, in the course of the evening, she said,

~~"I wonder whether/Was Christ was called a complainer against the world? Yet all these great teachers & preachers must have had a most deep & ingrained sense, a continual gnawing feeling of the miseries & wrongs of the world. Otherwise they would not have been impelled to devote life & death to redress them. Christ, Socrates, Howard, they must have had no ear for the joys, compared to that which they had for the sorrows of the world."~~

~~"Ah! but," I said, t/They acted however & we complain."~~

~~"Yes," she cried, "I suppose that is the difference. The great reformers of the world turn into the great misanthropists, if circumstances or organizations do not permit them to act - Christ, if He had been a woman, might have been nothing but a great complainer. Peace be with the misanthropists. in another hand: 43}~~

They have made a step in progress - The next will make them great philanthropists - They are divided but by a line -

The next Christ will perhaps be a female Christ, I believe But I do not/we see one woman who looks like a female Christ? ~~I don't see any one who looks, in the least, like her Precursor even - If I could see one, I would be/or even like "the messenger before" her "face", to go before her & prepare the hearts & minds for her?~~

~~"Now I don't wonder," said I, "at your being unhappy. If you have that insane ambition to be a Christ or a John the Baptist! Do you know that To this will be answered that half the inmates of Bedlam begin in that/this way, by~~

fancying that they were/are "the Christ.?"

~~"Yes," she said, "that is just like you all. You People talk about imitating Christ & you imitate Him in the little trifling formal things, such as washing the feet, saying his prayer & so on. But, if any one attempts the real imitation of Him, there are no bounds to the outcry with which the presumption of that person is condemned."~~

~~"Presumption indeed! It is mad pride, downright insanity!"~~

~~"For instance, Christ was saying something to the people one day, which interested Him very much & interested them very much - And Mary & his brothers came in the middle of it, & wanted to interrupt him, to take him home to dinner very likely (how natural that story is! I want to/does it not speak more home than any of the Gospels' reality) & he, instead of being angry with their interruption of Him in such {there are four lines blanked out and impossible to read}~~

an important work for some trifling thing, answers, "Who is my mother? & who are my brethren? Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother & sister & mother.' But, if we were to say that, we should be accused of 'destroying the family tie' - of diminishing the obligation of the 'home duties'.

He might well say "Heaven & earth shall pass away - but my words shall not pass away." His words will never pass away. ~~Only think -~~ If he had said, "Tell them that I am engaged at this moment in something very important - that the instruction of the multitude ought to go before any personal ties - that I will remember to come when I have done" - no one would have been impressed by His words - But how striking is that, "Behold my mother & my brethren!"

{in another hand: go on to p 10}

{there appears to be a text written underneath}

VII

~~Before I go on, I had better tell who "I" am. My name is Fariseo. I am one of those, who are called the Cynics of the age, who openly confess their own selfishness, admit the want of the times, & preach that we should bear with them making this confession, not with sorrow of heart nor well-trained resignation, but without shame & without difficulty, as, on the whole, the best state of mind -- I am the brother of poor Nofriari, & I tell her story as she told it me one day when I blamed her for not finding her happiness in life as I & her cotemporaries have done, & she answered that I did not know whether her life had been such that she could either find happiness in it or alter it. I made some few notes of our conversation, for it occurred a short time only before her death - My poor sister! She died at 30 - wearied of life, in which she could do nothing & having ceased to live the intellectual life long before she was deserted by the physical life - I saw her on her death-bed, & giving way to the tears & exclamation natural on such occasions, was answered by her~~

~~The dying woman to her mourners.~~

~~"Oh! if you knew how gladly I leave this life, how much more courage I feel to take the chance of another than of anything I see before me in this, you would put on your wedding=clothes instead of mourning for me!~~

f287

~~-60-~~

"But," ~~I said~~/they say, "so much talent/.! so many gifts! such good which you might have done!"

"The world will be put back some little time by my death," she ~~says~~/said, "you see I estimate my powers at least as highly as you can - but it is by the death which has taken place some years ago in me, not by the death which is about to take place now - And ~~S~~/so is the world put back by the death of every one who has to sacrifice the development of his or her ~~own~~ peculiar gifts ~~to conventionalty~~. (which were meant, not for selfish gratification, but for the improvement of that world) to conventionalty.

My people were like children playing on the shore of the 18th century. I was their hobby-horse, their plaything - And they drove me to & fro, dear souls! never weary of the play themselves, till I, who had grown to woman's estate & to the ideas of the 19th century, lay down exhausted, my mind closed to hope, my heart to strength, & all was still & dark & dreary.

~~She lay for some time silent - Starting up & standing upright for the first time for many months, she stretched out her arms & cried, "free - free -oh! divine Freedom, art thou come at last? Welcome, beautiful Death!" She fell forward on her face - She was dead.~~

~~One of her last requests had been that Let neither name nor date should be placed on {in another hand: 47}~~

f288

her grave - still less the expression of regret or of admiration - but simply the words, "I believe in God."

Add Mss 45840; drafts and proof sheets; no comments in Cassandra section; proof sheets with no title page, only one column wide. 65 pages Cup 401 I 8 (1) Adam Matthew reel 53.

Proof sheets for Suggestions, with John Stuart Mill (JSM) side comments

Each volume has Mill's handwritten name on, J. Stuart Mill at bottom right, and FN's "Confidential" at top

f9v (1:4) [1:5 full page]

FN: re God of Hebrews, one supreme God

JSM: They believed that their God was superior to the others & was the Creator of the world.

f10 (1:5) [1:7 full page]

FN: In this age...by far the greater proportion of mankind...have turned their faces to atheism or at least to *theism*.

JSM: qu. Deism. It seems better to reserve "theism" for the reverse of Atheism.

f10v (1:6) [1:8 full page]

FN: [re existence of the Holy Ghost as a real existence]

JSM: If these paragraphs be retained at all, would it not be better to convert them into a note? In the text, they interrupt the tenor of the argument & send the reader's mind wandering among the mysteries of Xtianity.

f13 (1:11) [1:15 full page]

FN: It is true, some of those called the most cultivated of the human race, Descartes, Laplace, Hume, have not been able to conceive of a God at all.

JSM: There must, I think, be some mistake here about Descartes. He not only believed but thought he had proved the existence of a God *a priori*.

f16 (1:17) [1:26 full page]

FN: For is it not our experience of law that it *always* springs from a will, from a purpose?

JSM: only appears true from the double meaning of the word *law*.

f31 (1:47) [1:71 full page]

FN: [re a creature made to do things by God's direct volition] not by his own will, for he has no will,

JSM: It would be by his will, though that will might be regulated for him.

f32v (1:50) [1:76 full page]

FN: could we imagine what is probably a contradiction, viz., man necessitated to think or feel or desire this or that by the immediate will of God, he would be a machine with the attributes of a human being.

JSM: [beside text] This is an argument one would only have expected from the "free will" people.

[in bottom margin]

A "machine" with the attributes of a human being would be no machine in any but a good sense. A steam engine which *wills* to do what it does would be, as to action, like a highly efficient & capable man, intent on doing his duty. After all, you held that our volitions are as much "necessitated" as they would be in this hypothesis.

f33 (1:51) [1:76 full page]

FN: It is in man's power to raise his race to the standard of Newtons and St. Pauls. And can he do this if he remain a machine?

JSM: why *not*, if it is done by the instrumentality of his feelings, intentions & will?

f34v (1:54) [1:81 full page]

FN: That a man is blind implies some ignorance of physical law, either on his own part or on that of those who preceded him.

JSM: What if he is struck blind by lightning?

f35 (1:55) [1:83 full page]

FN: Never let us give our belief unless our reason, feeling, conscience, are all satisfied; even though we cannot satisfy reason...

JSM: How do we know that the constitution of the world must be such as to satisfy our feeling & conscience?

f41 (1:67) [1:101 full page]

FN: or willing an *imperfect*, with such a degree of value as could be imparted to it by its being a passive recipient from God.

JSM: If the will is perfect, the (moral) being is perfect, howsoever the will became so.

f49v (1:84) [1:128 full page]

FN: Thus, seeking to avoid contradictions in the ruling spirit, seeking consistency, a continued existence suggests itself to us.

JSM: But why must there be no contradictions in the ruling spirit? or why not a plurality of spirits, acting in different purposes?

f51 (1:87) [1:133 full page]

FN: every wish, every act must be right as certainly, and *as much without exercise of their own free will*.

JSM: but it would be *by* their own will.

f53v (1:92) [1:141 full page]

FN: For a man may put an end to his service, if dissatisfied with it.

JSM: not if he has taken his wages.

f55 (1:95) [1:145 full page]

FN: Law neither explains nor compels.

JSM: Then how does Law prove a legislator?

f56v (1:98) [1:151 full page]

FN: Surely if you were bringing up a child, you would not wish it to make a free choice whether it will be a murderer or not.

JSM: this answers the doctrine in p. 50.

f62v (1:110) [1:169 full page]

FN: He always speaks plain in His *laws*...His everlasting voice.

JSM: laws many of which *could* not have been known to countless generations; and many are not yet known of.

f63v (1:112) [1:172 full page]

FN: "My poor child," He says, doest thou complain that I do not prematurely give thee food which thou couldst not digest?

JSM: Since man can only learn God's laws progressively, why is he punished from the beginning for his ignorance of those which such punishing cannot possibly teach him?

f68 (1:121) [1:186 full page]

FN: [Comte] ascribes to *law* the power of *explaining* how all modes of existence...

JSM: not of *explaining*, only of *stating*.

f68v (1:122) [1:188 full page]

FN: But Comte is the only *man* of thought and of excellent nature, in whom we realize the entire absence of belief in a Being superior to man.

JSM: There have been and now are many such.

FN: *Comte* says "this is to prove that there is no God."

JSM: Comte distinctly says that we cannot prove that there is no God, and he rejects the title of Atheist.

f75v (1:136) [1:208 full page]

Responsibility does exist between two things.

JSM: How does it appear that responsibility cannot exist unless undertaken voluntarily?

f79 (1:143) [1:219 full page]

FN: Responsibility, in the received understanding of the word. implies conditions offered and accepted, implies "answering."

JSM: I apprehend it only implies *having to answer*.

f119 (2:15)

JSM [corrects typo who/whom]

mis-print for *who*

f124 (2:25) [2:38 full page]

FN: "so that it was more than 300 years since the Greeks had had any true religion."

JSM: The Stoics had a religion.

f124v (2:26) [2:40 full page]

FN: "Yet such is the vagueness of men that *this* [consider the laurel how it

grows] is preached one day in the seven and the other six days the board of guardians preaches something quite different.

JSM: To all appearances Christ meant it only for his own immediate followers.

f135 (2:47) [2:72 full page]

FN: Nobody ever thinks of such a thing, unless, indeed, there is exercise of some faculty.

JSM: special & rare

JSM [corrects a typo of Goëthe to replace the ë with] e

f143v (2:64) [2:98 full page]

FN We believe that God's whole purpose is that man should learn (of himself) to be God.

JSM: qu. *like*

f158 (2:93) [2:142 full page]

FN: *Punishment would be done away with* and means would be taken for reformation.

JSM: non constat. The suffering of one *from others* may be a necessary means of the progression of the race, like the suffering of one from inanimate nature.

f176v (2:130) [2:198 full page]

corrects typo predicated from a knowledge JSM: predicted

f180 (2:137) [2:208 full page]

FN: For is not mercy the only goodness which society can apprehend, while we still conceive the idea of *punishment*, still have the word at all, instead of reformation. X

JSM: But is not one agent of the reformation of *many*, the punishment of one? though it ought to be the reformation of him too.

[2:209 full page]

FN: We know that the second of these objects is not attained, X

JSM: Not completely attained, that it is to a considerable degree attained. It is the gallows in the background that gives most of its efficacy to the other moralizing agencies with the very low. It establishes an association of horror with extreme wickedness.

f180v (2:138) [re stimulating passion] [2:210 full page]

FN: You must not gratify this is a legitimate way, under pain of exciting our censure--the illegitimate satisfaction is the only one we allow.

JSM: I am afraid society is more chargeable with encouraging him to gratify it in what is called a legitimate way.

f231v

JSM [corrected typo with with]

dele

f263 (3:37) [3:58 full page]

FN: We assert that no nature but that of God the Father can exist; and yet, if no other nature existed, He would not be God.

JSM: The contradiction is not fully made out. All that would follow is that One Being would not have the attribute of benevolence because there would be no one to exercise benevolence upon.

f264 (3:39) [footnote] [3:61 full page]

FN: We do not talk to one another of our feelings: we do not say perpetually, "How good you are!" "How much I love you!" At least, we cease to say this in proportion as we understand each other, as we really love and sympathize.

JSM: I do not agree in this.

f266v (3:44) [footnote] [3:69 full page]

FN: "Look at the pictures of the Mother of the ancient God of Love! odious in her beauty!"

JSM: I do not agree in this as regards the Greek statues of Names [?]

f267 (3:45) [3:70 full page]

FN: To be conscious that wrong is wrong--to hold it in repugnance as all that we have to fear or avoid in our life and being is true.

JSM: But remorse is no more than "repugnance" to our former (or present) self because embodying wrong.