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 hanged & 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
flv

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?
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 dish 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 -
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.

In the Cholera too, the poor are much better off than the rich - because the poor get their houses whitewashed & plyed 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.

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
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
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.
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
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 -

R.C. truth
You'd leave off
reading ye Bible
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
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 -
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 -
Does a law benefit each person individually as well as the whole? Yes because 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.
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.

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.
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.
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
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
all the laws connected with any event
perhaps no man can tell. However compara-
tively 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.
You say that 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]
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

substance of leg of mutton not
different from that of sheep
"person"/substance ought to be translated
substance/existence with entirety - including

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
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

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 -
The Euclid of Metaphysics

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 -

Definitions
Omnipotence
Perfection

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 - it 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
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 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 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 - But stones do not fall to the ground - It is not, If thou dost not attract the Earth, such & such consequences will follow - 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
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 -

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, 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.
We cannot have progress 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 physical force, & impose their own views upon a society incapable of appreciating them; or they may endeavour by instruction & persuasion to enlighten & conciliate the ignorant & 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 compe=sation for this exclusion, they may be said to have a
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 -

An allusion to Matt 9:12.

The Mysticists & 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 Mysticists 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.
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 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, 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 the Organization which)

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.
In believing that Law 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 forgiveness? 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 -

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.

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.
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

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
If you could do this, what wd 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 that 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 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 shd 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
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
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.

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-
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?

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

Louis Napoleon  
Clergyman  
Specifying time  
German Patients  
Believing in Prayer
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 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 -

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 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.
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 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
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 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 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.
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 have created another god. That with God, a contradiction 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
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 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.
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 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
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 -
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I
Belief

You ask me why, if we believe in God?

J.A. Yes, I don’t know why you, who disregard the authority of revelation, should believe in a God at all - still less, and why you should believe Him perfect?

M.S. The two questions have, for me, 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?

J.A. It means the strongest conviction.

M.S. It means, in common language, sometimes doubt & sometimes affirmation. “Is A.B. in London?” “I believe so.” Here it means, “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 conviction - But even here, I think you will find the belief modified by the modest “I,” which means, “It is I who believe, I don’t know whether others do.” What is therefore to be understood by “belief”? Sometimes a sense of certainty, sometimes of uncertainty.

J.A. I think we might as well look in Johnson.

M.S. But what will Johnson tell us? The sense in which the word has been used by certain writers, called classic. Johnson
says that “belief” is credit given on account of authority. But have we really no other sources of belief than authority? There are means of belief in the capabilities of human nature & human nature makes progress. Does human nature make progress? At least in progress. And the meanings attached to 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 words which express things, the house which we build now signifies a very different thing the house built by the 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 - Instances of change To give instances: J.A.: Name, name of meaning in words define Religion as “Virtue founded upon revereince of God & expectation of future rewards & punishments” & will quote Milton, word. Another theologian (belonging to an African tribe) thinks Religion means jumping over a stick - If either of these be really different we want a new word to express so an idea as the sense we have of our tie to God.
J.A. But to return to the word “belief”.

What meaning then, do you “believe” in God?

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 exercised - 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.

But we must be careful to know that the God, 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 reverenced, & 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 -

J.A. But illustrate what you say of the advanced state of knowledge & virtue necessary for a nation to conceive of a God as perfect.

Advanced M.S. Take those very Hebrews - state of Moses had learnt in Egypt, had matured knowledge & virtue 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 seen/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. 

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?

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.
M.S. Merely/I am trying to arrive at the meaning which we shall attach to the word to be attached "belief" - to prove that the highest state of to the word belief, (viz., in the signification of the strongest "belief." conviction), must be the result of the highest state of development - that therefore we cannot be said to "believe", in this sense, except when we have reached that state & at an earlier stage of development in man, - "belief" will mean a sense of uncertainty. 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 earnest? Scepticism, not belief, has brought them there - They required their 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 - Tendency 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, especially in the Northern manufacturing towns, have brought men to infidelity/gone over/turned their faces 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” -
M.S. I am quite aware of it. Even poor fellows 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 feeling residing in of the Perfect One, which wills Happiness - the thought of the Perfect One, that essentially/essence, worked out for the of theirs - Time is all that intervenes between man & 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. How it J.A. You are wandering from your subject. begins You see that, whenever man rejects revelation, however, he always says immediately, “God is incomprehensible, 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 - To find the 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, have so believed, than felt it to be essential, the Wisdom, the Goodness, 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 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 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 what to him was the Holy Ghost - & only to natures capable of receiving his revelation - that revelation which came thro’ the Law of the Perfect One that “treasure which we have
in earthly vessels, not "that the excellence of the power may be of God", but because so the wisdom of the Perfect One sees best for His Son - J.A. Then you quite agree with these infidels that we cannot comprehend God, & that it is no use looking for Him. How much 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 not be perfect unless one definite something, which is going on there, were as it is - & consequently we should know what it is - the same as to any past time in any part of the Universe throughout Eternity. We should know what God was doing 100 years ago - throughout Eternity the Son, in successive generations, will be working his way from ignorance & imperfection towards perfection. But now we cannot understand this - we cannot understand God. I would distinguish God the Father, as the Spirit of Perfection, incomprehensible to us, - God the Holy Ghost, as the Spirit of Right, of Goodness, of Wisdom, of Power, comprehensible to the Son, (as the Perfect Individual) not the perfect Spirit.
To “receive the Holy Ghost”, what a remarkable 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
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

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

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
-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 about the Eternal? M.S. Evidence, I believe, may be brought of a Will for long time past active, with in which we trace some benevolence, wisdom, power - But we are seldom called upon to act & feel only by of which we have certainty - we often empirically 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 the eclipses, as originally ascertained by 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 laws, but not yet resolved into them." We find signs of benevolence,
wisdom & power, which look as if the Will, in consequence of which that which exists does exist desires the well-being of that existence at some time present or future—

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

**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 not such observations rat/truly lead to 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 -
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?
J.A. We are wandering from our subject. Let us sum up. The gist of our argument was, was it not? to attach some meaning to the two words “believe” & “God”.

Summary of M.S. Yes. I have tried to prove that “belief” meaning was a state – which could not exist in some stages of national or individual development, but must belong to the more advanced stages.

I then tried to speculate/consider “empirically” on what a Perfect Being would do, if there was one – & to prove that He would appoint man to work out his own happiness. I meant/try to infer/deduce from this the “belief” that there is a Perfect Being, a God –
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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.

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

M.S. But here we come to the 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 sat 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. 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 synonymous 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, Which of the ideas of God 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 commands the expulsion of the Austrians/ liberation of Hungary from j/A. How do you know He does? this? M/S. I do not think I should not be able 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 do not teach to believe in a perfect God? It is evident that very few have believed that their God was perfect. 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/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/To take all the thousand
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—and we try to believe, if we think at all, that a God with these qualities is perfect.

If you would therefore let me leave unanswered the question, why do you believe in God?—as not knowing which of these ideas of Gods you mean—and 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 time/age, COULD not believe in a Perfect Being— that it required cultivation, development to conceive the idea of Perfection—& that 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

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

does not of those called the most highly cultivated of the human
teach of a 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 Why else the testimony to the words of Christ -

“Unless ye 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 much nearer to a true/to have had a truer conception of Deity

Intellectual cultivation

J.A. but, according to you, he would have approached nearer still/ had a still truer, if he had contributes known all that Laplace could have told to a truer him. M.S. Certainly, I believe so - I believe that the more highly man’s moral, in= tellectual, & spiritual faculties are cultiva= ted, 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 -

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 see that He has done in the Universe what we mean by perfect work/what we should have done had we been perfect?
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 &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 Eternity unattainable. why you consider your God eternal. If you 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 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 contain 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 manifestation 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 finite & imperfect, why am I to/we can discern alone infinity & perfection enables us M.C. O/only thro’ the idea of Eternity. to discern When the moral feelings predominate in in the finite & imperfect Infinity & Perfection. as like, not our actual but, our ideal selves – Where the moral feelings of a people have advanced beyond their old mythology, scepticism 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 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 feeling that he rejects the subject altogether - them 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
the Moorish invasion, the burning of the Libraries & the destruction of the schools, Christianity disappeared.

J.A. But let me recall you to our hand: The questions, which is, first, how has Mankind 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 innumerable 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 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

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 improve=ment in the knowledge & the being, in/of Man, is to increase the number of the former, to decrease the number of the latter instances. Moreover this important observation opens upon us from actual experience - that much evil which
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 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?

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

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.
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 much spiritual truth to be found as in the Bible. "In him is no variableness neither shadow of turning" - What an insight do these words shew. vide opposite page.

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?

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

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.

J.A. Yes, but/It is said that Mankind has such a desire, such a tendency to believe this that that alone is sufficient evidence to him.
M.S. But this is very doubtful. I have no desire to 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, 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 He is.

Religion not J.A. But with what faculties are we revealed by 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” (anschauung) which apprehends God - There is a which knows Him, as the senses know the
external world. There is a 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 Law-giver? But the conscientious Unbelievers said & done, all and the whole of the faculties exercised all that we can discern with these faculties is the Law of nature.

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 consciousness 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
circumstances, right development, right
evices of the nature - The thinking part
of Mankind has been irritated & disgust-
ed by dogmatic assertion of superstitious
notions - A revulsion takes place. Some
thinkers say in consequence, “I will do
my work & believe nothing but pheno-
mena recognised by my senses” - Reason
& Philosophy are in arms against super-
stitution & 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.
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 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, but 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 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 all existence to depend on this will in 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 metaphysics - 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.
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=
estation 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 -

It is not more
impossible to
understand
how God wills
without hands
than how an
artizan wills
his hands to
work.

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 The he cannot appreciate.
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=hensible & consistent, till we attain that blessed Oneness -

x J.A. There is an oneness of seeking external amusement, of doing what it is conventionally 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 ±/we shall work my/our way to light at lat - Then, when ±/we remember these days of darkness, may it be with the wish to deliver others from suffering & privations which ±/we have known by experience -

God

Without

Beginning

J.A. I want to know, ±/Is it an insu=perable difficulty for us to believe that 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 J.A. With regard to matter, it is probably exist or not? impossible for natures like ours ever to and what prove that it exists at all - We see no is the practical means of approximating, of advancing one importance step towards proof - of this M.S. Nor does it make the slightest question? 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 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, is often asked - not Revelation, Experience & Consciousness - Are our witnesses of God.

J.A. But w/What are to be our witnesses, they not that, to which we have to refer for truth, as to our feeling of the existence, the presence 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 M.S. I would ask each mind to ask each mind itself, are/is there not, if I look through to ask itself, 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 M.S. How much there seems to want/is wanted a Baconian way of treating these subjects!

wanted 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” 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 M.S. It will remain that Christ will remain? 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, "speculation" but that the question is approaching, Have we or have we not, a religion? - I think The question is come, Have we or have we not 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 contain much of mistake as to not J.A. 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
Are not almost all mankind in children in Religion & Moral Philosophy? If we knew how, 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, & 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 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. 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.
What I rather think is education 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 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.C. 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.
“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.

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

M.S. “If ye keep my commandments, ye/shall/will 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?

M.S. Christ indeed came into the world to save sinners, to wash them in his blood. Inspiration Atonement 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 π/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 -

J.A. Then are you an Unitarian?

Unitarianism

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.

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 -

Authority

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 -

J.A. But you/ It is said that those who do not admit “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 -

M.S. I think that we can see, in many of these cases, what part of the nature it was which 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 as a truth.
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, and dresses and invests our ideas with form, "a local habitation and a name" — which enables us to form a conception of something not perceived by the senses, to give it a presence and 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 God at all. Without these faculties, to whom do we attribute what corresponds to our personal power, whose thoughts correspond to what we observe without? It is impossible to form a conception of something not perceived by the senses, to give it a presence and life. A name, which gives the sense of reality, which enables us to form the idea of a local habitation, is not equivalent to a divine idea of power or cause, without imagination which generates the impression of causation, which generates the impression of power or cause, which a man without the idea of perception, it is supposed truth is not perceived. It is not evident, that a truth, which is not surprising, that more or some of these faculties are deficient.
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, - 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. If he does not decide by reason, he 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 yourselves that such what is the nature of Revelation, you will we shall still unconsciously derive your 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?

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.

J.A. And not Benevolence?

Benevolence greater than Man’s?

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.

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

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

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 only 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 spiritual 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
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, distinguishable as above that of Man, as fulfilling a purpose which Man has a spirit of Righteousness & 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 possibility, which present possibility, however, he may be constantly increasing.

[Side note.] J.A. I have two questions to ask before I can let you go on. First, I must call upon Belief as 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

M.S. It has been truly said that the 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 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 domains of truth may be made, irrespective of ignorance in others - The Astronomer, for instance, may inform himself of the Law, in ignorance of the Legislators - But he who more feeling studies the nature of the Legislators 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.
Decided J.A. But are not Great attempts now being made to remedy the evils of Man’s life by the philanthropical Political Economists, but not in the enlightened Educationists of the present day? I look upon Dawes, Combe, Ellis, Owen, Mill, Comte, as all, though of such different creeds, making a decided advance in the line of benevolent Social economy -

M.S. So do it. And if, to the influence of all these, whom you have mentioned, could be added a religious influence, I think, such a teaching/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?

J.A. It comes to this, w/What do you/we mean by Spirituality? M.S. Is it not \#/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?

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 - 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.

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

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]}

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 circum= stances, so ill understood, either in theory or practice, that it separates us from Him? Sympathy, in high things, is, as life & com= panionship 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.

J.A. I understand your enthusiasm for the Monastic life better than I did. But I want to know, 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.

J.A. But there are so many now who don’t believe in a god & there will be more. Is the name of M.S. It seems very strange that, when God being lost 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 of there/very strange that there should be 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
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,
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.

J.A. Well, for the present let us stick to the question, How can/ How ought belief in a God, arise as you represent to arise from the (we will not say, how does it arise?) 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 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, #/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 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 is 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 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
Will, for, in each present time, the whole of 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 existence. We can only say Perfect Wisdom, Goodness, Power wills the right development of Eternity.

What is the communication between this Being and us?

If there is such a nature, how would it direct me? what would it feel to me? how shall I atone myself with it?

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

J.A. Then you can only make out that the Father exists as a Will, willing that the whole shall thus develop itself, because thus only can Being become well-being. But if there is such a nature, how would it direct me? what would such a nature say to me, how would it feel to me, how shall I atone myself with it?

M.S. Yes, this is such as my belief. Oh, how
But how shall I understand Him, how receive His communication, receive Himself? is our cry -

We must put ourselves into circumstances to understand Him.

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 this, 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?

M.S. No, /We are not to wait passively for those circumstances. We are to think, to work for them - Or, if you have them in the present, we are to try to prepare your being, your nature for the time in which the opportunity for such work is sure to come - sure & certain.

J.A. Why sure?

M.S. Sure & certain - Otherwise there would 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.
Plan {in another hand: Welsh Newton}  

of St. Ignatius of Loyola, Harriet Martineau, 

Creation M.S. But w/What was God’s purpose in creating us?  

III M.S. Some say he created us for His glory, to 

God’s purpose & to serve Him. Others say that this is 

in creating honour 

us. H.M. For the glory, do you think? For 

For His purpose H.M. For the glory, 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 happiness? 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 negated/met by the argument 

we are J.A. T/that God is in that case wanting 

not happy. Omnipotence or in Benevolence. If He is
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.

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.
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

M.S. Is not that? This is really saying that there

Happiness is can be no existence but God’s. & yet/although, if
to be the there were no other existence, He would
creation of not be God - Perfect

J.A. I do not understand the enun-
Benevolence, ciation of your proposition.
then there

M.S. For there is no perfect happiness but

must be God’s. you say.
two Gods - H.M. less I don’t admit that
the Creator & It is vain to say that “to each being must
the Created.

one

from that of the Being, whom you call God.

M.S. But that? This is merely the confusion

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

Can this problem be solved otherwise than by giving man such a nature & such circumstances 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.
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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, 

imaginations 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 happiness but God’s - Because goodness He is the only Spirit of Perfect Right & wisdom, truth. And without perfect right & there can H.M. That is true, & therefore, I/That is the be no perfect happiness. M.S. You admit then that t/Therefore there is no perfect not have created man - had I/we been God - happiness. 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 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 

unhappiness.

What beings should we then conceive that God would create?
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?

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—

that Perfect Righteousness & 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—and yet, if no other nature existed, He would not be God.

J.A. How so?

M.S. Our first assumption is/For granting that a 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.

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

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
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?

M.S. God’s thought is truth - God’s 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?
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]

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.

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 thoughts, emotions, volitions in one individual as in another – But the relations are not less constant.

What is St. Ig. Certainly. But a/All these relations are merely means & inducements supplied by God to enable man to attain his end – And his end is to serve God. 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, feelings, 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 but what God desires – Then will he, by the laws of God, accomplish everything that he desires – And what can God do more?
According to St. Ig. How can you thus exalt Good as par with God? Man’s end is to praise & to serve God, & all other things are created 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 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 argument, or rather I think it capable of being raised still higher. Will you let me say wherein I differ, w/While entirely appreciating the truth & beauty of your/the highest view we can conceive it capable of being raised still higher. View as a whole, let me say wherein I feel 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 Omnipseotence, & 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.

St. Ig. But how is this reconcilable with the proposition that the smallest circumstance comes to us from the will of God?

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.
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. -

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 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

But sin God does not will, altho’ He wills the effect of it. That you are in that position, that you have that employment, that dinner, those clothes, that illness is the will of God.

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

Sin cannot be excepted from the proposition that every thing comes to us from the hand of God.

M.S. But I don’t see how you can Sin can be excepted from the sin. It seems to me that that is only by a quibble.

You can hardly be satisfied with that proposition - 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, the sin is our/his own.

M.S. Oh human nature! how much more beautiful in thy instincts than thy reflections! how true is thy intention, how defective thy reasoning! how much better art thou than thy belief!

If everything 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 arrange= 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 con=
scious 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?

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 of Mankind required to know those laws which are to be discovered necessary for the existence of Mankind. only by 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)
But those laws, without the knowledge of which Mankind must have come to an end, are probably taught by instinct - instinct being

Or by

Instinct?

J.A. But what is 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 intermeddle with? “Such knowledge is too wonderful for me.”

Origin

M.S. Is it not rather/If we believe that all God’s 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.

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

M.S. Sin being something untrue in our feelings, 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 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 stumble 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 be caused by ignorance?

St. Ig. From ignorance it is said/asked when “I knew it 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?

M.S. The remedy of finding/ is to find out God’s laws & under which of these to place yourself.

St. Ig. On earth it often it may be too late.

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

St. Ig./J.A. And with regard to our physical being?

M.S. With regard to our physical being also, all suffering, all privation from the enjoyment of which man is capable, arises
from ignorance of God’s laws, either our own ignorance, or that of those who have preceded us.

Did this man sin or his parents? That question implied a false idea, regards those laws only which concern our spiritual & moral being, that is, our feelings & wills 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 disregarded been disregarded in consequence of something wrong in the spiritual life? Disease in the spiritual wrong in the spiritual 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 to learn all these laws? Do we even know one of them? 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 happiness of love, of its exercise, of beauty & its production by skill, of truth & its production
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
J.A. But you would make men perfect?
individual
M.S. “Be ye perfect, even as your Father
to be made
in heaven is perfect” Yet will man never
perfect,
be God but one with God - & when he
preserving
suffers, he will yet have joy in feeling
his
“Thy will be done.”

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

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

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 Trinitarians 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 they are pure or not. However/Well, let us return to the plan of God. According to you, the Plan of God in creating 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 illegible proved in/by the Reason, felt by the feeling & approved by the Conscience.

Never let us give our belief 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 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 Moral senses? The Indian’s physical senses tell him a thousand things that yours do not - which shews that even first/former these come to different decisions. If all human men pretty tell all Souls gave the same decisions, we should much alike - truly regard these as equally certain with while the latter latter are far easier to ascertain - but give the decisions they will not be more certain than the former a different opinion to each?
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 & 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?

M.G. 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 - This is Habit.

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 then the first.

M.G. yes, 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. 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 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 - H.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.
“What is the origin of evil?” the question so often asked. “The Wisdom, Goodness & Righteousness of the Perfect” is the answer - who 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? J.A. But explain, explain - How can man or the Son, as you call man, exercise purpose of nature at all, if he is a slave to his wisdom in willing being? M.S. What is the purpose of being? this I mean. To this question we must answer by three other questions: - What is the purpose of Wisdom in willing being? J.A. First of all, what is Wisdom? M.S. Is not Wisdom 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 J.A. The purpose of being, essentially, well=being. 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.
I am not sure that we know what we mean - But I think that we shall know what we mean, if we speak of an Existence not human, though powerful, wise & benevolent, 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 recognized 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?

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, 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
If we recognize this wisdom, 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?

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
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?

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.

There is/were less 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?
IV

Abbott, M.S.

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

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 reconcilable 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 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 disco =vered 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 -
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?

M.S. Divine & human nature, understood 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 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 “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 improvement by chance, not after a type & purpose
(in another hand: Pebody)

Each advance has always brought evil with good

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 beginning of evil in this world - why it ever existed -

M.S. If we see no evil, exists the possibility 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 them- selves & 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.
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 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
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 improves, & 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 appertaining 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,
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,

[sidelong] 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
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
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 undoubtingly 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.

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, 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
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.

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.

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?”

M.S. Aye & 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.
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

If the existence of the individual, when cut short for himself, benefit future generations, does this satisfy our moral sense/feeling for himself?

H.M. But he pours out it is said the riches of his 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
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 - 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 organism of life so that the most will be made of life - then that time will not be lost by mistakes -
Such M.S. And t/But then still more will it be felt

destruction that the ties of sympathy, of capability
of what is of communicating mutually, between any
valuable two are different from what can be
inconsistent between any other two - that, $T$/to put an end
with the to such ties would be to destroy that which,
existence of a by the laws of God, can never be again.
Spirit of Love such destruction of that which is valuable -
& Wisdom - 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 J.A. Shall the "clay" judge the "potter"?
with Love & Wisdom M.S. That which is inconsistent with
does not become Love & Wisdom does not become consistent
consistent by by supposing that Love & Wisdom omni=
supposing potent - To compel one man to sacrifice
that Love & Wisdom himself for many more, would this be
omnipotent 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 H.M. But what is it that assures us
to sacrifice one that it would be contrary to right to
for another, compel one man to sacrifice himself to
if we would. others? Is it the constitution of our nature?
M.S. It has been thought right, in some
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 bad 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 suppose that each individual does contribute his portion, & then retire from existence to make room for others?

M.S. I think that it would be 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.
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?

H.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?

H.M. Because it is said our senses tell us nothing about it.

H.S. 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,-

Do our senses tell us nothing about it?
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 himself?

H.M. Still 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 with 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 -
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 judge by our own wisdom, we may judge what is wisdom in Him, by His what is wisdom in us.

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.

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 -

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 our belief in a future state.

M.S. And you think that/this is thought a very poor dependence. I 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.

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 manifestation 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?

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 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 & manifestation.

J.A. But setting aside these mystical/considerations speculations, you will admit that we have
J.A. — You must have faith it is true that we have no real “foundation” but “faith” for believing in a future life. We are told that Faith will remove difficulties, which I acknowledge lie high in the way of believing in a future state — A future state is, in itself, so impossible that it is useless to reason about it.

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 & Righteousness & 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, benevolent 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?
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 through the senses it is said & therefore it is vain to dispute about any thing else.

M.S. 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 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 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?

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, 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
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 understand again what would be Righteousness & God? Wisdom & Goodness & Benevolence? in an omnipotent Being?

J.A.[But how do we know, I ask]it is again asked,

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 amount possible, is there any limit to Divine possibility?

J.A. But when we say the greatest 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
To prove that the existence of an Omnipotent Spirit of Love & Wisdom 
would be continuity to all conscious existence - We/I will apply myself /try to prove the second proposition first.

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

H.M. But may we not say that the
May not a general Past give value to an individual Present? 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?

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.

J.A. But what do you/we infer from this?

M.S. 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.

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 tho’ exactly that exercise,
no other will gain - & that power, that
capability will be lost, if he ceases to exist.

J.A./H.M. But often, in inventing or
discovering,
which, in accordance
with His Law, have arisen
from individual
exercise of
power, & could
not, in accordance
with his
Law, arise by
any other man.

[not FN: Henley]
It would
not be
consistent
with Omnipotent
Love & Wisdom
to destroy
those means
for improvement

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 existence be entirely founded on the character which we are able to trace in the Divine?

H. M. Then you admit that our expectation of a future existence must be entirely founded on the character which we are able to trace in the Divine?

H. 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?

H. 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 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.
God cannot exist.

J.A. Not even the good of other beings who exist?

M.S. I suppose it. 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?

M.S. I rather think that 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.

J.A. But Man makes God, it is said, imagines 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 is all.
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.

M.S. But how can you/we discern that which is not appreciable by the senses?

M.G. 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 —

Character of God’s Laws gives us the character of His Will.

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 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 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 communicated! 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 materialistic 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?
Is there H.M. Of the physical nature experience improvement within certain limit of the physical, without a limit to the rest of nature? prove that means may be taken to strengthen it to a certain point, but not beyond —

But can this be said of any other part of nature? But do we really find persons become more tender, more loving and affectionate as they go on with life?

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

Note P. 29a *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.
If, then, Man discovers the existence of a wise, good & omnipotent Being - If more if he discovers that more happiness would result from progressive than from successive being, will result has he not discovered that individual being, from progressive will be progressive?

If experience & consciousness prove that, next in value to the feeling of Man towards the being, is 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 idiosyncracy 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 idiosyncracy – 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, not by ceasing to exist.

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 — J.A. — But now, e/ 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 J.A. — But you must not blow hot & cold. Your / This reasoning is it will be said this —

Both the highest & lowest human 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.

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—

H.M. But what proves this? And

Side Note 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 & 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
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?

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.

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, Right=
eousness - 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 what suffering we should think admissible to inflict on one for the benefit of another.

H.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 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? Û/we persist in asking –
The question often asked with regard to God amounts to this: How do we know that to do evil to one that much better than ourselves will not commit murder? 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?

What real belief have we in the nature of God? We do in some degree regulate our lives by our belief of/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 H.M. But what reason have we practical reason for believing in a future life? 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 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}

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.

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 sub=
jective, or whether it is objective, & con=
nected 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/is to 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.

Right

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 & 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 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 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 concerning this future state? And what can we know concerning this state? concerning the change which takes place, when human life ceases in this world?
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 - improvement 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]

---

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.
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
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 -
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 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 universal accordance with Love of which the results in human nature & human history are such that unless our present existence is connected with a future, it is repugnant to our highest desires, 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 only, in such belief that & in this belief only, can & 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
{in another hand: Mumford} certainly attain that state of progress in righteousness which befits their nature. I/We cannot wish to trust my/our own ignorance or the ignorance I/we find, even among the wisest & best of men, with human destiny, 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. I/We can endure anything if I/we can believe that we are all on a road by which our affections our sympathies, our desire to exercise successfully 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 contrarieties 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 know ledge 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 the future by the present.
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 possibility 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 unconsciously & without their own will or purpose, a better existence for future men.

Yet as little can I/we desire even to be as machines, 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 Chronomery 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 is 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 attempt to conceive it represent it as satisfactory — Love a love is satisfactory which ensures that with/according to certain 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 learning & 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 Omni potence 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 consistent with its character & tendency as now we see its operation. Therefore it is that we desire, therefore 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.
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 certain number into that state of grace which will have for its consequence hereafter salvation — & leaves the rest in the state, in which they are by nature, of sin & death.

In what sense we indeed we are predestinate. Ï/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.” & Ï/we truly say that he is “predestinate” to sin & death. Ï/We see the child of Lois & Eunice brought up amid great objects, “unspotted from the world” — & Ï/we can truly say he is predestinate to grace & salvation.

Apparent Jacob Abbott Then you leave nothing deviations for True Will to do. All children however brought from Law.
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 I 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=
broken chain, held in the hands 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 – 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/ 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. But the nature, however, it is said, remains under the free will of the a responsible Agent.

Does God interfere with some things & not with others, that nature, however, it is said, remains under the free will of the a responsible Agent.

M.S. This is to say, in fact, that God interferes 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 uniformity.

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.

Calvin: Yours is a far more thorough-going Predestinationism that mine/that of Calvin. M.S. Oh! we are all Predestinarians now, M. Calvin, in the full force of the word/We are Predestinarians, each in his own sense - The only difference between my/this Predestination & yours/that of Calvin is that we believe all are 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
still & wait
till the Laws
whip us into happiness.

What is meant by Free Will?

A power to will whatever I 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?

No but/it is said, a power to choose whether I will do/will a thing or no -

That is to say, that you can have two wills two at the same time. Two wills? Rather three - For you must have a third to decide between the two.
Am I free to will or not to will a thing as I please? J.A. Do you mean/Is this to say, that I am not free 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 you will a thing to prove that room at once to shew you/me that you can will it—

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 well enough, I can overcome my shyness & lay my Punctuality aside for once.

M.S. - I/We don’t know you each other always enough 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 M.S. Responsibility? I wish people would use some other word. What a low It expresses but a low conception it is of the connection/relation between man & his Creator?

J.A. Then where is our responsibility?

M.S. Responsibility? I wish people would use some other word. What a low 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 Has God no higher motive in administering 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
of her child only because she will have to answer for it. Of such a mother nay even of a nurse, your carelessness take we should say that all love for it/the child must have ceased.

In what relations will you admit the word Responsibility, if not in that between man & his God?

J.A. But in what relations will you is it rightly used?

M.S. I can understand it/the word “Responsibility” right 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 under= takes a charge, there is Responsibility incurred. The housekeeper expressly agrees to answer for that linen - In many human transactions, a tacit agree/similar compact 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 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 -

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/ 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 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
interests of the servant become the same as
minister’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)

And quite right too. The Calvinists again tacitly
admit that Free Will implies & sa Irr &
what you call Irresponsibility! if you/we,
miserable 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
to the level of animals.
Universal Pre-ordination
makes us free.

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
teaches tricks, & which has neither act nor part in
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 could man have any power at all for carrying his will into effect?

How does J.A. But it is said his will is, according to this doctrine, the offspring of his nature, which is the offspring of previous circumstances, therefore his will itself is not free – make our will in any sense not however 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 deceived in it is not M.S. It is true. But not/Not however because the Law has failed, but because some other Laws, unknown to us, are concerned – which, when we know them, will endure our calculation, based upon absolute certainty/foreknowledge that effects can never vary or/ not to be expected, but because we did not know all the Laws.
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 God’s
Omnipotence?
M.S. What is that Omnipotence? To satisfy your
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
Omnipotence
include
M.S. All that we can say, I believe, is that,
the power of
effecting
a contradiction?
If God repented, &/or wished to make the Past
not to be, He would not be God. He would have
made a mistake. A Being likewise, who
could wish to effect a contradiction or an
absurdity, would not be God - And that
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 lent/agree with your

Can we share
the Omni=

potence

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 - F Do we wish for a greater extension of omnipotence than this? Faith truly makes men omnipotent.
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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 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.
Law is no explanation away every thing by Law, we shall be/is to enable us to do without.

But, my dear Sir, Law is no explanation 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,

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—

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—

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.

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 the distance” —

For murders are done—but stones do not fall to the ground—

M.S. “Thou shalt do no murder” means If
thou doest murder, such & such consequences shall follow. If 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 repent” 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 Responsibility to a table of facts, what have you left at al of Conscious Agency?
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 or Power in a conscious intelligent Being, All calculation, all foresight becomes nonsense,

2. a will in or Power in a conscious intelligent Being, divine or human—

{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?

J. A. Then you do away entirely with the doctrine of Reward & Punishment. 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?

M. S. How can He indeed? And how could any one ever think He did? Why then, 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 J.A. How can there be any right & wrong theory if there is no "Free Will"? it is asked. That God makes allowances. 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 means 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 means 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, if/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
(in another hand: Guppy)

It is said that removing the feeling of self-blame does

Is there any danger of with all bar to every license
doing away There is no danger - Why, your sinner could not
do it if he would. Do you suppose/Could Bonaparte
with the could go on being Bonaparte to the end
feeling of of time? that/could a selfish tyrant can go on
Right & being a selfish tyrant for ever? No, the
Wrong by laws are so constructed/such by their essence that
doctrines? selfishness & tyranny bring their own fruits, their
own inducements to goodness & benevo-

lence. A man cannot go on being a
Bonaparte if he would - But, but beside this, it seems to me that yours is the immoral
doctrine, not mine. Can a doctrine be immoral where goodness is happiness, not connected with or the cause of it, but identical with it, where wicked-
ness is misery? What is it you say? The other doctrine says †/that there is always a hope that God
will forgive, that you/we may sin & yet escape the punishment. But the only happiness worth having is God’s happiness. And the Divine Happiness, that happiness which we are all to share, is not the consequence of goodness - it is goodness - But where happiness is made to depend upon some change of mind in God & not in man, where, as in the case of the dying but repentant sinner, God is supposed to forgive, that is, to change His mind towards him & bestow happiness
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
Penitent
Thief support
the doctrine
of death bed
repentance?

Then what do you do with the
The Story of the Penitent Thief? so often quoted, is
not relevant.

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 impossi-
bility.

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? Insen-
sibility 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 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 “predoomed to misery”.

“Free Will” 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-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.

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 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 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 make Right M.S. B by an arbitrary will? do you
Can God think? Can you think/could the Creator could make make Wrong Right? Perhaps we can only answer wrong that this by saying the Creator is the Spirit right? 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 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 decree/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?

M.S. No, it is not. It is not meant to be so -

J.A. That is only a mere quibble.

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 characteristic, 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.
But what does 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 whose punish it, are certainly at variance. sense of justice must 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 unpunished would produce in the community.
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.

M.S. I had not been what I am, they would not have had the same working for me, it is said.

M.S. I had not bene what I am!

How gladly would I not have been! 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, Shelley Suppose I were to say, I was born by chance in its ordinary sense, means the city/county of London/Sussex - it happened to be the year 1852/1792 & I chanced/fell upon parents of .... acting by chance Shelley Indeed? Do you admit no chance?

If there is no chance, there is no Free Will. For Free Will is only the will acting by chance - i.e. not determined by any motive.

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
Difference alter it, if he could. It is true that it between was by the laws of God that Calvin Law & was in such a state of mind as to Decree. 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 & 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 if God had created man without reason?

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.

J.A.: Then how much better it will be said to put us beyond the possibility of mistake!

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 foil for heaven to teach man by what sinners he has suffered to appreciate what he has without gained.

{in another hand: Byson?}

their but as a means of teaching consent him what is suffering & what is happiness. as & how to avoid the former & gain the latter.

warnings J.A. And Buonaparte & the other poor to the rest? 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.

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 wretches, 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
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have the

greatest
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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 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. could there be any 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 temptation.
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 J.A. Then am I a passive instrument
passive in the hands of your motives? If so,
instrument I may as well give up the struggle at once.

If I can’t prevent however the mad dog from
biting me, what is the use it will be said of my
being prevents? What is the use it will be said of my
not being prevents? Am I not at all affected? If
I can’t prevent however the mad dog from
biting me, what is the use it will be said of my
being prevents? What is the use it will be said of my
not being prevents? Am I not at all affected?

If I cannot prevent however the mad dog from
biting me, what is the use it will be said of my
being prevents? What is the use it will be said of my
not being prevents? Am I not at all affected?

If I am the J.A. Then am I a passive instrument
passive in the hands of your motives? If so,
instrument I may as well give up the struggle at once.

If I am the J.A. Then am I a passive instrument
passive in the hands of your motives? If so,
instrument I may as well give up the struggle at once.

If I am the J.A. Then am I a passive instrument
passive in the hands of your motives? If so,
instrument I may as well give up the struggle at once.

If I am the J.A. Then am I a passive instrument
passive in the hands of your motives? If so,
instrument I may as well give up the struggle at once.
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 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]
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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.
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
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?
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
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.

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?  
1. What is? with regard to human will.  
2. what would be most satisfactory (with regard to this) to what we feel to be morally right?  
2. what ought to be? in other words,  
1. what is?  
2. what ought to be?  
[If it is said, “we can learn nothing with  

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 superhuman observations, "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" communications we arrive at what is called a "certainty" of a capricious and not unrighteous 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.
But, if there it is desired to pursue the enquiry upon human observation & experience,]

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.

I ask:

1. does Human Will 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

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.

2. how would the government of the 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 discrepancy 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
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 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 invarableness; 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 "philosohie 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 
re-stated 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''.

2. What ought to be?

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 & perfectly righteous, the existence of other beings would follow.

JS: 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.

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."

A Perfect God must create.

For a Being would not be omnipotent & righteous, unless His existence became the source 1. of other being - other Beings!
2. of other righteous beings (on the same reasoning) other righteous Beings!
3. but NOT of other beings other beings
righteous through the righteous not
direct will of the through His
Omnipotent, because direct will
the Being would not
be perfect in righteous not
righteousness who thus
operated on other through His
beings.

**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
& 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

```
righteous, through righteous by,
advance from limited advance, thro'
& imperfect natures their own exercise
towards perfection, of their own faculties,
by exercise of the from imperfection
faculties of those to perfection.
natures individually & collectively:-
```
JS: the fallacy of the word "Law" runs through the whole argument. The sooner we get our philosophy out of the "Courts" the better.
FN: the means & inducement
inducement & the to be supplied by
means to such his Laws.
exercise being afforded certainty of advance
by the laws of the to be supplied by
Omnipotent & Righteous His Laws.
Being.

JS: It is a fact however that
in human souls there is a
progress, which must either
arise from the use of faculty
implanted once and for all, which
again implies the exercise of
free will which you are destined [suffered?]
to deny, or it must be the
result of the same free will
operating in the appropriation
to the life of the soul, of certain
supplies of spiritual sustenance
(“Give us this day our daily bread”) given by the soul’s Lord and Creator, which is “Grace”. It is perfectly consistent
nay more it is necessary that the
soul should receive what it requires
when it requires it from its 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.

FN: This is the only
thing possible on the
hypothesis of the
existence of a Being
omnipotent & righteous.

If we are asked
our ground for such
an Hypothesis, it is
this:- that the character
& tendency of the Laws
manifested in the

FN: History of Human nature
becomes consistent only
with, becomes inconsistent only
without such an
Hypothesis.

That human volitions
shall accord with
(be subject to)
definite Laws follows
on the Hypothesis.
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 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?
Volition being in accordance with Law, over his own will defined.

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.

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.

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?

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.

FN: II Dr Sutherlands

Objections

“Freedom of willing is matter of experience.”

Answers.

It is so, in this sense. To Printer.

It never happens that what we should will,
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

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 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 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 for 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 invariableness & 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.

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 for 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.

**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
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: 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.
obey. This is fact, whether the will be
a self-determining
power or a manifest-
tion 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
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?
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.
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-

**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 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.
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 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.

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.
“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.
In the desire to “submit” without question to any Higher Power (be that power God or man)

The simple reply to all this that God is omnipotent, we must admit this while we admit that he is free.

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,”]

Only those can use such an expression who have been tried. Those who have not been tried cannot.

“Isaiah’s question as to the right of the “clay” to ask of the “potter” anything about its creation,

Certainly, absolutely God has the power.

the Jesuit’s aspiration to be able to love God tho' he be thrown by Him into hell,

Such a question is not asked of us. The Jesuit asks it of himself.

- appear to me
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?
The abominable doctrine involved in that of Baptismal regeneration,

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.

that God damns little babies, come into the world without any choice of their own & which certainly could not get themselves baptized),

It is right to show that for it is no part of Christianity.

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.
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 discrepancy 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
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.
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, 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.”
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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
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.

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
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.

**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 deprivs 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?
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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?
On the ground of every day observation we know that our idea of what is right, and our 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.

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 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.
Christians accept the Character of Christ in the New Testament as the personal manifestation of God's Character.

If you or any one else can give us the absolute freedom we then have & at the same time 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 part of your question. It admits of a very satisfactory reply otherwise.

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.
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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,
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].

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, Compte & Holyoak have arrived at this — by the sheer force of logic!

"If he has so revealed himself, the revelation must be a correct one. "He cannot deny himself".

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.
There can me 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 Gods Laws. Before you assert this you ought to shew what are laws sufficient to enable you to know God & Gods will, & then you must shew that no other laws are necessary to be known & that you knew the "necessary".

"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 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
[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:
does there exist such a
Power as shall make
Man's existence to be made a road
by which 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].
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 simultaneously, 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
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
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".
"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.

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
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 manifestations 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.
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 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.
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 Righteousness of character - it would be impossible
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 God's character & moral administration is. Which is certainly not the case.

**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
Note: 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 man's 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 &
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 man's 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.

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 Pyrhonism.

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 then 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.
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FN: Though we be comparatively 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
"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

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
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."
"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.
How indeed could the thoughts of the Infinite & Eternal be carried out (or perfected) in the finite world?

A proper question but not germane to your position

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 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.]

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.
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.

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 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
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 great & 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.

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 God's moral government is just & perfect. but we have never yet discerned how that government is conducted. and most likely never will.
4. I hold that the most obvious object of God's 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 & easily traceable to your doctrine of necessity & your ideas of Law.

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 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 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."

{f35v}
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.
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].

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
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 & poly-theism, 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".
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. 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, 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.
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 -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.
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 un-examined points in philosophy & in theology, & then they will have served their time.

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.

"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.]
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?"
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 realize 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.
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 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
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 Righteousness, 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?
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.
"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 preventing, 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"
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.
"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
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
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 - Consistently 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.
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.
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.
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
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!!

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

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 consequences. 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"
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.

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.

The superficial recognition of Quetelet's truths so dangerous is that they convey to the half-taught mind

This But what makes 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 extraordinary), 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, "imagination", - 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".
"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,
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.

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.
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 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.
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.

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 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 defeat. [?] 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
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
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
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.

\(\text{f48v}\) \textbf{FN:} Such distinctions may be unimportant in common conversation - but are so important

\(\text{f49r}\)
\textbf{FN:} in such an enquiry as this that, if we would advance one step beyond the mere everlasting \textit{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 \textit{Liberty}, \textit{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.

"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 contradistinguished 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 mestes [?]. 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.
"to create them in
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".

Volitions are a
manifestation of Law.

Law is that which
is laid down.

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 "withdrawn" 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
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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.
If it is "laid down", or determined by Will, Divine or Human, that, to a 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.

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.

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.

The whole of these cases touch of easy decision.
JS: another question which admits of easy decision so soon as we have settled that man's will is free. But the decision would be very different if we decided man's will not to 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 be put to death - that the a child, every time it crawls about the tea-table should 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
or it so to keep it.

All human law presupposes freedom in mens will.

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 circumstanced, will not be a selfish being.

We are dealing not with the few very few exceptional cases, but with the 1000 millions of human wills.

Such a man, discovering that there is a way of keeping Law by which he may promote the health & virtue 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.

But this is not God's Law. For men do kill. But God's Law is never broken.
But Men do kill & if they could not kill, there would indeed be no "liberty". This is Moses' Law, not God's Law.

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 mariage! 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.

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.

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.

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.

If Quetelet's statistics proved what you say they would simply shew that wicked society necessitates remedy: nothing more.
But this 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 that 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
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]
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 in-
dividually, & 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.

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 know-
ledge, not perfect in
wisdom & goodness,
want assistance or guidance.

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.
The history of mankind shews that the want of such assistance & guidance I acknowledge the want individually. 

has led to the belief that 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.

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.

But, as the mind has progressed, some find there teachings do not contain intrinsic evidence of truth - they are but the teachings of men of like nature to ourselves - though in some way superior to those they taught.

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 to know them. Will you give me their names.

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. Which we 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.
But we do know by experience the capability of human nature for indefinite improvement.

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 histories years.

The character & tendency of Law, - (as above defined), - as manifested throughout the phenomena of nature, are that it is shew it to be a process of thus governing human nature.

All unproved, at least in the sense I understand you to believe in Law.

This Law, not written for the eye, nor spoken for to the ear, is observable in the history of human existence, as it passes before us.

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

**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 not have been - and were those facts precisely again to co-exist or prae-exist, those organizations precisely again would exist.
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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 is has nothing whatever to do with law. It is merely accidental. We cannot reason from it to moral freedom.
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.

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 & independent, 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 manifestation 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
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 neccessitated 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.

[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.
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 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,
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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 [?]
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 learn how to desire, to cause to be desired these conditions, how to realize such desire.

JS: But there is no such law yet discovered.
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? Unthinkingly 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 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,

[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.
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 He has made progress in Righteousness, so that after death they shall continue (or attain) to make infinite progress therein.
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.

Law, in accordance with which Righteousness 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.
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 necessitarianism. 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]
"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,
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 "decrees" 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
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
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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 * preceding

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 of Law is that, whenever 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
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.

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?
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
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. Copernicus is not the ultimate & final discoverer of astronomical truth. But not the less is it there to be discovered absolute & final astronomical truth.

JS: 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 invented it: and its application in deciding on the nature of truth has led to all sorts of infidelities.
FN: What did we say when the Anglican 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
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.
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, perceived 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 manifestation 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.

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.
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 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.
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 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.

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
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 man's will or God's 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
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 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?
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.

Such would be the practical result power of this belief,—when united with 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.

One great reason of our want of success in all our efforts is the "sic volo sic jubeo" philanthrophy. "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.

Would Sanitary Reformers cease their efforts under this such a belief?
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 circumstances. While circumstances rule man, the majority in hot countries will be lazy slaves.

JS: Quite true.

FN: Because food is plentiful,
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,

(if he replies at all,)

prayer for the removal of the evil.

"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
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.
"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
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 concomitants.

So with diversities of animal life & character. And breeders
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
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,
no difference in co-
existing or preceding phe-
nomena 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.
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.

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.
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 acceptance, 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.
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
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 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
grandeur, 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 [?]
right, I should say it is
utterly, hopelessly, unproductive.

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.
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.

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.

Others indeed suppose that here also exist
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.
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 be still by the Horse Guards, by Lord Panmure & the Army Medical Service.

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.

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.

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.

Both these interpretations 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 God's 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?

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 God's plan of the government of the world, without reference to man's 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.
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.

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.

This divine Will is now shewn by 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.
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.

While the (so-called) Evangelical believes that "the heart of man is desperately wicked",

(mark the word, which signifies 'hopelessly' wicked)

The word desperately does not mean "hopelessly". It means "determinately" & "willfully".

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 -

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?

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.
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 cf "preventible" towards the abolition of twin vices. But oh for a more direct acknowledgment of this consequent effort!

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 man's 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.

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 circumstances co-exist, that virtue will as certainly prevail where certain other organizations & circumstances co-exist - then vice would cease & virtue take its place in proportion to the force of that feeling & that conviction.
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 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 con-ditions 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 of the existence of these conditions will effect mens deliverance? History tells us that for 3000 years man has had this knowledge and the result is what we see.
Given the conviction of this invariable co-existence 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 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.

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.

[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 &
wrapped man in Pharaseism everywhere.
It was a perfectly logical result.
You know also what Christ said on
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.

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
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
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 may 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 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, 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 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.
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 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

in which I assert that phenomena (i.e all modes of being which begin & change), shall universally exist with regard to each other.
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
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
1800 years ago. They have attempted to show that Christianity is un-
reasonable, 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.
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
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?
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,

**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
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.
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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 [the?] God & our God, to be studied now & for ever in His Laws.

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.
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].

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.

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
of, in Liverpool, 17 years.
in the healthier districts, double that amount time
[the only variation in this doctrine is a
greater or less preponderance 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 Christianity.

JS: 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
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

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.
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
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.
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.
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sparing from such
a belief as this. For
submission to Perfect
Goodness is absurd.
Practical 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 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.
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 agree with what you say is said respecting punishment, (tho' we would leave out the word hereafter), in as far
course can engender as 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?

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?

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" -

[3]
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 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 diametrically 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 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 haves 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 its own capability of meeting or understanding this subject in which there are certainly feel difficulties, than in giving up its feeling & conviction that God is Omnipotence & Benevolence.
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 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.

Work out this field
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.
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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}
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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
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

Is.  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.

Is.  You  This is not supposing there a constant degene-
ration in the race of mankind?
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.

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

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 ...
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?

But we often sin it is said with the clearest knowledge that 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,
the habit was so strengthened if you that you we did not know how to overcome it.

IA. 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 antecedents 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 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 somewhat? 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 we speak of his will is an independent question. I suspect however that we lay immeasurably too much importance upon the will. The question
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.  

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?  

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.  

--- M.S. 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
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.

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 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 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 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?
Is there any meaning in the word "Free Will" applied either to man or to God? 

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 

Is God then the subject of necessity? 

Shelley. Certainly. Nor that And God can have no will 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 immutable 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
Or is He the subject of Law?  

J.A. no better than the ancient Fate Shelley. And if Religion is our tie religo 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 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, & therefore you must admit that God is Himself the subject of Necessity. 

If God willed evil, was He not subject to necessity?  

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.
Is it not that God cannot but 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 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 respecting 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.

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 human character & history, the more glimpses shall we have of Law making it what it has 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 throughout. 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
always. but, as to determining his own nature, sometimes he does & sometimes he does not. The child does & ought not - yet the object if 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, (‡ 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 ‡ are six thousand years to educate a being meant for Eternity?  

J.A. Well, I must return to this that
Yet man determined his own will something else determines it not. {end}
your system do not prove that man cannot determine his own will - that something else determines it for him

Can man choose to will any thing? {end}
M.S. Everyone will acknowledge that 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.

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 of these oft-disputed words.

Can a thief will not to steal, at the moment he is tempted?

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.

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 that 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.
Has then every crime of history been brought about by the laws of God?

J.A. Then the whole every horrible Revolution of 48 & 49 war has been brought about by the laws of God. Every atrocity 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.
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 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.
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IX. J.A. But let us in order to see where your 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.
Is it true
that at any
given moment
it was
impossible
to us to
will otherwise
than we
did?

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).
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.

Rhetoric is not logic. (but logic is often the best kind of Rhetoric)
Is sin not to feel repentance?  

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
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 his brain. His intellects are affected, not of the 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 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"? 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}

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 [illeg] 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 I 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.
Is humility an essential of goodness in Man?

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.

What is Humility?

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 pass 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.
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?

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 our knees till we obtained them. But I 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 I can understand are quite different - they 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
Religious instruction must be given partly of assertions considered by the teacher 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 &
Is there a "reflex" action in prayer? 

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. 

What is the "power of Prayer"?

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
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 disappointments 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

---

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 Confalonieré 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 I 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.
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.

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 it 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 hi 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
If we ask we want an answer the cry & 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?

We want communion with a Divine brother.

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.

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.

How can man receive an answer from the Eternal?
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
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?

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?

J.A. But I 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 it be said, what remains to be expressed to God? Surely, infinite are the sympathies, infinite the thoughts & feelings of Man towards the Perfect Spirit with whom he deserves to be one.
If, though I have much to say to God, 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 ground for this belief? 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—

Neither would the Being be perfect, who did not cause others to partake in that which constitutes well being.
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 and 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 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?
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 world is what we have to mould - is it not? not to fly from -

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.

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)
{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 finding Him there, because they did not expect He would be there -
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.
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 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 e/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 extraordinary that a man should think himself a teapot as that he/we should think God like that? 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 Protes=tants & 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! -a /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!, 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
Is not that/this “idolatry”? Idolatry is worshipping something which is not, which has no existence, is it not? 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? ñ/ 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 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?

"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

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

"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
(a) Here again comes in that fatal mistake about the Will! A boy, William is good & 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 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."

"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
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 - 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-mortification & self-inflicted tortures & wondered why God was so far off, & whether “his arm was shortened that he could not save”, & whether 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 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 varia bleness neither shadow of turning”-, but on an arbitrary
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 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
I used to 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. 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 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 -
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 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 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=) 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
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 by 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 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
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
God will not take care of unless you 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
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 passed/in the course of 50 years before me of late/many of us! I often fear lest 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 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 feeble 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 feeble 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.*
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.

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

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 ± 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, †-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 –

†/people who have been sitting all the morning; as young ladies usually sit in the drawing room with friends – & when †/those who have been at real work on things suitable to me/them – as †/do/there is between the times when †/people who have been shut up for 10 or 11 hours in a close room or carriage without food, & when †/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 †/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/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 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 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 & the mother against the daughter & there will be five in one house divided, three against two & two against three.”

“Yes, father, she said,” If I/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 I/we want not to do - I/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 do not 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 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/the can’t be grateful to people for making me/them slaves of me/them. I 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 interrupting 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 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 momentary impulse, vibrating, like a pendulum, between resentment & remorse, 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 a/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 a child & did not know; & they/how could the nurse let me do it?” How could they/she 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.”
“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, 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 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 / 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—and, even for such second-rate things as these, people cannot command the time necessary, how will they do for subjects of thought?—And we are slower still to apprehend that we must not rob you of the state of mind with which to think 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 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 everybody 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 or 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” -

(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 com pared indeed? The one had no possibility given her; the other had -
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 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/herc 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—/Very few swallow it at all; it runs down on both sides the baby’s mouth, &

(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 angry 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, 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 un made the most tangible progress so that Gœthe 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,
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 progress - Then comes 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, she seems to make money for making money’s sake - A Cabinet Minister, of the highest moral worth, subscribes to Hudson’s testimonial, even 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 distinguished & 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 ornamental 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 Titian produces Holy Families/whose Venus is an earthly profligate, paints a 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."
“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 to= morrow 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 disin-
terestness, 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,/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 any thing 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, I
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 & 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 marriage 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 -

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 known 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 par-
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 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 s 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 - & 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 such would be a God whom we can feel veneration for, 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, Certainly Christ’s was not the God of Law" (b) Insert 92b.

{in the margin in another hand Tomks}"

"You think 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?"
(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.

(in another hand: Dyke) (a) God’s plan is to teach all from invarableness - 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 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

“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 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!
"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! How shall I find help? I rejoice, 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 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.
When I feel 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.

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?
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.

I/We have long since done with the miraculous view. I/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!

But, you will say, they/it is said people might believe Christianity if they liked it. But—Could those who lived before Christianity, 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 if 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 represented not a God but a Devil—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.
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) 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.
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 everybody/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 if/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
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, 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 &
that His 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 occa-
sionally, 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
believe in God, because, if I really did believe
in Him, believed, i.e. in a *Perfect Being,*
whose scheme was that of the Perfection for
all His creatures, I should we not be in a continual
“rapture”?
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 if/we have the evidence of St. Teresa that she saw two little devils round a priest’s neck - if/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
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.

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 shrunk 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,
derar father, like Portia, for theological discoveries.
‡/They would have given her my/their heads, my/their hearts,
your/their hands - She would not have them - 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. 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 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, "& 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 / 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!! Because He gave it / left off, 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 “/ 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 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 & pur= suits 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 & amuse= ment - Do you think Does not God does not intend His children to be happy?”

“I am not surprised at it” she continued.
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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, When they wrote down in their visiting-book whom they have to visit, is there any reference to God in that? "I do not see", said Portia at last, "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? 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? 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 - 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 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 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, the whole of conventional life consists of saying, 'I am so sorry,' I hope you are coming when you/we are not 'sorry' & you/we do not 'hope'. 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 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 pate 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 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 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 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 it was preached to them that they should live."

"But surely" said 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 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}
“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—and 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 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—and 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 no more do they know what to teach their children. Even the Atheists among the Operatives cannot bear teaching them that there is no God—and 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 religious woman—she used to go to church on Sundays & say her prayers—that was her religion—Her goodness was to be careful of the poor, & to do little kind things by everybody & 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?

It reads its prayers every day, it is true.

But, Portia, I/It is said that we could have no comfort in my/our religion, if Î³/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 make up expression, He always intends to say something to us —"

"Then why do we not always hear?"

"Only 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 the Rimini miracle. We had been to Rimini a few months before—and I confess I was myself struck with 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—and 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 revived—how the besetting sin, swearing, had disappeared & many conversions, had have taken place—“It may be the effect of colour,” has been said she, “but to my mind, is it 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 look with deep reverence on the instrument, through which He has worked such a change?”

“Well, the most striking part of that 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 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 your 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 super-
stition as that?" this.

"But if 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 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
-27- -29-  

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 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 any body 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 “shocked” at what you/we say of God that they will have neither Him nor you/us for a “leader.”

“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 “everlasting punishment” - who requires to be “interceded with” all day by Jesus Christ to do that which is good. Why, 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 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" 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 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.”

The question is what the goods of this world are which we are to “despise”. I should say that “The goods of this world” were/are to be one with God - & these goods we are not to “despise” - And 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, 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 &c 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 is self-indulgence—the indulgence of the higher parts of yourself—I don’t think I—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.”
"But Napoleon thought about the praise of men, & his faculties were all in full & interesting exercise."

"yes, I should rather have said, in the work of God & mankind - 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 it 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."

"Columba, I admit your rebuke & return to my subject. I think, 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."

"But don’t you think there are many useful rules among the R. Catholic Orders?"

"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."

"But you don’t agree with them about humility."
"You see I think 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 / 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 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.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 Voltaire's, 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 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? 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.
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 -

Why do you believe this - Because Galileo/Aristotle would/what Aristotle 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/The assent of numbers added any/thing to his certainty - or that their dissent took anything/thing=f=from it - If/Will it not be so with religious certainties?
"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 /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 acquaintance,” 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 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 right-eousness"? 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 not take so long a time in 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 St. Ignatius Loyola tells us, & “examine myself/ourselves twice a day”, with great profit. But not in the life we at present lead."
I should like to say to men, It is no use talking of salvation, unless you ask, “what shall I do to be saved?” And then comes in — But really 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, 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 m/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
(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.

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?"

"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 we are to understand the nature of God & that we can make no progress without such understanding - I think The whole doctrine of a future state depends upon it & all our capability of perfection.

“I do not believe that 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
"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, 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
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.

θ/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 illig/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 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? I 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."

It should not be miserable if I/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 I/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 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 miracle, - 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 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 invariability & 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, we believe many things which they don’t believe. an eternal life - the goodness of God - though they say they do)
“Well, Portia, on the whole I think you think that the Catholic Orders are the only 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 answers 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 we do not owe it 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 / your natural feelings & inclinations - but endeavouring that / your nature shall be such that / your 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 / 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. Experience proved such marriages to be fatal to a race - 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 ours/ourselves such a nature that the seeking our selfish interest would be unnatural, & that the not doing God’s work would be “disregarding 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 selfishness.
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, your warm bed or your good dinner for 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 your make our bed cold or no bed at all, & your 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 - 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, ¹/to cultivate the spirit of mortification, ¹/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 helps me, do you? One might easily excite oneself to hate all these luxuries — But I don’t think it does me any 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 a mistake in 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 was perhaps the most spiritual being that 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 theoretically that He was plenarily inspired, a man=God. What do we, we Protestants for instance, 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 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 no right in 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 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 make 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 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 anything 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.”

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
“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 there is a Law which makes persecution favourable to development. A persecution which weakens or paralyses the organization, (& a slow system of disabilities, the depriving 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, I/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, Abracadabra, 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 wronger/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 Philosophers 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 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 The Roman Catholic way is the most sensible - where you who takes your beads & says so many Paternosters for every sin, as your 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 we do think of our sins enough to tell them each & individually to a priest who is the Intermediary, & who tells us whether we are sorry enough, & if we are, gives us Absolution - 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 know no x "Taking his clergyman’s duty”? the very words are 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 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 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 sees 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

(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 there is some rough truth in the superstition, A died for the good of B, A was drowned in order to teach B sympathy."

"Yes, I think 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 you 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, "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 particular things are indeed brought about by Providence."
  "I believe that, If when we 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 “Oh “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, 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 useless it is talking to any body/one about religion! Can you/we expect anything else when people go on paying morning visits to each other, al= though they know that both sides will be glad if they are not at home? And The B.Cs, 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 everybody 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.”
"My dear child, We are such martinetts 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 themselves 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.

“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,

(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."

LIV  XXVII

[in another hand:  Guppy]

"The opinions which I have given in conversation on people’s lives & characters, concerning which I/we had some thoughts & experience - the opinions which I hear given in conversation on the few subjects on which I/we have worked, seem to me/us, as I/we should expect, my/our own to seem to others, if I/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 &c 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 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 conception of its nature & object.
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 endeavoursing 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.”
"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
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 drawing, how the exercise of it shall affect the character & life, so as to render these in harmony with the nature & purpose of God and enable them to fulfil the work of Man.

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 Protestantism—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."
Family love, it appears to me, is generally but a reduplication 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.

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 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 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}
Add Mss 45839, 288 folios, sections on women’s novel; notes from 45839e and 45839; photocopies very poor; Adam Matthew microfilm reel 52
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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

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 -
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 it 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 it 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.

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
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}
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 -
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 then 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 coexistences & successions springing form 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}
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}

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
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 development 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 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 everybody 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
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, 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

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 miserabe 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!
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
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 is 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

say, “I believe all you say to be true,” yet con-
tinues to manifest a fear of death & of punish-
ment 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?
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 / 2ndly, how to make it — We are to ascertain first what is right & then how to perform it” —

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
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?
“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/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

* 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 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/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 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.
“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 ceases. 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 is! When one is not afraid of being oneself, when one suits the people one is with, when what one says and feels do not shock them or annoy them or frighten them, life is easy, life is improving, one makes 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 are less known by their 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. “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! 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 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.

Suppose you were to say of me that I do not desire the death of my child, but rather that she should turn from her wickedness & live. & expect that I should be admired 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 revengeful, or sometimes, as a climax
that He does not wish for the “death of 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 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 single hands are non-cooperative - & when they have done their work, what/there comes a collapse, come next!”

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 - 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 28

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 would 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

Amlamp

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 Internet, left inactive, its powers without an aim, - the heart, left void, its nameless ennui/ennui without a 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 circum-
stances under which the human being cannot be good, - & also of thinking that the kingdom of heaven without will produce that within -
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 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, have 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 dis=
engage 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/her 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."

"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
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 tremendous noise into the boiling dark black, bottomless chasm below. But drifting on the air & sparkling in the sun was the spray sprinkled with a thousand bright rainbows. 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 seductive 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 vanitious 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."
As sorry create have of man And died offspring 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, eternal punishment will disappear out of its/his religion - Everlasting damnation & capital punishment will go out together.
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 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 asked her whether she did not like Society. She pressed my arm & said, "What has "Society" done for us? what is the mission 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...
Society neither finds you/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.
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who gives to them (curious anomaly!) so she says to 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 I/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 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 expense 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 next morning they were all sitting in the drawing room, reading & working, & visiting 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 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
love, like the Titian’s devout Virgin, rapt in pure contemplation, in impassioned religious enthusiasm, and the “Venus’s hair” fern like the dreamy maiden of the North, 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 had 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 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
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 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 progression - 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 & employ- ment of all the powers, (and where do we see the woman with half her powers employed?) there can be no Repose, & with it, as if/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 49

{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

"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 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 every change has been made. (illeg) - But how can I take this? 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.

I/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 & 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. or Mary think, but what God thinks - God’s laws are for. 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 {illeg} 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 a Law which favours or which discons- tenances 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 consulted Statistics & made out/or make out what I could 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/may marry, still without making the least calculation - The parents thought/“think” they could not, & disapproved - The poor girl grew/thin & pale - ‘Now, don’t you approve?’ she said/says. or if she did/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.

{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

54
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 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 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/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 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 I 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 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 I/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 & 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 am feeling that I am/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.
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 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.
One of our most distinguished ethical philosophers says that he feared 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 &c &c. Whereas the Family, he added, which is Nature's work, presents variety, old, young, male, female -'

I/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 is 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. I 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 &c &c. Perhaps there are 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
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 -

We so agree with the principle laid down by my ethical philosopher that I would wish for a different organization of life & society. I was going to say that I am 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 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 we want never have to root out feelings or opinions. I find that 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

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.
"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!

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, Will it be said, we do not take Love into the account? We hardly ever saw it, & therefore cannot well tell what it is. 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? 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 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 & said truly, that so few people are capable of such a purpose - And are such not capable of Love? We have seen women in Love, as it is called, & men too. We never fell I could say, now that is love. Lord & Lady P. Mr. & Mrs. I unite together to keep up 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.

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 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, 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! 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, 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. I really think The parents are really as much to be pitied as the daughters.

“But our time & our faculties at least we have/”

“My dear, Children 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 — 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.”

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 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 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, 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?”

“My dear, I think that 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, 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?"

"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 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 deputes, & painfully feels, if she sees the faults, that she knows not how to prevent them."

"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 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."

"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.

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.
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.

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 - Let us not wish in a cowardly spirit to shrink from the pain of disappointment - but 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, 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

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 –

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 – & improves – 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, unattended 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 '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.

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 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 they mean & feel so rightly to each other, 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? Æ/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!"

“...” You say, Fulgentia, that /Is all this question about 17 relation between parents & children is new?...
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 no/No other religion perhaps ever died out so entirely as the Greek & Roman Pantheon - I imagine that, in Asia & to a degree in Africa (?) (though we know perhaps too little about Africa to judge) the old religious 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 they left traces of themselves, in ceremonies & practices adopted from them by the Christians - that the abstractions, Virtue, Good= mess &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 God & 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 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 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!

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 Concerning 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, comes from *rego*, I govern - but the right of governing from/by the right of governing & governing from/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 -

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 t/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.

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 pre=
pared 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 charac=
ters 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 &
24 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 -
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.”
You say, Fulgentia, 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.

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 26 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 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 present=None by 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.

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 to fulfill 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 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 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? I/we know not — I/we can only say, without this the essential of well-being is wanted — I/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, — I/we would, if I/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? Fulgentia- What I/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, I 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 attraction 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 & teaze 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?

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 or/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 superficially taught - not if so many of them are pursued that none can be done thoroughly - not 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 de/did.

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.

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 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.
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? 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 -

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 (I/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. I suppose 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 I 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 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/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, I 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.

If we have been sick at heart with my/our own faults & those of my/our friends - if 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 bring about the effects, which are brought about.

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, mutu-
ally to 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, recollect
ing 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 keepest
silence, excepting in the never silent voice of Law —
& excepting in those voices, those human voices, in=
spired 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 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.

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 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 has been 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 – What is she 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—

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
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 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
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 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/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 -

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.

*I/We don't want/wish to force them out of the family.*
*I/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 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.
f115

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 they/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?”
“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.

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.”

“It seems to me that I should like to live
But parents live in such a way that I/they must say, Yes, “I /We can spend £300 a year on a house in town, but I/we can’t give anything like that to my/our daughters – it would be very inconvenient.”

“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.

“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?² 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.
²/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 daughters can not, however, claim the money - But their time & their faculties I believe 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, how 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 that "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 conversation 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 -

"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 cooperation 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.

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 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 Euclid’s 4th Proposition & for this reason - that the Law of God in the characters of Mankind appears to be variety, not repetition.

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 of the same character as the parents. One would think it easy to make out

(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. But, however this may be, we may set down that God's law is variety, not against repetition. There are therefore, many/the strongest reasons why a family cannot develop itself to perfection within the walls of one home. With sons this 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!

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.

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 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
to be their bounden slave, as long as they live, unless they can be gratified by a marriage to their taste.

"Well, my dear child," I answered, "I have listened to your sermon/ I have read patiently for which I hope you give me credit. I suppose it is all aimed at Fulgentia & that it means I ought to give her a separate "establishment" - Now I want to know what she has not got that she can possibly desire - She may order anything she likes, she has the command of her money, time, influence.

"I was not thinking only of her, dear father, /Take any "daughter at home" of the richer classes. but of my own children alone. But I will speak of Fulgentia first. She has her dresses her food & her lodging & £100 a year. I don't know that she has anything - What else? There is a great deal of money spent on a carriage, but she has no share in that. I don't suppose she ever wishes to get into it. There is money spent on a cook & giving dinners, but perhaps she never wants to eat them or see the people who eat them. I really don't know what has she has out of the fortune but dress & food?

"And what else can she want than such a situation as hers to make her happy?"

How intensely is I am now feeling man's ignorance of what happiness is! how ignorant I have myself been of it. how earnestly people seek the circumstances which will make impossible for them that for which the type of human nature essentially hungers & thirsts! I know now distinctly what I should seek for in life, if the search were before me. But it is so no longer - And how eagerly are stones sought for bread! I think This arises much, because people really do not know
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
tell how to calculate upon, – which, sometimes indeed, are pressed into being, squeezed into shape by opposition 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 –

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,

“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. 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.

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.

(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 & 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 superintending 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 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.

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."

To this I answered that, if women would but
think seriously of their responsibilities, & would
illeg themselves by proper studies in Natural
I was in despair. I had taken Columba to 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. “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? 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 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
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 something 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?’

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, “as much as the Roman Catholics can believe that there will be Unity & Infallibility, so do we. I don’t see 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 immovable 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 be one day as surely as there is Unity in Astronomy – I mean that 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,” said I.

“I think there 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, ‘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 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.'"

"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 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 should say '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 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
as if we said in Physiological Science, 'you may think for 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, learned 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
who reasoned high

‘Of providence, foreknowledge, will & fate.’

“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.”
“and infallibility too?” said I.

“And I, Infallibility can only be attained in the same way.

Each will learn of God

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 note, if I can find

one, as that the Earth moves round the Sun? Does

not all educated England believe the one as “infallibly” as the

other?

do I believe. Polygamy

& theft are wrong as “infallibly” as it is untrue that the earth is

stationary. Yet the Mahometan does not

believe the first, nor did the Lacedaemonian

the second. These are discoveries as

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 - 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.”

“I do not understand your 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?

The word truth appears to have been derived from troweth - that which a man believes was troweth 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 “troweth”. 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.
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. 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 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, 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 trust in the God who will work a miracle in answer to their prayers, the veneration for 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 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 there is, or rather there was a time, said I "as with us Protestants now a days, when we do not believe 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 the supernatural Phase - when people prayed & expected 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 & Fénélon 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 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?'
Jones

that Did any one looked to see whether George IV had made any alteration because they prayed 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, The God of Prayer has also died out, & the far higher God of Law is not yet come

“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 you keep your heart in one church or another? How can you keep it from following your convictions?

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, having heard & thought & read (especially the Bible) & prayed & found that his convictions were in
another church, that it was his duty to stay where he was? I do not quite understand 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 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 sentiment, 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.”

“And this is the doctrine that you are going to teach your own children.”

But “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 / 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 / into the blank cold darkness & bare heath of unbelief.”
"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 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 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?

But 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 Protestant 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 I/we hear “the voice of one crying in the’ crowd, ‘Prepare ye the way of the Lord.’ I/We do not wonder at the rejection of Monotheism on account of its dulness - I should think t/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 ±n/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."

"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 "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 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, & I feel sure that He would not have said, says, ‘I am Jesus whom thou persecutest.’ I/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 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 - 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 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!

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 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"
& 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
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." "
½/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
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 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 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."
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 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? 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.

I/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? I/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 I/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.”
"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."
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. I/We am not surprised at not being happy – How can
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(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)

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.\[2\]
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 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 I a mother feels a particular attraction for one of my/ her children, I/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."

"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 the drawing-room equally or to church. For I 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 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."
“No,” said Portia, “We don’t say of God, ‘He must not,’ but ‘I am/we are sure He will not’ - it would be 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 any type - At first, in the world’s history, everybody tried to get as much as they could - & there were quarrels about wells & so forth - everybody 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”.
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 -
“I see,” said I, “you would do away with all liberty.”

"It seems to me," said she, "that for any great end 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 which generates the material, — not vice versa, as some think, the material, & material only, which generates 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!

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 natures & 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 accor-
dance 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 -
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 idiosyncracy - this 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 idiosyncracy. To fill up the practical detail of how such implicit obedience to Government & such free exercise of idiosyncracy 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 idiosyncracy. Hitherto, generally speaking, individual obedience checks freedom of idiosyncracy. 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 government of the Jews was called a 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!"
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?
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.

IV then, I/We should object to illegal/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,
because that would be a test that consid-

eration had been given to them, that it was

not loose exclamation from emotion, or crude 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.

II

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 a/Destructiveness, self=esteem, hope, love 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
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.

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 - if/perhaps would say, the only means - as far as I can discover.
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.

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 - I believe, that to the well-born & well-developed, no subject, proper for man's interest, would be without interest to each. Nay, man must always be wanting in divine comprehensiveness, in proportion to the portion of the Divine thought, of which he has no knowledge or feeling. It is certain, however, that, in a religious order or "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 idiosyncratic tendencies, limitation of study, limitations of employment must be most carefully considered. 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 cannot 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 comprehensiveness 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 religious "Society" of today must systematically limit the studies & employments of its members. While that which exist (I mean, (in mankind & among human characters)
The idea, prevalent in all ages, of a priesthood 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 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. 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.
It seems to me that 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.

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

(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!
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

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 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, I 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
belong to the Church of England, - 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 & 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 & 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]
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 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 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 - I/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 & intellect trace a thought, a feeling, a purpose for well-being, for comfort, for enjoyment in various modes of being. I see not how 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. 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 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, reflection, & experience, do I strengthen my belief that God is good.

But,- granting that for many individuals it is by experience proved well that they attain goodness & knowledge - still 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”? - 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 - 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.
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 shrink 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 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 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 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 Endeavour that your spirit to them be in relation with the best you/we know of their characters - for
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 condemn 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 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 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
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 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, to begin with, some few would/must unite in endeavours to make life & work one with the Divine thought & purpose—and 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. I/We strive to interpret it aright.  I/We find that Truth, Goodness & Wisdom are regulating the Universe aright with relation to Eternity. I/We find that there is neither right nor truth in the feeling of reproach to myself or/others 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 pat - 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 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 I/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 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=reprash, but for/as a spring to divinise humanity - to 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.

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 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,
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 conception 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 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 appear to me essentially contradictory to what I have acknowledged as truth. My 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 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.
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, 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 1/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 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 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.

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. 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.

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?

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 Goodness - Godness is Goodness - I now not that 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 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 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?
There is a want of elevation, of comprehension in almost all the objects for which Men work. Cooperation, in one true work, through/with various idiosyncrasies would admit of sources of happiness little 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 idiosyncracy in every human being, there might be the “Unity of the Spirit” of God & of Man.
Sermon VI (in another hand: x 11)

“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. We have no experience of any material existence which has ever ceased to be accordant with those laws, an accordance with which constitutes what we mean by matter.
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, for 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.
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”? 
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?
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 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 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.
I

"The voice of one crying in the "crowd,

"Prepare ye the way of the Lord."

Dartnell

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 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
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/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
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 mauling 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/them/thoughts employed upon, & your/them/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
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
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 watcheds & fasted/s more in the body than I have done/theys 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 (illeg)/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, scoured myself/ourselves morally, used the intellectual hair=shirt, in order to subdue that perpetual day=dreaming, which I knew was/to be/is so dangerous! I have/We resolve, ‘this day month I will be free from it! twice a day
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 produces 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
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
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 wish no torture less, The earlier it will bless.”

Nofriari & Fariseo sate sobbing together in the shadows of the cypress a ileg 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 white blossoms & shining green of the orange trees glistened among the cypress.

“But why, my sister,” said Fariseo “have you quarreled 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.
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 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 suffers - the story of one who has not the courage to resist nor to submit to the civilization of her time - (is this)

Poetry & imagination began 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 wished to satisfy the wants which my Intellect created for me/it - But there is a physical, not moral, impossibility
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 presence of an inferior organization - but, in general, just the contrary - Your sister-in-law Mrs. A. has the imagination, the poetry of a 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 profession - where they 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 & oppor tunity 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 then 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?"

"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 end 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?
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 how do you/we explain then said I (if I am Fariseo) "the innumerable many 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 way 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 - I/Many women never had/have an hour in all my life/their lives - (excepting before anybody was/is up in the house) that I/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, some=
thing 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 opera=
tion - 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

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}
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 I suppose, the most valuable of all things. If they had come every morning & afternoon & robbed me/us of half=a=crown, I/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=tem=pered, & 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 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
he knew not what to say. They sate 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 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
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 (I 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, I/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
on one another & are dreaming of the 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 landscape,” 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 a 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 I/we were a child/children, whose spirits rise during a fortnight’s holidays, who think 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 o ver many. I/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 I/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 I/we see? I/We see great & fine organizations deteriorating – I/We see girls & boys of 17, before whose noble ambitions, heroic dreams & rich endowments I/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}
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 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. 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 if some loved its solemn desolation - its silence - its solitude - if they are but allowed to live in it - if they are not perpetually 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, 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? 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?

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"}
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 / 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.

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 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.

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
how imperfect, in the present state of the world, such an education must be - I dreamed of/they long for experience, not patchwork experience - but experience followed up systematically to enable me/them to know what I was/theirs 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 patchwork. 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 - 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 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, 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 commonplace, every-day characters that we 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
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.

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 -

And, if a woman’s music & drawing are only used by her as an amusement, - (a past-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 unconscious - 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 -/if they accepted that. That man & woman have an equality of 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
breath 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/them! They are
exhausted, like a man/ those who has lived on opium or
on novels - all his life/their lives - exhausted with feelings
which ied/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?’”

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 I/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.”

If/We have nothing to do which raises me/us - no food which agrees with me/us. If/We can never pursue any object for a single two hours! for If/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, everybody 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/ later 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 -

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. Æ/They are an hour before Æ/they can fix it, & by the time it is fixed, the leisure is gone. Æ/They become incapable of consecutive or strenuous work.

What Æ/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/to bed, as if Æ/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 Æ/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}
IV

“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 '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 end, do you think?

Alas! 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 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! When shall we see a woman making a study of what she does? Married women cannot - for a man would think, if his woman 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.
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, & 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, imme=
diately, 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 expecta=
tion, 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! 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}
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/the 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/the they cannot recall them. I/They do not even remember them - and I am/the they are left without the food either of reality or of hope. Late in life, I/the 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/the never find an hour free in which to collect my/their thoughts - & so discouragement becomes ever deeper & deeper - & I/the less & less capable of undertaking anything -

Oh! 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/shear 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 them the means to exercise this moral activity, must give 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, 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 - (♀/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, “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 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 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 way, by fancying that they were or 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!”
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!"
“But,” I said, “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 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 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 conventionality. (which were meant, not for selfish gratification, but for the improvement of that world) to conventionality.

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}
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her grave — still less the expression of regret or of admiration — but simply the words, “I believe in God.”
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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.
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.

FN: It is in man’s power to raise his race to the standard of Newts 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?

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?

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?

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.

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?

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.

FN: For a man may put an end to his service, if dissatisfied with it.

JSM: not if he has taken his wages.

FN: Law neither explains nor compels.

JSM: Then how does Law prove a legislator?
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 ê 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.