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NATURE AND METHOD OF ETHIC.

Insino a qui l'un giogo di Parnaso
Assai mi fa; ma or con amendo
M'è uopo entrar nell' aringo rimaso.

Dante.

§ 1. I propose in the present work to complete the examination of the phenomena which belong properly to Metaphysic, that is, phenomena which can be satisfactorily treated only from a subjective point of view or in their subjective aspect, by examining in some detail the feelings and actions of man, his judgments on them, and the moral and legal conceptions which he deduces from or builds upon them. One half of the total examination of these phenomena has already been performed in a work entitled "Time and Space, a Metaphysical Essay;" and the analysis there contained serves both to mark out the field remaining to be explored, and to furnish the principles and the framework, in other terms, the Logic, to be applied in its exploration. In that work it was maintained that phenomena, the whole world of phenomena in the widest sense of the term, and
every portion of it however minute, had a double aspect, subjective and objective, was at once a mode of consciousness and an existing thing; but that these opposite aspects of a phenomenon applied to the whole of it, and were not elements constituting it by their combination. It was further maintained that every phenomenon had, besides this, at least two such constitutive elements, metaphysical, and logically discernible in it, but not empirically separable from each other; the inseparable union of which constituted an empirical or complete phenomenon; which phenomenon then had, as a whole, the two aspects just mentioned, so that the same two kinds of constitutive, metaphysical, elements could be discerned alike in either aspect. These elements were of two kinds, Time and Space the formal, and Feeling the material, element; time, or time and space together, entering into all phenomena whatever, along with some mode or modes of feeling; which latter were however indefinitely numerous, so that the formal element, being of two kinds only, served as the common link or bond between them all. Metaphysic in its strict sense, it was said, was the theory of the formal element in consciousness, of the general modes of its combination with the material element, and of its function in supporting redintegrations or series of perceptions, if spontaneously occurring, and in guiding them if voluntary or undertaken for a foreseen purpose. Accordingly the second part of "Time and Space" contained a view of Formal Logic and its laws, and of the further functions of the formal element in the processes of Reflection and the formation of Ideas.

2. The present work is intended to deal with the
remaining half of the subject, namely, the material element in consciousness, the feelings; under which term, as will become evident in the sequel, actions are properly included; for the proof of which inclusion I may perhaps be permitted besides to refer to "Time and Space" § 32. It will be equally impossible here as there to isolate the material element from the formal in order to its examination. Just as in "Time and Space" the formal element had to be examined in combination with its matter, the purpose of the inquiry furnishing only the direction and mode of treatment which the investigation was to assume, so in the present work the combination of the formal element with feelings can never be left out of view; indeed the degree and mode of complexity with which different feelings involve this element will be found the chief index to their appropriate analysis and classification. The form is the logic of the feelings; to arrange them logically is therefore to examine their relations to their formal element. In this way it is that the work already done in "Time and Space" furnishes us with a method and a key to the work remaining to be done here. There we had the establishment of the Logic, here we have its application. In the first Book of the present work accordingly I shall endeavour to apply this logic of the formal element to the analysis and classification of the different modes of feeling, whether sensations, emotions, passions, desires, pleasures, pains, efforts, volitions, or actions; to the modes of movement or working which pervade them and connect them into a life; and to their combination, in consequence of such working, into types of character, so far as these can be dealt with without taking into
consideration the effects of different external circumstances, which in all cases so largely contribute to mould them. I hope that this analysis will put me in a position to sketch out, in the second Book, a system of principles of judgment, applicable to feeling and action, a system to guide judgment in all cases that may arise, in short what I may perhaps call a Logic of Practice; a logic in the same sense as the formal element is a logic in application to the material, that is, a fixed method, by applying which to actions and systems of actions, to history and to life, we may ascertain whether or not we have the object-matter before us in its natural and real shape, with all its essential aspects brought out in their true relative importance, without omission and without addition. It will be reserved for such a logic of practice to examine and if possible to determine the various questions which are still agitated respecting moral obligation, such as, for instance, whether happiness is its only source, or a sufficient account of its origin; whether it is the true happiness of the individual, or that of the race, or that of sentient beings generally, which must be held to have this character; where the ultimate criterion is found for judging doubtful questions of morals when they arise; whether and on what grounds it is possible to condemn an action while acquitting or even honouring the agent, or to condemn the agent while honouring the act. Such questions as these would fall properly within the scope of the system of principles I have endeavoured to picture, while they would be almost hopeless of solution without a previous analysis of the phenomena, such as the first Book will contain; since, although a solution might be made to appear
highly probable a priori, it would lack the justification attainable by its evident applicability to the phenomena, prepared by the analysis. On the other hand, the second examination of the phenomena by the systematisation of a logic of practice is plainly requisite to complete the subject as a whole; and it is this part of the work which justifies its claim to be an enquiry into the Theory of Practice in general.

§ 2. The necessity for entering in the first Book upon an analysis of the whole of the material furniture of consciousness will be more apparent if we consider the different views which are entertained of the nature and scope of Ethic, and the different ways in which its study may be approached. Ethic seems in the first place to be conversant with actions and habits; and farther, since the motive in all action is to obtain or increase some pleasure, or else to avoid or diminish some pain, pleasure and pain being well called by Bentham the springs of action, Ethic seems to be conversant also with pleasures and pains. These two views are easily united, for pleasures and pains stand to actions and consequent habits in the relation of cause to effect, so that in studying pleasures and pains we are studying actions and habits at their source, and in studying actions and habits we are studying pleasures and pains in their stream; and by combining both views, and studying the reactions between stream and source, it seems as if the whole subject would be sufficiently exhausted.

2. But this is only one side or aspect of the subject, for so far as it has now been stated it aims only at discovering what actions or habits are or will be done or exist, not what ought to be done or exist. From another side Ethic seems to be conversant
with judgments about actions and habits, pleasures and pains, as better or worse than one another, judgments of approval or disapproval; in which view of the case, the actions and habits are classified under the two heads of virtues and vices. These two views are again capable of combination; and it is only as such combination, and in virtue of the addition of the second view to the first, that Ethic becomes a practical enquiry; since it would not differ from sciences of pure observation and experiment if it confined itself to studying the sequences of phenomena, and did not proceed to guide opinion in preferring some to others in future conduct. It is its influence on future action and habit, by means of a judgment on the past, that makes Ethic what it is, a practical study.

3. There is then a sort of reduplication, ἰπαναιφλάσις, in Ethic, a returning back on its own observations and a fresh traversing of them, arranging them under new categories expressive of praise or blame. In the first limb of its course it is a science of speculation, in its second one of practice; and it makes no difference that practice, consisting of actions and habits, is the object-matter of its investigations, unless it treats them in a way to influence future practice. Now it is in determining the relation, and the relative rank or primacy, between these two branches of Ethic that disputes arise which necessitate the careful metaphysical analysis of the phenomena, previous to the establishment of any ethical theory whatever. The speculative branch of Ethic deals with what is, has been, will be, or will not be; the second with what ought to be, or is better or worse than something else. Now every judgment
asserting an “ought” is itself a phenomenon or fact, which belongs to the speculative branch and falls under its cognisance, as being determined by the laws governing the sequence of phenomena as such. In other words, the judgment which asserts the preference of one thing to another is made what it is, say, ‘that courage is better than craft,’ by causes which are irreversible and belong to the domain of facts; apparently, therefore, however much the judgment may express an “ought,” there is no validity in it beyond the validity of its being a fact, since if no one whatever passed the judgment it would become not merely invalid but nonexistent; and apparently also those judgments only which do continue as facts and outlast or outweigh in fact other judgments, so as actually to influence practice, have a right to be obeyed,—a right derived in no measure from their containing an “ought,” but solely from their actual permanence as facts. In this way the special function of the practical branch of Ethic seems destroyed, and itself subsumed under the speculative branch, the weight of its “ought” being exhibited as a case of weight of fact, and its right as a case of might.

4. But in so stating the dispute for the primacy we shall have proved too much; if this view were true, the practical branch would be not merely subordinated to the speculative, but it would be destroyed as a distinct branch. *What is erroneous in it may be thus exhibited. It is true that all judgments are facts; but the practical validity of judgments consists in their being existent at a particular time, in their being passed at the moment of the action passing from the present to the future. All
conscious acts—and it is only conscious acts and their consequences that are the object-matter of Ethic—are judgments at the moment of their becoming acts, are preferences of one mode of acting to another. It is only when we look back upon them as past actions that they have a fixed or purely speculative character; each action has been a judgment in the moment of its birth as action, and its character as a judgment is that which has given it its character as a fact, that is, has made it, and not something else, a fact at all. The debate therefore between the two branches of Ethic must be thus settled: the judgment is supreme at the moment of acting, but the actions which are its product have their validity not from their being practical judgments but from their being accomplished facts; and when it is urged that every judgment has its nature and content determined solely by the entire course of past actions and events, it must be replied that these actions at least have themselves become such, and have acquired their determinant force, solely by having once in their turn been judgments. The reference of judgment and action to different times dissolves the apparent contradiction between their claims. In looking at actions as past we consider them speculatively and as matters of fact; in looking at them in the moment of becoming past we consider them practically and as matters of judgment. Yet the apparent contradiction is too deep-seated and thorough-going to be satisfactorily removed by such brief remarks as the foregoing. It will soon reappear in a somewhat different shape.

5. When Ethic, then, is treated as a practical science, the debate is changed from one between judg-
ment and action to one between different kinds of judgment. Judgment is supreme in practice, in determining the future; but among judgments themselves what differences are discoverable, what judgments are superior, what inferior? Here is the question which, by dividing the opinion of moralists, renders necessary the thorough examination of the furniture, the phenomena, of consciousness. It is admitted that, since the enquiry is a practical one, the judgment, the preference of a better to a worse, the assertion of an "ought," is supreme; that we are not blind actors but judges and choosers of conduct. But if the judgment determines the conduct, what determines the judgment; aye and what ought to determine the judgment; for, in admitting judgment as supreme, we do not admit it in its character of fact but in its character of judgment, that is, as the assertion of a better or of an "ought"? Not that it is actually passed, but that it is a preference of a better to a worse, is what we mean by calling it a judgment. What kinds of judgments are better than others, what kinds of preferences are best, what is the supreme "ought,"—these are the questions which seem to have presented inextricable difficulties to ethical writers.

6. Now it is worthy of remark that the same question which has been raised between the speculative and the practical branches of Ethic, or rather the difficulty which lay at the root of that question, presents itself here again in a different shape, in the dispute between different kinds of judgment for the primacy. Pleasures and pains, it was said, are the springs of action. All conscious acts are done from these motives. As a matter of fact, they do produce
and guide action. No action takes place which is not the product of them, of course in their largest and widest sense. Gather up into one ideal the greatest and best, the most refined and most finely harmonised pleasures, including those which arise from a sense of duty fulfilled, with the smallest admixture of pain, and you have the famous conception of the Summum Bonum, ευδαιμονία, happiness. When it is asserted that pleasure of this kind not only actually is, but also ought practically to be, the motive in determining judgment, when no difference of kind is recognised between the actual motive of action and the practical motive of choosing,—or, if these two things are distinguished logically, it is yet maintained that the motive determining the judgment has no other validity than the pleasure, of whatever kind, which determines the action,—then is held the theory which, in many various modifications, is known commonly as the theory of the Utilitarian school. But if on the other hand it is held, that, besides the motive to action which is universal, namely, the avoidance of pain and the procuring of pleasure, of any or all kinds, there is another motive which alone has validity in determining the judgment, different in kind from pleasure and not derived from it, although always accompanied by it, namely, a sense of duty or moral obligation; and that this element in the judgment is what gives it practical validity, though it may or may not determine it to become further action according as the pleasure attaching to it is greater or less than the pleasure attaching to other lines of conduct at the moment of choice; then is asserted the counter theory to the Utilitarian, a theory which for want of an already current single
name may perhaps be called the theory of a Moral Law. And I believe that all theories of morals, ancient or modern, will be found to be some modification of these two, and to rest ultimately upon one of the two principles which I have indicated as the basis of each. For instance, under the Utilitarian principle may be reckoned both those theories which would deduce all moral virtues from self-love, or enlightened self-interest, and those which would deduce them from sympathy or benevolence, Schopenhauer’s Neminem lædæ, immo omnes quantum potes juva, and Auguste Comte’s Vivre pour autrui; for in both of these happiness or well-being is considered as the sole source of right, whether the person who is to enjoy it is oneself or another. And under the general principle of the other school, the principle of duty or obedience to a moral law, may be brought those theories of a self-determining Ego, Will, or Person, which is exhibited best in Kant’s Kritik der Praktischen Vernunft, and also those which assume a religious shape, namely, obedience to the Will of God, which displays itself in the concrete duties of holiness, purity, self-denial, unworldliness, humility, and so on.

7. The intricacy in which all discussions are involved, which go deeply into the principles of these two schools, seems to me to flow from the difficulty of logically distinguishing between the validity which a thing has for determining the judgment as judgment and the force which it has for determining the judgment as action; for every judgment is an action. It does not follow, because a motive determines the judgment as action, that it must also have determined it as judgment; the greater pleasure, it is
clear, determines the judgment as action; we both do the thing and appear to think it the best thing to do, for the judgment as a total act is itself determined, not the action determined against the judgment. But does the greater pleasure supply a valid reason as well as an effectual motive to the judgment for its determination? This is a question which is not so clear. Now those who insist that the motive determining the judgment actually is eo ipso the thing which the judging or reasoning element of the judgment thinks best overlook the possible effects of a distinction, which is always to be found in the judgment itself, between its volitional and its comparing functions. Judgment, inasmuch as it is action, is compound; will as well as reason is contained in it. The determination of the judgment may mean the determination of the volitional element alone, with small contribution, even almost none, from the comparing element, or again in direct opposition to the knowledge given by that element, as where we persist in doing what we know at the time is pernicious. This analysis of acts of judgment is all-important. All volition is reasoning, since it includes some degree of comparison, and conversely every act of reasoning is a voluntary act; it includes the two component elements or strains, perception of a comparison or relation between two perceptions, and volition to hold them together till they either combine or one excludes the other. Pleasure is a motive which acts on and determines volition; the truth or untruth of the perceptions in relation is what is perceived by the comparing element, in virtue of which the volition is reasoning. It is the empirical method only which persists in treating an
act of reasoning and an act of volition as two separate and complete acts, in separating so-called actions from so-called reasonings. Nothing but confusion can result from such a deviation from the truth of nature.

8. However, when we have drawn this distinction the question still remains, whether there is any ground or reason determinant of the reasoning element or strain in judgment, different from pleasure, which is confessedly the determinant or motive of the volitional element. The Utilitarian school seem to me to have answered this question in the negative, without having clearly enough perceived the distinction of the two elements in the act of reasoning which gives it significance. They are thus always recurring to the question of fact instead of to the question of right. What makes one course of conduct to be judged better than another? They reply, Its being perceived to be productive ultimately of the greater pleasure. But is this judgment right? They reply, The greater pleasure is its own justifica-
cation. They thus take up, with respect to the determination of judgment, the same ground which was above supposed to be occupied by those who denied the validity of judgment against fact; the question of right and of justification is in both cases merged in the question of fact.

9. In opposition to this the other school of moralists ask, Why is it that we have the conception of right, of duty, of moral obligation, as things different in kind from pleasure, even from those pleasures which are attached to the observance of these conceptions themselves? And although various theories have been started in order to satisfy this demand,
such as, for instance, that the conceptions in question have been produced by long association and experience of the superior kinds of pleasure with steady resolution in virtuous conduct; or that they have arisen from the notion of debt enforced, or of punishment inflicted, by superior power; or by means such as these with the additional ingraining force of hereditary transmission, (see, for instance, Mr. Herbert Spencer's Letter to Mr. Mill, printed in Prof. Bain's Mental and Moral Science, page 721, 2d edit.); yet still the enquirers are not satisfied, but keep steady to their conviction, that conceptions so different must have a different source, and conceptions so much loftier a loftier one than those to which they are thus referred. You must prove to us, they would say, that such a transformation of notions of expediency or might into the notion of moral right is not only possible but actual, must lay your finger, as it were, on the moment of operation, before we can consent to give up the belief that the latter has always been, what it appears to be now, a primary and original fact in consciousness. For, as a matter of fact, the conception of right constantly recurs in contradistinction to that of pleasure or of power, as is subtilly remarked in the following passage from a well-known work of this school,—Price's Review of the Principal Questions and Difficulties in Morals, Chap. vi. p. 185, 2d edit. "One cannot but observe on this occasion, how the ideas of right and wrong force themselves upon us, and in some form or other, always remain, even when we think we have annihilated them. Thus, after we have supposed all actions and ends to be in themselves indifferent, it is natural to conceive, that therefore it is
right to give ourselves up to the guidance of unrestrained inclination, and wrong to be careful of our actions, or to give ourselves any trouble in pursuing any ends. Or, if with Hobbs and the orator in Plato's Gorgias, we suppose that the strongest may oppress the weakest, and take to themselves whatever they can seize; or that unlimited power confers an unlimited right; this plainly still leaves us in possession of the idea of right, and only establishes another species of it.—In like manner, when we suppose all the obligations of morality to be derived from laws and compacts, we at the same time find ourselves under a necessity of supposing something before them, not absolutely indifferent in respect of choice; something good and evil, right and wrong, which gave rise to them and occasion for them; and which, after they are made, makes them regarded." This however is not inconsistent with the explanations offered by the opposite school; but it is evident that the objection will not be removed, until the actual transformation of expediency or might into moral right has been indubitably established.

10. And so also on the other hand, although the disciples of the school of moral law are thus staunch in maintaining their conviction of the original difference and superiority of some principle of right as opposed to expediency or to might, it is clear that the only proof of their conviction being true would consist in their being able to put their finger, as it were, on the spot, and say what precisely it is in a judgment, or in the object of a judgment, which gives it this distinct character of right, duty, moral goodness, or moral obligation. Until this is either done or shown to be impossible, the controversy be-
tween the two schools must continue. But to point out this element precisely is a matter which depends on analysis of the phenomena of consciousness, an analysis more searching and accurate than any which has yet been performed. Here then we are driven back upon Metaphysic.

11. Metaphysic proper is purely speculative, and contains two branches, statical analysis and dynamical; the statical analysis determines the nature, the ἴστη, of an object or state of consciousness, the dynamical determines the general modes of movement or sequence of such objects or states, and to that extent the πῶς παραγίνεται of each of them. But that part of Metaphysic in a larger sense, which is practical as well as speculative, namely Ethic, while it retains as purely and entirely speculative the dynamical branch of enquiry, which determines the πῶς παραγίνεται of judgments and actions, introduces into the statical branch, the analysis of the ἴστη, a distinction between what is and what ought to be. The practical moment, the moment of validity, of judgment, of better or worse, the moment of "ought,"—this is discoverable only in the statical analysis, the ἴστη, of objects and states of consciousness.

§ 3. 1. The same considerations which show the insufficiency of the methods of the just mentioned schools, unless founded on previous analysis of the phenomena of consciousness, show also the insufficiency of the method which approaches the examination of the practice of individuals from the side of their relation to society, and endeavours to determine the laws of their practice by deduction from the laws of the practice of men acting in masses, whether statically in a nation or state as it exists at
any one time, or dynamically in its historical changes and developments in long periods of time. For when the question is, not what the state actually does or what it actually tends towards, but what it ought to do or ought to become, which are the practical questions proposed to every individual in his sphere, and peculiarly to those who are called to guide or directly influence the collective action of the state, the same difficulties arise again which arose in the case of the individual, relating to the criteria of desirability in the choice of ends. Ought the state to have a conscience, as it is called; ought it to direct its measures towards promoting the moral virtues in its individual citizens; or ought it to aim solely at their material prosperity as individuals, or at the material aggrandisement of itself as a state? Such difficulties as these are unavoidable the moment the question is put practically; and to ignore the question of what is best to be done or ought to be done, expecting an answer which shall be a guide to future action, is nothing else than to treat Ethic and Politic as purely speculative sciences, and, since all human action is choice and must be guided by some consideration or other, however we may treat it, to deliver it up to the blind determination of foreign or external causes. It is, comparatively speaking, easy to discover what the actual constitution of a state is, what its history has been, and what it is actually tending to become. This is treating the subject merely as a matter of observation of fact, as in the physical sciences. Every one, however, admits that Politic is a practical science, having for its scope to modify the actual condition, in some measure at least, for the better, and therefore to study the laws of society and of
history as laws of natural phenomena, with a view to imprint upon them a better tendency; in other words, to introduce improvements where it is found practicable. Now the moment society begins to entertain the practical question, it is necessarily some individual or individuals in consultation who entertain it. What society thinks best to be done, that some individuals think best to be done; the practical judgment of society is the practical judgment of some individuals, many or few, in that society. They become its organs in all choice of conduct, and without organs it would be a blind non-deliberating agent, an object of observation and experiment alone, like the objects of chemistry or astronomy. This necessity of society's acting practically only through individuals is that which compels it to act according to the conditions of an individual's judgment, and therefore subjects it to the difficulties which, as already shown, constitute the, at present at least inevitable, embarrassment of Ethic. Consequently the science of Politic is subordinate to that of Ethic, the science of the whole mass of individuals to that of the individual separately, in the practical branch of the science. But in the speculative branch of Ethic, the action of the mass, or society as a whole, upon the individual is a part of the external conditions to which he is subject; and with the total of those conditions must be studied speculatively, as if it were the object of a science of pure observation or experiment. There is one branch of Ethic, the speculative branch, in which it is subordinate to the corresponding branch of Politic; and there is one branch of Politic, the practical, in which it is subordinate to the corresponding branch of Ethic.
2. If we cast a glance back at history, or at the history of philosophy, we shall find this view confirmed. The earliest complete theory which embraced both sciences, Plato's Republic, was the expression of the view that Ethic was entirely subordinate to Politic in its practical branch. (See Sir Alexander Grant's Ethics of Aristotle, vol. i. Essay III.) That which was desirable for the community was first determined, and the individuals were to be instructed not to consider what might be desirable for them individually. It is certainly remarkable, though by no means inexplicable, that Plato should have taken this view, Plato who was the great upholder of the idea of justice as opposed to pleasure, and of the conception of the virtues being ἱστημέναι. It is an instance of the fact that great moral truths are seen more easily and therefore earlier when exemplified on a large scale, as in society, than on a small scale, as in the individuals, in whom they nevertheless originate. Plato could conceive the realisation of the idea of justice only by imagining it applied at once to the relation between a community and its members, not as obtaining between two individuals apart from the state; although, in truth, only by first satisfying its claims between the individuals, as such, could there exist any true justice in the whole; for justice is an idea conceived necessarily, if at all, by individual minds, and except as so conceived has no existence. The question really was, not what Plato, a spectator ab extra, thought just in a state, but what the individuals of the state would concur with such a spectator in thinking so. "Das Princip der neuern Welt überhaupt ist Freiheit der Subjektivität, dass alle wesentliche Seiten, die

3. Ethic then was by Plato involved in Politic. With Aristotle the two became distinguished. We have separate treatises devoted to each. The actions, habits, and characters, of the individuals were examined, and classified as virtues or vices; and a general characteristic of the virtues was pointed out, namely, that they were all “means” between two extremes which were vices. Besides this, what was much more important, the logic of the ἥγεμον and its τέλος was introduced, with the supreme τέλος of all conscious action, ἐνδιαιμονία. Yet, notwithstanding that some prominence was given to the question of choice in its subjective aspect, προκάθεσις, no criterion for the subjective determination of choice at the moment of action or judgment was given, beyond what lay in the general perception of ἐνδιαιμονία. Beyond this a tribunal, and a function in man corresponding to it, were indicated, to which recourse was had in all doubtful points, I mean the frequent appeals to ὠφθή λόγος, and ὡς ὅ ἄγαθος ἐρίσει. It is one thing however to have a judge appointed to decide questions, and another to have a judge furnished with a criterion or test which he must apply. He may not, even in the latter case, be able to decide all questions, but he can go farther than if he were left to his unguided sense, and the farther in proportion as the criterion is distinct and of immediate applicability. Aristotle, then, made the immense step of separating the practical branch of Ethic from Politic, but he did not treat it subjectively to any great extent, nor carry his analysis of choice far enough to discern a sub-
jective criterion beyond the conception which "right reasoning" or "the good man" might form for himself of happiness as the end of life. The practical question in Ethic however is, as already shown, whether there is or is not such a subjective practical criterion.

4. If we turn to history proper we find a corresponding fact. Neither in Greece nor in Rome was there a spiritual power, in the usual sense of the term, side by side with or above the temporal, as Auguste Comte has shown. The development of the mind of man had not reached that stage at which the subjective side of practical judgment could make itself manifest, either in the shape of a theoretical philosophy or in that of a political constitution. It is only dawning in the Aristotelian doctrine of προοιμία. It is however the most prominent feature in the writings of St. Paul, the point on which he most earnestly insists: "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind" (Rom. xiv. 5); and "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. xiv. 23). St. Paul is the law reformer of rising Christianity, as the writers of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the Fourth Gospel and First Epistle of St. John are its religious philosophers, or reformers in theology proper. He substituted the law of Conscience for the law of ordinances, the status of grace, of faith, of sonship, for the status of servitude to an external authority; free grace and free obedience being two expressions for one and the same thing, namely, the relation between the subject and the sovereign, between man and God. The doctrine of a conscience which could not be bound by temporal laws was the specific shape in which the subjective aspect of choice made its im-
importance felt; and this is what underlies the terms, moral obligation, duty, moral sense, moral law, and the like, which we have seen are the watchwords of one of the two great schools of moralists. In history, the origin and separate existence of the Spiritual Power, the Church, are the manifestation of the same phenomenon, conscience asserting itself against power, the conviction that there is something in practical judgments which gives them a validity superior to any force or might which they derive from motives of happiness, whether these are exhibited as attractive or deterrent, as pleasures or as pains, as rewards or as punishments. What precisely this something is, in what precisely consists the supreme validity of conscience, demands a more searching analysis of the facts or phenomena of consciousness, and that subjectively, than they have as yet received.

§ 4. It follows from what has been said, that the method proper to Ethic is that of subjective or internal observation. Actions and habits, and chains of actions and habits, are objectively nothing but events and chains of events, and these may be observed and examined without any more reference to subjective feelings than is necessary in the case of physical phenomena, the succession of waves on a beach, or the stages of growth and development of a tree. But the moment we enter on the consideration either of the motives or springs of action, or of the end aimed at in actions, we enter on the question of the value of feelings to the agent, their comparative value in kind, and in degree of intensity. We have to consider what these motives and ends are to him as feelings; and the same is the case with the actions of men in masses and the events of his-
tory. For when we would form a judgment of the comparative value of the goal to which the actions of a nation or of the race appear to be tending, or of the several tendencies which compose its entire course, we have to ask what feelings and thoughts that goal or course will consist of, what capacities for enjoyment will be developed, what characters will be produced, what the minds of the men will be. This necessity for entering on the subjective analysis of feelings in order to determine their comparative value to consciousness is irrespective of the view which we may take as to the merits of the Utilitarian school or its opposite. All consideration of motive or of end, whether these consist of pleasure only or also of duty, all practical enquiry, involves the taking up a subjective point of view. Pleasure and pain in all their kinds and degrees are subjective feelings, the names of them do not even appear to have a meaning apart from such feeling, nor can we reason about them without bearing in mind their subjective significance. But physical objects, actions of men and events of history, though equally consisting of subjective feelings in their last analysis, and therefore capable of being subjectively treated, yet can be also analysed as objective things, and their laws discovered, without the necessity of a constant reference to the fact of this subjective constitution and nature; we need not be constantly translating the terms describing them and their sequences into terms significant of their subjective aspect; it is enough that they can be so translated if occasion for such verification should arise; otherwise the course of investigation would be interrupted, the objects being sufficiently well known in their objective aspect.
2. Although therefore there is no class of objects which is not capable of being examined both in its objective and in its subjective aspect, there are yet two classes of objects which are most effectively treated, the one from its subjective, the other from its objective side. Physical objects, generally, belong to the class which is most effectively treated from the objective side, and are objects of special empirical sciences. Among these may be distinguished, for the purposes of the present work, first, the nerves and nervous organism as forming one whole class of the causes of states of consciousness; and secondly, those changes of sequence in physical objects which are known as human actions and historical events. But on the other hand, feelings and thoughts, in all their varieties, among which it has been shown that everything which is a motive or an end of action must be reckoned, belong to the class which can be best treated subjectively, which indeed can be only treated subjectively, so long as the phenomena belonging to it have not been made, by the course of thought, into complete and familiar objects, with names which have a definite and admitted connotation, as in the case of physical objects.

3. Now it has been shown in § 2, that Ethic comprises two branches, to one of which, the speculative, it is now clear that the study of actions and events, of changes in physical circumstances, and especially of nerve structure and function, as causes of feeling and thought, belongs; while to the other, the practical branch, belongs the study of feelings and thoughts, and of ends and motives of action. This latter study is also necessarily the study of feelings and thoughts as they are to the individual, because only to an in-
dividual do they appear in the character of feeling and thought; as belonging to masses of men they are feelings and thoughts of the individuals composing the mass. Ethic therefore can only be completely and satisfactorily studied by a combination of the three sciences of History, Nervous Physiology, and the Metaphysical analysis of states of consciousness in the individual; but it is nevertheless the last of these which is the chief domain and distinguishing feature of Ethic, in virtue of its being a practical science; and this it is which renders it a branch of Metaphysic. Neither history nor nervous physiology can be pursued entirely without reference to subjective analysis, since it would deprive the events described in history of all significance, if they could not be compared in respect of the value of the tendencies which they exhibit; and the investigation into the structure and functions of nervous matter would be left equally without meaning (assuming that the nervous organism generally is the organ upon which feeling and thought depend), if we did not attach or endeavour to attach some mode of feeling or change of feeling to each different structure and different function of nerve as it was discovered. So also, on the other hand, subjective analysis has to depend upon history for the conditions which surround and modify the feelings and thoughts of the individual imagined to be under analysis, and upon nervous physiology for the causes producing or supporting the individual's feelings and thoughts, and bringing external objects, actions, and events, to bear upon them by acting upon nerve. But there is also a great part in each of these three studies, which is peculiar to it and independent of the other two.
The analysis of feelings and thoughts and their sequences by themselves, or in their character as feeling and thought, apart from their conditions and causes, is the independent part of subjective analysis. The conclusions reached by such analysis may be suggested and supported by the collateral conclusions of history and physiology; but the analysis itself must be conducted on its own independent basis. Were it not independent it could give no support in its turn to the conclusions of history or physiology; and yet it has been seen that they do receive such a support, in the significance which is lent to their conclusions by the feelings attached to them or involved in them.

§ 5. Since subjective analysis is to be the staple of the present work, and yet there is at the present day a deep distrust and dislike, even among men of science, to anything that bears the name of subjective or internal observation, or worse still of Metaphysic, a distrust and dislike which I cannot but think unreasonable and erroneous, I venture (though it is a task I would gladly avoid) to enter at somewhat greater length upon the true meaning and real validity of this method. For Metaphysic also claims to be a part of positive science, if by positive is meant verifiable. And first to take up the matter from the point already reached, the study of history compared with that of the individual.

2. It has been ably maintained by Auguste Comte and others that the study of the organisation and development of society, that is, of men in masses or of the whole human family, must precede the investigation of the organisation and development of the individual consciousness, the study of which is
Ethic. The grounds of this opinion are, first, that the general laws of human doings can be better seen in the gross, or when acting on a large scale, since then abstraction is made of partially operative and accidental circumstances, and secondly, that the individual units of society are governed by the strong tendencies of the mass to which they belong, somewhat as straws are carried down by a stream; so that not only as a rule of logic, a rule to help investigation, is this method advisable, but also in order of history and of nature the laws of the whole precede and dominate the laws of the component parts. To these grounds must be added the notion, common to Auguste Comte and to most positivists, that the method employed by metaphysicians and known as the method of internal observation is delusive and pernicious. The study of the individual apart from society seems to demand the application of this method, while that of society as a whole appears to require an objective empirical method only. (See Buckle, Hist. of Civilisation in England, vol. i. Chap. iii.)

3. Now first as to the method of internal or subjective observation. It was shown in "Time and Space" that one objection which Auguste Comte made to Metaphysic was owing to his confounding it with Ontology; but there is another cause, which is his disbelief in the method of subjective observation. The first ground of objection can be obviated by showing that Metaphysic is perfectly distinct from Ontology; but it cannot be denied that Metaphysic employs the method of subjective observation. In fact subjective observation with its application to other minds and to the events of history is the whole
of the method of Metaphysic. In the first case Comte was wrong in his estimate of what Metaphysic is; but in the second, he is right in his estimate of what Metaphysic is, and wrong only in his opinion of its validity. No doubt the term and the method have both been employed delusively; they have been employed to the establishment of Ontological systems; hence Comte's dislike and disbelief of them as capable of a true and valid use. The ontological metaphysicians employed this method to the establishment of a theory of a Self in some shape or other; wherever they were unable to analyse, there they established an entity, of which they said that they were intuitively and immediately certain by their own internal observation. They were thus conscious of a Self, of which they could give no account and no analysis; and then they used this entity to account for other phenomena, and constructed the world out of the Self wholly, or else out of the contact or conjunction of the Self and some external entities equally unknown, or Things-in-themselves. It is clear that on this track all progress was barred by a limit being set to further analysis, while the result reached was eminently unsatisfactory. Hence the dissatisfaction of scientific men with a method which appeared always to lead to such results.

4. But is such the necessary result of this method? An answer may perhaps be thought to be given by "Time and Space" itself. But independently of that work a few remarks will show not only the soundness of the method but also its inevitable nature, seeing that it is and always must be employed, even by those who reject it in name. It is supposed by these writers to require, that the per-
son employing it shall observe the operations of his consciousness in the very moment of their operation, that he shall divide himself from himself, and at once think or perceive and observe his thinking or perceiving; if this were possible, it would even then, they say, so disturb the normal operation of perception and thought that no conclusion could be drawn from them in this disturbed state to their normal mode of operation. See Comte, Cours de Phil. Positive, vol. i. p. 31-33, 2ème édition.

5. Both objections would be unanswerable if the method of subjective observation did require such coinstantaneous application. But the fact is not so. Past states of consciousness are all that can be observed, and all that need be observed, by the applier of the method; and this is done in memory or reintegration, spontaneous and voluntary. Past states of consciousness recalled in memory are objective, that is, are objects to the reflecting consciousness, to the applier of the method of subjective observation. And all past states of consciousness when recalled in memory are equally objective. It matters not whether the observer recalls a house seen or a sentiment experienced yesterday, whether he recalls the result of a problem in astronomy or chemistry, or the method of its solution, or his feelings before and after his attempt at solving it. All states of consciousness recalled in memory are objects of consciousness; and nothing can be recalled in memory which is not an object of consciousness, and which, consequently, is not an object of subjective observation. In whatever operations of thought, therefore, memory is employed in addition to or combination with direct presentative perception, in those is em-
played the method of subjective observation. Nor is the case different with purely presentative observations; for suppose we are watching a visible object, the sun, for instance, rising out of the sea; the object consists of feelings of ours; and whenever we hear the words sun, or sunrise, the meaning of the words consists in those same feelings recalled in memory. Would we know what the object seen is, what we really see, and what we infer from, add to, or combine with, what we really see, we must fix our attention on our feelings, the visible light and colour and shape; and in doing this we are applying the method of subjective observation. In fact, subjective observation is nothing but objective observation taken subjectively; the same thing is seen or observed, but in the one case as if it were an absolute independent object, part of an absolute independent external world; in the other, as a complex of feelings belonging to the observer. Both aspects are equally objective to reflection; but the former, the objective, aspect alone is supposed, erroneously, to have been always objective and not subjective to direct perception.

6. It is erroneously supposed that the opposite method to that of subjective observation rests on no metaphysical theory. It rests, however, on the assumption of a difference, an essential but unexplained difference, between consciousness and the objects of consciousness. This difference in kind and in position between the two worlds, the inner of consciousness, the outer of things, is adopted as a theory from which to start by the current positive philosophy; yet it is adopted without enquiry solely because it is familiar. A little thought properly directed shows
that the two supposed worlds are inextricably interwoven, and are in fact but one world which a subjective delusion makes us regard as two; the delusion consisting in transferring our present view of the matter, the divorce we have established between consciousness and things, to the world itself as a perennial fact of its constitution. The truth is, as I have endeavoured to show elsewhere, that there is one world with two aspects, consciousness the one, and the objects of consciousness the other. To study consciousness is to study its objects; and to study the objects of consciousness is to study consciousness itself. The attempted divorce between science and subjective observation stands, therefore, itself upon a metaphysical theory, and that an erroneous one, the metaphysical nature of which is concealed from the eyes of its votaries by its familiarity. This is no argument against the validity of the objective method, but only against the notion that it is independent of Metaphysic. The two aspects, subjective and objective, are given by, and the two methods corresponding to them are founded in, reflection; and the distinction between the two methods can no more be overlooked or given up than that between the aspects; which latter, as we have seen, is so evident as to lead sometimes to its members, one or both, being regarded as absolute existences.

7. But since there is nothing, for let anything be named, which is an object exclusively of either one or the other of these aspects, and the two aspects are thus inseparable and coextensive, the question arises, how the corresponding methods are discriminated from each other, how they come to be separately applicable in science, and what are the peculiar
functions of each. The discrimination of the methods depends on the distinction of the aspects; and this distinction is the following. Any object, simple or complex, when treated in its relation to consciousness alone, has its analysis given by subjective observation, as consisting of a complex of feelings in time or in time and space together; and any object, simple or complex, when treated in connection or relation to other objects in consciousness, has the laws of its sequences and configuration given by objective observation, as an object among objects. The question of τί ἴστι is answered subjectively, the question of πῶς παραγίνεται objectively. The connection between empirical or complete objects is given by objective observation, the analysis of such objects separately is given by subjective observation. See this distinction in "Time and Space" §§ 11. 18.

8. Thus, although everything is inseparably both objective and subjective, the difference between treating things separately by themselves and treating them in connection with other things external to them is a difference between methods which are the one subjective, the other objective; for to treat anything separately is to treat it in its relation to consciousness alone, and to treat anything in connection with other things external to it is to make its relations to other things the predominant object of enquiry. The functions of these two methods are thus implicitly determined also. The first sketch and direction of enquiry in any matter must clearly be given by subjective observation; which results in a provisional definition of the thing to be examined. It is then compared with other objects; that is, its place among these, the causes which produce it, the
consequences which flow from it, the measure of its constituent parts, in extension, intensity, energy, duration (which is only done by treating each of its constituent parts as an object among other objects), are determined; and all this is the work of objective observation or experiment. Lastly, the new shape thus given to the object as a whole is tested or verified by subjective observation; and not only the verification of the whole object in its new shape, but also the verification of each instance of measurement of its constituent parts in the course of objective observation, is a subjective process, an appeal to consciousness itself as to matters of fact. The proper functions of subjective observation therefore are two, provisional definition and verification. That of objective observation is measurement or calculation. Hence all apagogic reasoning, the reasoning in Algebra for instance, belongs to objective observation; but the reduction of apagogic reasoning into ostensive is a kind of verification which belongs to subjective observation. In every chain of reasoning we are continually passing backwards and forwards between the two methods, objective and subjective; and this is what we should expect from the nature of the distinction which has been drawn between them.

9. All kinds of object-matter whatever are necessarily treated by both methods combined. There is no class of objects which is exclusively the object of one method and not of the other; just as there was no object which was not subjective and objective inseparably. Everything-alike is the object of provisional definition, measurement, and verification. The objects of the physical sciences are no exception.
Verification in them is plainly an appeal to actual presentative perception,—to sensations as facts. This may be shown by supposing the proof to be separated from the verification; since without such verification, or subjective experience, to appeal to in others no proof of any proposition to them would be possible. You may prove to an Indian that rivers must be frozen in northern winters, but he will not understand what being frozen is, unless it be from personal experience either of this or similar phenomena. His own experienced feelings are at once the test and the fountain of all his knowledge. While you are proving to him your thesis out of your knowledge, he is ordering and combining in his brain not your knowledge but his own, not your states of consciousness but a succession of states of consciousness of his own, recalled in his own memory and consisting of his own feelings. When he has got at last the true notion of rivers frozen into ice, he has not got out of feelings into facts, but he has got feelings which will be verified by presentations, which are equally feelings. If you should actually show him a frozen river, he would still not have left feelings for facts, but he would be actually and presentatively having feelings which admit of no further verification.

10. This way of describing the matter, however, brings us to the real difficulty in the method of subjective observation, to that difference between the subjective and objective methods, which makes the results of the former so much more uncertain than those of the latter. It is this, that in subjective observation the same phenomenon, in point of place or number, can never be examined by more than one
observer. The same frozen river can be seen at once by many; but the memory which each has of the river, or the actual perception taken subjectively, can be examined only by each observer for himself. In observing the phenomena of consciousness, it is as if a set of specimens of all the various plants of a garden was taken home by different botanists, and each set examined separately by each botanist; and the whole of the attainable knowledge of those plants had to consist exclusively in the agreement of the separate descriptions furnished by each botanist from his own set of specimens, without it being possible to point out with the finger which plant was intended by which description. This difference is no doubt a great disadvantage on the side of subjective observation; but it does not attach to it because it is subjective. All verification is a subjective process; but in verifying the phenomena of consciousness, the same phenomenon cannot be handed round, as it were, for verification by different observers. Each observer must verify subjectively in all cases; but in consciousness he can only verify a similar, and not the very same, phenomenon as another observer. This is a difficulty to which all observation of the phenomena of consciousness is exposed, and not only their subjective observation; it could only be avoided by renouncing the observation of them altogether.

11. The two methods have the same functions, and the same order of application, when their object-matter consists of the phenomena of consciousness and of the actions of conscious agents. I do not suppose that any man ever deliberately sat down to recall and analyse his own mental furniture, without first having a purpose or object provisionally defined
in the first place, and, in the second, without taking some description or narrative to be verified by that analysis. The process I apprehend to be something of this kind: A certain class of feelings, provisionally defined, is fixed upon as the object-matter of investigation, and this is kept more or less present in memory; then biographies or narratives of actions are read, actions and incidents in daily life are noted, containing or similar to the class of feelings in question, and the sequences of their parts are compared and measured, which is objective observation; lastly, the phenomena so collected and compared are verified and interpreted, at every step of the process of comparison, by reference to the personal subjective experience or feelings of the investigator, which are themselves recalled to his memory by the phenomena which he is examining. He is precisely in the position of the Indian endeavouring to understand the meaning of rivers being frozen. Words describing feelings or states of consciousness, as well as words describing actions and events which flow from feelings, describe them as objective phenomena, the analysis of which in relation to consciousness alone must be given, if at all, by subjective observation. There is no isolation of the self of the enquirer, no abstraction from other persons or from the world of phenomena at large. He does not analyse and describe himself as a separate object apart from them, but he describes them, in the only way he can describe anything, namely, as they appear to him. The external actions, speech, gestures, expressions of countenance of men, whether actually seen and heard, or described in books, with or without the attribution of motives to them, would be entirely void of mean-
ing, were it not for the subjective experience of such phenomena connected with certain feelings and motives in oneself. In reasoning about such phenomena without any such subjective experience, if it were possible to do so, we should be reasoning about unknown quantities, and our terms would have only the value of algebraical symbols, or a currency without purchasing power. On the other hand, without a large gathering of phenomena by objective observation, subjective observation would be impoverished, and lack matter to be exercised upon. The result would approximate to a mere description of the phenomena of self, abstracted from the world at large. But this, which is a vice or a weakness in Metaphysic, where it occurs, is by no means a necessary feature of subjective observation; it is a vice to which all branches of knowledge, and not Metaphysic only, are liable; as indeed they are also to the opposite vice, that of having too little subjective insight. But the latter vice is most dangerous in the metaphysical, the former in the physical, sciences; because the subjective method preponderates in the one, the objective in the other.

12. Let us now draw some of the practical conclusions from the foregoing analysis, so far at least as Ethic is concerned. There is a comparatively great amount of agreement among men about the meaning of terms describing external actions and circumstances, and this agreement hides from our view the necessary antecedent processes of subjective observation upon which it is founded. There is a far less amount of agreement about the meaning of terms describing feelings and states of consciousness; and this disparity of the agreement in the two cases
leads us to disparage the use of the latter class of terms, and to trust exclusively to the former, although the subjective method of observation has been a necessary source of the agreement attained in the one case, and is our only hope of attaining greater agreement in the other. Again, the line usually drawn between objects of objective and subjective observation is fluctuating and uncertain; men are prone to call an object, when described in terms the meaning of which they do not accept or understand, an object of subjective observation, or an object existing only in the brain of the describer; while objects described in terms which they do understand, and accept as at least not self-contradictory, they will call objective, as objects which may possibly exist in a given case. For instance, a man will say he observes fear in the faces of a terrified mob; yet he sees only the evidences of fear, and the connection between the evidence and the emotion evidenced is given only by his own subjective observation. The agreement of men in the meaning they attach to any term is the circumstance which seems hitherto to have determined them to consider the fact described by it as a fact of objective observation. And in arriving at such agreement, where it exists, we are driven back upon ourselves, upon our subjective observation, at every step of the process. Yet we are required by the Positive school of philosophers to build upon this sandy foundation, to erect this fluctuating limit into a strict philosophical distinction, and to renounce in consequence the appeal to consciousness at the very point where agreement ceases and uncertainty begins, as if it was not owing to this very appeal that the agreement
at present existing has been actually obtained. It is only by further appeals to consciousness, subjective observation, that the boundaries of agreement can be pushed forward, and its domain enlarged. I do not say that nothing can be done in working with the terms upon which there is agreement already, but that to enlarge the number of these terms, and to make new progress in investigating human nature, which is the problem of ethical analysis, the same method must be resorted to which has been a constant condition of all the previous advance, the combination of subjective with objective observation, in provisional definition, objective reasoning on phenomena external to the observer, subjective verification and interpretation. To restrict enquiry to a so-called objective observation is the most retrograde doctrine ever heard from philosophers who aim at the advancement of science. (See the remarks, to me quite conclusive, of Mr. Herbert Spencer, in his Principles of Psychology, Part i. Chap. vii. § 56, edit. 1868, although I by no means adopt his mode of using the terms objective and subjective.)

13. Lastly let us recur to the question with which this § commenced, the relation between Ethic studied subjectively and History studied objectively. History studied objectively alone is the discovery and narration of actions and events as they have actually occurred; and although certain general facts may be demonstrated about the order of sequence and recurrence of these phenomena, there is yet no science of history until this order is shown to result from certain causes, less general than the order as a whole, which have recurred or are capable of recurrence; thus producing parallel or analogous con-
sequences in different nations, or in different sets of phenomena, such phenomena, for instance, as are contained in the different sciences. Thus Auguste Comte's Law of the Three States may be regarded as a generalisation of the course of development found, first, in the different sciences, and secondly, in the different branches of human activity as well as in those of speculation. But, in the first place, such a generalisation of the events of history, although it completes the first step towards a science of history, is, taken by itself, to be paralleled with such observations as that the planets move in ellipses, in Astronomy; observations which require to be further analysed into the forces and their measurements which in composition produce or result in the curves described. The astronomy of the solar system could not be said to be constituted as a science by the general observation of the elliptical orbits of the planets. But the further analysis of such general laws as that of the Three States consists in pointing out the feelings and motives which have influenced human action and speculation, so as to produce the result described by the generalisation. And no doubt the generalisation itself was attained chiefly by the consideration of such motives of action. In other words, this and other such generalisations are both effected originally and must be applied subsequently by means of subjective observation combined with objective. It is not mere movements and configurations of physical objects that are described by such generalisations, but changes in the feelings and opinions of men, embodied in and evidenced by such movements and configurations; the actions and events which are generalised are phenomena consisting of
both physical and mental changes, of which the latter give significance to the former. The motive and the result of every human action is a feeling, and the events of history are but actions in combination. The generalisation therefore of the phenomena of history requires completion by being analysed into the actions which compose it, and by these being again analysed into their several motives and results. The persons whose lives have made up human history did not indeed aim at acting and reasoning so as to produce the result described in the Law of the Three States, but they acted from some immediate motives, and for some immediate ends, which have had this as their general result. The problem of history as a science is to find, 1st, what kind of immediate motives these were, and 2d, what were the intermediate steps between the so motivated actions of the individuals and the general result described by that Law. The connection between such immediate motives and intermediate steps, the media axiomata of history, are the kind of results which are of practical use to the politician and statesman in forming judgments to guide future policy; such judgments as may be found, for instance, in the works of De Tocqueville. But the motives and feelings of individuals can only be known to others by objective observation interpreted and verified by subjective. Ethic, then, is no less the complement of History studied objectively than History is of Ethic studied subjectively; and the necessary complement of both is the study of the physical environment and physical organisation. (See on the whole subject of this § Book vi. of Mr. J. S. Mill's System of Logic, especially Chapters ix. and x., 6th edit.)
§ 6. 1. Let us now enter more closely upon the method which Metaphysic follows in applying its subjective observation to the phenomena of Ethic. Metaphysic claims for this method that it is equally positive with the objective method, that is, demonstrates facts which are equally verifiable with the facts demonstrated by the objective method. The guarantee of this consists in its strict application of the distinction between first and second intentions, that is, between things as perceived directly by consciousness and things described in comparison with other things by general names. ("Time and Space" § 10.) This distinction is the logical corner-stone of Metaphysic, which primarily deals only with things as they are to consciousness alone, not in their second intentions or general descriptions. A general term reasoned on by itself is at once co ipso elevated into an abstract entity. For instance, time, space, matter, are such general terms which might be reasoned on by themselves and made into entities though abstractions; but instead of this Metaphysic deals always with the things containing these abstractions, analyses the phenomena in which they are combined, using the terms, time, space, and matter, solely to fix and connote the features which are actually perceived in the phenomena. The ontological philosophers, on the other hand, not having drawn the distinction in question, always use such abstract and descriptive terms, words of second intention, as connoting independent things, and in this way make entities of abstractions. Finiteness and infiniteness, unity and plurality, being and not-being, possibility and actuality, thought and intuition, and many more such terms, are reasoned on as if they were pheno-
mena instead of being descriptions of phenomena; and thus the description becomes an entity, and philosophy an ontology. See an instance in Schelling's Bruno, Werke, vol. iv. Apth. 1. The same was shown at some length in respect to Hegel's Logic in "Time and Space" § 45. Notwithstanding, therefore, that Metaphysic approaches phenomena from the subjective side, the fact that it keeps steady to phenomena in their first intention, that is, to phenomena as they are perceived, renders it as positive and verifiable as objective science.

2. But does not the Metaphysician claim to construct the world out of his consciousness? This is the most usual objection. Most certainly he does not, in the sense of constructing it a priori out of abstract descriptions of phenomena. This is the ontological method. The metaphysician bases himself on perceived phenomena, experience, alone. The grain of truth in the objection is, that the metaphysician approaches phenomena from the subjective side, appealing to experience to verify the fact which he asserts, namely, that all phenomena are subjective as well as objective. How else indeed could they be verified; is not all verification an appeal to subjective perception,—look and see, hear, touch, measure, and so on, all of them subjective acts? It is, on the contrary, the usual division and separation of the world into two compartments, mind here, objects there, which makes verification, logically speaking, impossible, and at the same time introduces an absolute existence, unknowable as well as unknown, behind phenomena. For suppose, to take an instance, I am looking at a tree; if you tell me that what I see is determined partly by my own
constitution of nerve or of mind, and is no real indication of what the external cause is like which produces the effect of a tree on me, or appears as a tree to me: your arguments make the phenomenal tree, the thing which is denoted by the name tree, unreal, and at the same time refer me to something behind, or below, or previous to, the tree, which is both more real than it and unknowable by me. You tell me in one breath to busy myself only with phenomena and only with the unreal. Can such a method deserve the name of positive? To the metaphysician however the phenomena are the realities.—Then as to verification, is the verification which you have in view a verification of the relation between the phenomena and their unknowable cause, or between the phenomena themselves? Of course the latter, as we both agree. Is not then, according to your view, the verification not only comparatively unreal, but (real or unreal) also subjective in the same way as the first observed phenomena were which are now verified? I conclude therefore that, so long as it is phenomena alone which are observed and examined, these are equally capable of verification by the subjective as by the objective method.

3. In arguing as above I do not claim for Metaphysic that it has not taken: new ground, or is enforcing only what it has always urged. Some old ground has been abandoned, namely, Ontology; for Metaphysic had not till lately separated itself from Ontology, and perhaps would not have done so but under the influence of positive science, and especially, at least if I may speak of myself, of the works of Auguste Comte. His writings will be prized, and his name honoured, by all seekers after truth. But
I think that in the old compound structure of ontology and metaphysics there were truths, which were not and are not now recognised by the positive schools, truths which can be separated and made the basis of a systematic and verifiable structure, which structure is or will be Metaphysics. The first step towards this, in this country at least, was taken in 1841 by the late Prof. Ferrier, in a short paper to be found in his Remains, vol. ii., entitled The Crisis of Modern Speculation. Yet even he afterwards wrote as an Ontologist. I claim then for Metaphysics not only that it is a verifiable, but also that it is an advancing, study. It must not be thought, because the objects which are proper to it are universal and necessary, being the elements of all phenomena, that the mode of conceiving these objects, the theories about them, are therefore bound to be stationary. I see no connection between these two things. Metaphysics advances in dependence on the advance of the special sciences; its method alone, subjective observation of the elements of phenomena logically and not empirically separable, is what it retains as its constant distinguishing characteristic.

4. The need for Metaphysics, as the complement of the special sciences, and as their logical basis, may be brought to a very simple test. If the elements of phenomena, which Metaphysics speaks of, are universally present in combination and yet only logically discernible, as is maintained, then they ought to be discernible in the simplest and ultimate objects which are known to physical science, out of which the physical sciences construct their hypotheses and explain their facts, or into which they resolve them analytically. Now there are two things which at
the present day are regarded by physicists, I believe almost unanimously, as such ultimate and simplest objects, namely, Atoms and Force. What is an atom? It is an extremely minute body, size and shape not agreed upon, but far smaller in size than to be seen by the microscope, yet still occupying space in three dimensions, and capable of affecting our sense of touch were that sense sufficiently acute, just as it is capable of affecting our sense of sight had we sufficient visual energy. In short, an atom is imagined like a grain of dust extremely reduced in size. I hope physicists will pardon my untechnical phraseology. Now what I want to point out is, that the qualities of visibility and tangibility are not altered in kind by this extreme reduction in size. The grain of dust is a presentation, the atom is a representation or mental image; this is the only difference. It still occupies space in three dimensions, and still contains tangible and visible qualities; we picture ourselves seeing and touching it. It also occupies some duration of time, since to exist for no time is not to exist at all. Here then is the union of feeling, or matter, with space and time, or form, which are the metaphysical elements of the empirical or complete object, the atom. In other words, the ultimate element of the physical sciences is analysed metaphysically into elements which are only logically separable; and subjectively is the product of imagination working on the perceptions of visible and tangible objects of presentative experience.

5. Again as to Force. I think I shall not be contradicted in saying that no physicist conceives force apart from atoms, or from molecules, or from masses, except by way of logical abstraction. Force,
then, would be conceived as motion or change in atoms or between them, in molecules or between them, in masses or between them; as motion if space is involved as well as time; as change of condition if time alone is involved, and a single atom envisaged, though even this would seem to involve imagining the atom itself distinguished into parts. But change of condition in larger masses involves space as well as time, and is change of configuration, or motion of parts. The conception of rest, the negation of motion, is a compound conception; it is the equilibrium produced by two or more forces working in opposite directions; it is not the absence of motion, but the balance of more motions than one. The terms statical and dynamical are therefore terms of method, signifying the adoption of a point of view or a starting point in the treatment of the phenomena. (See Mr. Grove's Correlation of Physical Forces, and esp. page 206-7, 3d edition.)

6. If this, though untechnically stated, is correct, what does it amount to but saying that force is the combination of new time and space relations with what we had already before us in the conception of single atoms; for some time and space relations we had already in them? When, therefore, the physicist has reached his ultimate and simplest elements, atoms and force, or change in time and space relations of atoms, he has not reached what is absolutely ultimate and simplest, even so far as our knowledge goes; he has not gone so far in analysis as our knowledge enables him to do, for he can still distinguish the logically separable elements, which compose his ultimata, just as much as they compose the obvious perceptions and presentations of daily life. The
argument does not rest only upon the fact that the representation of an atom is formed by imagination from the presentation of visible and tangible objects, but also on the circumstance that both presentation and representation can be analysed into the same logically separable elements.

7. Metaphysic, then, digs down deeper into phenomena than physical science does; deeper in one direction at least; for the method of physical science which analyses phenomena into minute empirical portions, atoms and their movements, is deep in another sense or direction, not entered on at all by metaphysic. If however the physicist could show, either that the ultimate elements of the physical sciences, atoms and their movements, were not further distinguishable into metaphysical elements, logically but not empirically separable from each other; or that the ultimate elements of metaphysic, feelings, time, and space, were empirical or complete objects, such as are the ultimate elements of physic;—then, in either case, the logical priority of metaphysic to physic, in dealing with phenomena from the subjective side, would have to be abandoned. But to show that atoms cannot be conceived without force, nor force without atoms, is merely to show that the metaphysical conception, of elements only logically separable from each other, has a wider application than merely to the phenomena of metaphysic, namely, to physical science itself; for it would be showing the ultimate elements of physic to be still more complex than they have been here supposed to be. Again it is often said that the conception of pure force, or force as a cause of motion, is subjective, but that motion, the effect, is objective. The latter
is then regarded as the object of physical science, and the former relegated to some metaphysical limbo. But the fact is, that force, when conceived as such a "cause" of motion, is conceived as objectively existing, and as much by the physicist as by the metaphysician, and equally unprofitably by both, since it is nothing but motion itself counted over again; while on the other hand motion is conceived and analysed subjectively as much as objectively, by the metaphysician as much as by the physicist, and profitably by both to the extent that each deals with it. In short there are no notions and no objects which are exclusively objective or exclusively subjective; none which are exclusively objects either of physic or of metaphysic. It is not in this empirical way that the line can be drawn between them.

§ 7. 1. While the method of subjective observation is applicable to all phenomena without exception, in conjunction with that of objective, the moment in which we pass from observing presentations to observing representations, that is, repetitions in the mind of things actually seen, heard, or felt, that moment the subjective method remains to a great extent the only one available or useful to any purpose. But to what precise extent is it the only one available? Precisely to the extent that general agreement has not been effected about the meaning of the words in which the representations are described; and the immediate purpose of the method is to observe and describe the representations so accurately that others may recognise their accuracy, and have the same fixed and definite thoughts and feelings called up by the same words. There are many representations which are already in this condition; for instance,
those of many past events in history, say the execution of Charles I. All men attach the same meaning to the words describing such events, so as to have the same pictures in their minds when the words are heard. But there is much even in a representation of this sort which is not fixed, namely, the feelings of the actors in the event described. No description can be supposed to give these with perfect certainty and definiteness. The cause of this is, that neither those who have described such events nor we who read the descriptions have had a logic of feelings sufficiently accurate, or supplied with such minutely appropriated terms, as to catch and fix them in a narrative which all persons should understand. Generally we may say, that, when the representation which is examined or described is a representation of something that has been or can be an object of presentation to the external senses, then there may be agreement as to the meaning of the words describing it, and the method may be predominantly objective, the subjective aspect of it ceasing to attract attention. But on the other hand, where the representation is of an emotion, or passion, or desire, attaching to such external objects, there, the immediate question being as to the particular feeling involved in them, and this being the matter to be settled and brought to a definition, the subjective method, that of observing the subjective aspect of the phenomena, becomes of itself, owing to that very circumstance, prominent and attractive of the attention.

2. There is then no "hard and fast line" between the methods of subjective and objective observation; both keep the eye steadily fixed on the phenomena;
but while all observation, and methodical observation which is reasoning, inasmuch as it belongs to and is exercised by beings who have reflected, who are self-concious and distinguish themselves from the objects of their thoughts, is necessarily both objective and subjective at once, the objective aspect of the observation is then first prominent, in any object-matter, when the definition and analysis of the object has been agreed upon and expressed by definite terms; in effecting which, while agreement is yet being arrived at, the subjective aspect is the prominent one. The possibility of changing into the objective method is a proof that the subjective work has been done.

3. Now in the history of events, the historian's first task is to discover what events and how have actually taken place, or have been presentations to the actors in them; this being done, there is a wide field left for the interpretation of those events, assignment of their emotional meaning both to the actors and for ourselves; and here is needed, as the first step, a logic or analysis of feeling, which as yet the subjective method can alone supply. Similarly in physiology of the nervous system, the first task of the physiologist is to show what the structure and functions of the nervous system are, and what actions definitely take place in it; and again, this being done, there is a wide field for the assignment of the definite feelings and thoughts, which depend upon those actions of the nervous system, and here again is needed as the first step the same analysis of feeling and thought, supplied as yet only by the subjective method. So that, while there is one field of enquiry which at present is only open to the sub-
jective method, yet this stands between, and in close connection with, the two sciences of history and physiology, each employing the objective method. This subjective enquiry consists in the analysis and classification of feelings and thoughts, the content of consciousness; and is the analytic part of Ethic. Our efforts must be directed to bring this object-matter up to the point where it can be treated objectively, that is, expressed in minutely appropriate terms with definite and acknowledged meanings; and not until this has been done, and only to the extent that it is done, can the complete or connected treatment of the three branches, history, physiology, ethic, be taken in hand. Not for a moment must it be supposed that ethic makes pretension to settle single-handed questions of practice, whether of individuals or of societies; questions which can only be settled by the united branches, treated in connection as parts of a great systematic whole. To prescribe political or social duties, for instance, can only be done by such a combined science, and so much the more imperfectly the more imperfect is any one of the three branches, and the more imperfect their combination. Till the establishment of the principles of such a combined science, moral and legal, social and political, national and international, codes and ordinances are more or less tentative, more or less on trial. In the present work I make this attempt only, namely, to bring up one of the three branches, ethic, to the objective state, or to make it more capable than it is at present of objective treatment.

4. The method therefore is not only subjective but analytic. I make no pretence at demonstration, except in the sense in which a physiologist is said
to demonstrate the structure of a tissue, when he describes what he has seen through his microscope. The greatest differences of opinion may and do exist as to what is "demonstrated" by the microscope in such tissues; yet this is no reason against examining them in that way. Only by repeated observations, under different modes of preparation, by different observers, and under more and more powerful microscopes, can agreement be arrived at as to the facts really to be seen. So it is also with the subjective observation of feelings and thoughts. The present disagreement is no reason against employing renewed observation. The demand that we should assert nothing which cannot be deduced from some already certain proposition is a demand which does not recognize the early stage at which the enquiry at present stands, and one which would launch us at once into an ontological method, since at present we know little beyond the meanings, necessarily vague by themselves, of the general terms describing the phenomena. The analysis of these general terms must be given first by the analysis of the phenomena which they describe; and, to carry on the figure, the microscope to be employed is that offered by metaphysic in her distinction between the formal and material elements of phenomena, taken in their first intention.