The guiding emotion is expressed in the two first lines; and then, in the description of the tree, each image, perfect in itself, is evolved out of the one preceding it, like the coiling of a serpent as he moves, in majestic procession. Greater modification is introduced into the natural things described than even in the passage from Wordsworth; the cedar, for instance, and the breeze are not described, in personification, as the poet really supposes them to be in truth, but only as they are for the time alone, so long as he is under the influence of that emotion. In other words, we have in these three passages a transition from almost pure description of phenomena, through a description which attempts to analyse their inmost nature, to one which is almost purely synthetical, that is, expressive of emotion in an order of redintegration not derived from the objects described, but governed by the emotion itself. In the first the imagination is redditive, giving back but slightly altered the objects as they are perceived; in the second it is critical, penetrating into their supposed true nature, and personifying them in that; in the third it is inventive, moulding the objects themselves, as well as personifying them, in obedience to the flow of thought stimulated by the emotion. And these differences, it must be remarked, depend upon the intensity of the emotion itself and its comparative force relatively to the purely intellectual energy combined with it; in the first case, the emotion stimulates the perception to group the phenomena, in the second to reason about their nature, in the third to change their action; and accordingly the first passage is the least, the third the most like the pure constructions of music, that is to say,
the first stands nearest to prose narration, the third

to pure lyrical expression of emotion.

6. Descriptive poetry contains a vast group of

poems which, when classed according to the magni-

tude or importance of their object-matter, culminate

in Epic poetry. Narrative, reflective, didactic, satiri-

cal, poetry is chiefly analytic; objects or events are

taken up as they are supposed to have existed or

happened in actual history. Occasional pieces are

for the most part to be classified with these, as, for

instance, the smaller poems of Catullus, Goethe, and

Landor. The epic poem, at the upper end of the

scale, is poetry interpretative of the true but latent

significance and grandeur of the history which it re-

lates. Magnificence or grandeur, moral or emotional

sublimity, are the characteristics of epic poetry; for

instance, Virgil’s

"Veniet iustris labentibus actas,

Quum domus Assaraci Phthiam clarasque Mycenas

Servitio premet, ac victis dominabitur Argis."

And

"His ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono;

Imperium sine fine dedi."

And this characteristic is found even in the repre-

sentation of the smallest incidents by a poet who has

the true epic spirit, for instance, Virgil’s Circe

"Urit odoratam nocturna in lumina cedrum,"

a most magnificent image. Among our modern prose

literary writers, none, I think, has had so keen a

sense for epic magnificence as De Quincey; at least,

what I intend to convey by this term will be perhaps

best understood by referring to his Selections Grave

whenever personal character and personal history are the objects described, and yet the interest is purely poetical, it is almost impossible to avoid the dramatic form, almost necessary to allow the person to speak for himself. Mr. Browning’s Paracelsus and his Historical Dramas are essentially descriptive and analytic; but since personal character, feelings, and history, are their object, they take a dramatic form. Where these are described ab extra by the poet himself, the interest will generally be found to be not purely poetical, but in great measure moral or didactic; for instance, the Books of Wordsworth’s Excursion containing The Churchyard among the Mountains. In epic poems it is the speeches which are the chief instrument of developing the character; the Achilles of the Iliad, for instance. What narrative could give the insight into this sublime character as a line or two does which he utters himself:

'Αλλὰ, φίλος, θάνε και σὺ. τις θλοφύει κύτως; κτλ.

and again in the same speech:

'Εσται ἡ ἡώς, ἡ δείλα, ἡ μίσον ἡμαρ,
'Οσπότε τες και ἐμιδί ἄρις εἰ κυμάν ἐληνται.

7. Dramatic poetry is a still more complete mixture of the synthetic mode with the analytic, and this in two ways. First, the conception of the characters, and events in which they take part, is fixed in the poet’s mind, and becomes to him an object to be described and interpreted as much as if it were a true history or a piece of natural scenery; but the mode in which this is effected is entirely synthetic, by letting the persons of the drama speak for themselves and inferring the action from their words. Secondly, description is not entirely excluded by this
method; the speakers describe and analyse, though the poet does not. The same speaker passes immediately, and often in the same speech, from the pure lyrical expression of his own feelings to description of events, and vice versa. The longer speeches in a play, therefore, belong for the most part to the intermediate gradations of imagination, and are modes of poetical rhetoric. This complete impersonation of many characters at once, and the necessity for exhibiting them as entire or complete persons, constituting the staple of the poem itself, and not merely coming forward to express their views or feelings on particular occasions, as in epic poetry, is what renders dramatic poetry the most arduous of all; at the same time it is the most perfect of all, since it enables the poet either to sink into pure description, or to rise into pure lyrical expression, according to his desire.

8. Where synthesis has finally won the predominance over analysis, there arises the lyrical mode of poetry. The law of succession of images is entirely derived from a previous state of emotion, which lends its warmth and colour to the objects described or introduced in the lyrical flow. But among the poems usually classed as lyrical many are very imperfectly so; most of Horace's Odes, for instance, are narrative or occasional poems. Pure synthesis is nothing but the expression of emotion, and hence the musical element is most important in lyrical poetry. Hence repetitions characterise it, as in Hebrew poetry; for instance, in the Psalms and the Song of Deborah. The emotion of the poet bursts out in vocal sound and tone, and creates images in his thought which it stimulates; and the language employed is the utterance of both at once. This is what I suppose Mr.
Arnold to mean by the "lyrical cry." Lyrical poetry is more than music, it is the fusion of images and sounds to express a previous emotion. It is the poetry of passion, as descriptive is of emotion; but it contains all kinds as well as all degrees of passion. Command and entreaty, reproach and fury, hope, despair, and frenzy, and the passion of love, are among its burdens. Shelley is at his best in the synthetic mode; for instance, in his Adonais and Epipsychidion; though these perhaps would not usually be called lyrical, owing to the metre in which they are written. Yet they are essentially expressive of passion, as well as synthetic or constructive in their mode of redintegration; and since poems are now no longer set to music, we are at liberty, as it seems to me, to adopt the term in a new sense depending on a new distinction. The metre determines nothing. For instance, the Second Part of Mr. Arnold's Tristram and Iseult, beginning

"Raise the light, my page, that I may see her,"

is purely lyrical; but the discourse of Empedocles, in the same poet's Empedocles on Etna, is not lyrical but analytic and descriptive, while at the same time it is most beautiful and imaginative poetry. No more beautiful instance of purely lyrical poetry can, I think, be given than is offered by the closing scene of Mr. Swinburne's Atalanta in Calydon, e.g.:

Chorus.

O thy luminous face,  
Thine imperious eyes!  
O the grief, O the grace,  
As of day when it dies!

Who is this bending over thee, lord, with tears and suppression of sighs?
Meleager.

Is a bride so fair?
Is a maid so meek?
With unchapelated hair,
With unfilleted cheek,

Atalanta, the pure among women, whose name is as blessing to
speak.

Atalanta.

I would that with feet
Unsandalled, unshod,
Overbold, overfleet,
I had swum not nor trod

From Arcadia to Calydon northward, a blast of the envy of God.

But a fragment can give no notion of the beauty of
the whole scene, still less of the whole drama to
which it belongs. In dramatic dialogue the con-
structive, or lyrical, mode usually comes out in com-
paratively short bursts, as, for instance, King Lear's
"I tax not you, ye elements, with unkindness," &c.;
or in that passage of the Choephoræ of Æschylus,
in which Electra, taking up the words of the Chorus,
urges on Orestes the sacredness of revenge for his
father's murder, a passage the intense power of which
is due perhaps equally to the rhythm and cadence
of the words as to the simplicity and terror of their
meaning:

Chorus. τοιαύτα ἀκούων ἐν φρεσίν γράφον —
Electra. Δί' ὣτων δὲ συν−
tίτραμεν μόνον ἡσύχων φρεσίν βασιν.
τὰ μὲν γὰρ οὕτως ἔχου,
τὰ δ' αὐτὲς ὅργα μαθεῖν.
πρέττει δ' ἀκάματη μῶς καθῆκιν.

9. What is more specially called Pathos is an
approach which lyrical and passionate poetry makes
to reflective or descriptive. It is a certain resigna-
tion to an universal and inevitable law, combined with pity for the special case described, that is expressed in the pathetic. For instance, Pindar’s

\[
\text{άλλα τοι}
\]

\[
\text{ηρατο των ἀπεθνων οία καὶ πολλοί πάσοι.}
\]

And though the thought of a general law is not often found so clearly expressed as here, yet the pathetic lies always in making an appeal to a sorrow felt as universally incident to humanity; for instance, Mr. Arnold’s

“Mown them down, far from home:”

and again Milton’s

“For Lycidas is dead, dead ere his prime,

Young Lycidas, and hath not left his peer.”

10. The three well-known kinds of poetry, then, descriptive, lyrical, and dramatic, are founded, according to what has been said, upon the predominance either of analytic or of synthetic modes of reintegration, or on the union of both in equal measure. They are not the spontaneous production of a supposed lyrical, descriptive, or dramatic “faculty” in poets, but require, like other phenomena, to be accounted for, to be analysed as well as enumerated. The process of imagination itself, which has been here distinguished as either synthetic or analytic, constructive or descriptive, will need however a further analysis, which can only be given when the operations or modes of working of the mind have been analysed as functions, that is, dynamically as well as statically. The foregoing examination therefore must not be considered as finally closed. (§ 73, 1-10.)

11. I have said nothing hitherto of poetry in
prose, nor yet of the larger class of general literature. Prose may be the vehicle of poetry as well as verse, but it is very seldom that the only, or even the principal, purpose of prose literature is to be poetical; and when this is its main purpose, it is easy to apply to it what has been already said of poetry in verse. General prose literature, however, requires distinguishing from poetry on the one side, and from scientific literature on the other. Horace did not distinguish poetry from this general literature; the well-known lines,

"Aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae,

Aut simul et jucunda et idonea dicere vitae,"

give a correct picture of the scope of general literature, not of poetry in its strict sense, defined, as above, by the imagination of reflective emotion for the sole pleasure of imagining it. General literature is a great field which, while receiving daily new acquisitions from culture and discovery within its own limits, is also daily suffering encroachments from the different branches of science, as one subject after another becomes the object of accurate, methodical, investigation and verification; these are however restored again to literature when their scientific treatment is completed. Literature accordingly is distinguished from science partly by aiming at entertainment or amusement, partly by its want of a strict method of investigation and proof. It aims either at entertainment alone, or at combining it with a certain moral instruction and profit. Philosophical, political, historical, satirical, and critical essays, speeches, sermons, written dialogues, novels, and tales, compose the greater part of it. For in-
stance, at the very head of our English literature, the beauty of their language considered, stand the Imaginary Conversations of Walter Savage Landor. Novels sometimes rise into poetry; but their aiming at amusement in the first place, which determines both what incidents are to be described and in what way, renders them essentially inferior to the greater part of poetry written in verse. To expect the finer kinds of poetry, or much of any kind of it, from novels is like expecting to get as beautiful a statue from freestone as from marble; and this not merely because they are written in prose, but also because, aiming chiefly at amusement, they are adapted not to call out the imaginative powers of the reader, but to entertain him with little call on his own mental exertion. The minute description of character and action in the best novels renders them more akin to philosophy than to poetry. Yet there are some which have a distinctly poetical effect; I should name Wuthering Heights as an instance. In Book II. we shall have to enumerate the little group of sciences, relating to the ways and works of man, which have been won from the field once occupied merely by general literature. But while the scientific and literary methods of treating any subject may be distinguished pretty accurately from each other, there are a number of works of different authors which it is impossible to class wholly under the one or the other category; works, for instance, which explain scientific conceptions to the general public, or which mix scientific conceptions and accurate research, in one part of their subject, with purely literary treatment of other portions of it. There are also compositions in verse which yet belong rather to literature than
to poetry. Literature holds a middle position; it cannot indeed pretend to the rank either of pure poetry or pure science; but on the one side it is moulded by principles of Art, on the other it is the expression of the Opinion of powerful minds, that is, of an opinion which is the pioneer of science. As aiming at entertainment it is art, at truth it is knowledge; and it is to the labourers in the field of general literature that is committed the maintenance and advancement of the general or non-technical culture and education of the community.

§ 44. 1. It has been shown in § 38, that the moral sense in its operation subordinates all feelings, and all objects whatever, to two emotions which mutually sustain and interpenetrate each other, love and justice; and that it forms of these an ideal which governs the whole of life. The effecting of this subordination in thought and in act may be called the passion of morality. When this moral ideal has been formed, there arises in it another desire, the desire of feeling it in its greatest intensity, both for the sake of the feeling itself and also in order thereby to effect the subordination of feeling and action, the moral government of life, more thoroughly and securely. These two passions or desires, the one of governing life, the other of intensifying the perception of the governing ideal itself, are inseparable and mutually supporting. This latter passion is Religion; or Religion is the passion of the ideal of the moral sense; and, far from being, as sometimes thought, a mere sentiment, it is a passion which commands action and insists on perfect obedience to its law. But the intensifying of any feeling is also the attentive analysis or knowledge of that feeling; the desire of
greater intensity can only be gratified by closer knowledge of its framework. There arises therefore a knowledge of the framework of the ideal; at the same time as the passion for it. It becomes necessary for us, then, to follow this analysis, and see what it is, and how its object is related to the Subject, whose object it is and who feels the passion for it. It is clear that this process is a mode of imagination.

2. It is not here the place to prove that every feeling or conception is real, while it exists as a feeling or conception; that the mere fact of having a particular feeling or notion is the existence of that feeling or notion as an object there and then; this has been done in "Time and Space." The question here is as to the truth of such a conception or imagination; in this case, of the ideal of the moral sense, the object of religion; that is to say, whether this ideal is necessarily permanent in consciousness, so as to arise in all cases where there is a moral sense at all, and in different shapes according to the degree or mode of development of the moral sense. The remarks in the preceding paragraph sufficiently show that some such ideal is a necessary consequence or accompanying feature of a moral sense; those which follow will be an attempt to show that the moral sense, as above described and analysed, must have an ideal of the kind now to be exhibited however feebly and imperfectly.

3. The term Revealed Religion is, as Coleridge truly said, a pleonasm; all religion is revealed. The term revelation means having become self-evident, or evident and incapable of proof. In this sense every immediate feeling, and time and space in all feelings,
are revealed. Religion is nothing else than those ultimately ideal moral facts, objects, truths, or feelings, which are revealed in this sense of the term. This may be shown from the common point of view very simply. Ask any person what he means by revelation, and he will tell you that he understands it to mean facts, objects, or truths, revealed, i.e. made known or told to us by God. That is, that there must be an author of the revelation, a particular person distinct from the thing which he makes known to us. But he cannot rest here; for ask him farther, how the existence of God, the author of the revelation, is made known to us, and he will answer—by revelation. How so, you reply, when revelation requires an author as well as a thing revealed? O, he will say, God reveals Himself to us; He is author and revelation at once. This is precisely what is meant above. The terms, That which reveals itself, or, He who reveals himself, are precisely equivalent to the term self-evident. In revealed religion, therefore, as well as in revelation generally, the thing revealed is not distinct from the author of the revelation, except as we afterwards distinguish these two parts or elements in the total object. And therefore, when it is said that things revealed are certain because they are revealed by God, this means that they are certain because they form part of a self-evident object. This object, however, in reflective emotion, is a Person.

4. The Subject, at its very entrance upon the two ways described in the first paragraph of this §, finds its religious ideal distinguished from its moral ideal, and in this way: the moral ideal consists in the perfect government of its world of thought and feeling by its emotions of love and justice; these emo-
tions are bound to, or are bound up with, a world of actual feelings, thoughts, and actions, which together constitute the mind and its objects; but the religious ideal, consisting in the perfection, imagined as attained, of this government, consists in an image of which nothing is known but the two emotions of love and justice in an intensity of which there has been no other experience than this anticipatory one. The world or body of these two emotions is entirely provisional, because there is no limit to the changes which may be wrought by an infinite perseverance towards the attainment of the moral ideal. The "body prepared" for the religious ideal is entirely unknown. Hence, while each of the two ideals are objects of the same Subject, they are at an infinite distance from each other; the most ideally perfect man at an infinite distance from God; and yet God is, as an ideal, in the heart of the humblest man. The two ideals are like two roads running in the same direction, and towards the same goal, one of which ends at a certain point, the other continues out of sight; or like a railway and a telegraph, which travel together to the sea, which only the telegraph crosses. The religious ideal forms a part of the Empirical Ego, since it is an object of its Subject, but it is on the extreme verge of its horizon, the ideal completion of that part of it which I have ventured to name the True Ego. This sameness of the Subject of both ideals is the condition or ground of the communion of the soul with God, the act realising which communion is Prayer; the provisional character of the religious ideal is the unsearchability of God; its ideal perfection the awe-inspiring difference between God and man.
5. Let us now examine the emotions which arise in the Subject in the formation of the religious ideal. They will fall naturally under two heads, those which are felt towards the ideal itself, and those which are felt towards the mind of the Subject in comparison with, or relation to, the religious ideal. God, who is the religious ideal, is the framework of the emotions which are felt, as it is said, towards him. In respect of his love we must feel love; as it is said by St. John, "We love Him, because He first loved us." In respect of his justice we must feel a certain intense admiration, for that is the name of emotion which is excited by beauty or equity of form. Love and admiration when combined together are the complex emotion of Worship. The emotions felt towards our own mind in contemplation of, or relation to, God are intensifications of those of the moral sense itself; they are two, and both refer to past actions or to the present state of the mind; the first is Sin, the intensification of remorse; the second the sense of justification or approval in God's sight, which is the intensification of good conscience.

6. The emotions just described, worship, sense of sin, sense of justification, I will call the primary religious emotions; they are emotions which arise in the framework of the religious ideal, in our contemplation of God. But when we reflect farther upon the relation in which we stand to God, upon the consequences to be drawn from these emotions, as now exhibited, we necessarily arrange them in somewhat varying ways, and experience emotions correspondingly various. The reasonings which we enter on about these primary emotions exhibit aspects of the framework which have their corresponding emo-
tional elements. And these emotional elements and their frameworks are the attributes of God, being second intentions of the primary qualities and emotions which are his essence or nature. In the first place, referring the emotions of love and justice to their second intentions or categories, we find them to be respectively the perfections of feeling and knowledge; but these perfections in combination are perfect power; for perfect power is known only by its modes of exertion in time, in the succession or combination of objects or of images. We characterise God, therefore, as the union of the perfections of Feeling, Knowledge, and Power; these being all second intentions, and the third having existence only in the combination of the other two. See on these points "Time and Space" § 71. In the next place we imagine God as taking account of ourselves, that is, of our minds, and of our thoughts and feelings as well as actions. His knowledge of us is necessarily imagined as more perfect than our own knowledge of ourselves. Hence we cannot, and as a fact never do, expect to escape his knowledge. To think we could would be to think we could escape ourselves. And in exact proportion to our self-knowledge is the inevitable power of our own conscience. Again, his love towards us is the love of a superior to an inferior; it is perfect, but it is mercy. When we reflect on our emotions towards him, as on his towards us, under the same general heads of knowledge, feeling, and power, the knowledge which we have of him, the intellectual part of our state of mind, or the subjective aspect of the framework of the religious ideal, is Faith; the emotional element remains the same as before and is worship; in which
however love is the element common to our feelings towards God and towards men; the emotion of which the perception of his power is the framework is Hope. The three distinctive religious virtues, faith, hope, and charity, thus flow directly from the contemplation of God as the Ideal Object of the religious emotions. Of these, faith, which, as just shown, is the intellectual or cognitive aspect of the emotion which we feel towards God, as love is its emotional aspect,—for every state of consciousness is or contains at once both form and matter, feeling and cognition,—is subject to an ambiguity in the term, so important as to require special notice. This, with similar ambiguities in the terms sanction and prayer, which will be noticed farther on, is the root of the greatest part of theological controversy, at least of such as turns on the deeper points of religion.

7. The term faith is often taken to mean belief on insufficient evidence of facts or statements not self-evident; and this is represented to be a religious duty. It is clear that it is not the same as the faith above described, which is the apprehension of a self-evident Ideal Object of perfect love and justice. But in truth it is neither a religious duty nor even a duty at all; and to make a duty of it introduces a contradiction into the very mental conception of religion. That which is not matter of choice cannot be matter of duty, for the duty of doing or not doing anything supposes that we have the power of doing or omitting it. Now whatever rests on proof, whatever is of an intellectual character, whether it be regarded as the clothing or framework of an emotion or taken independently as a fact of history or doctrinal statement, is not open to choice; we may...
choose whether we will enquire into it farther than at present or not, but, in either case, the shape it assumes is forced upon us by the evidence which we have, and belief follows closely and inseparably upon the evidence, its firmness varying with the cogency of the evidence. To make an intellectual matter, therefore, a duty is to set human nature at variance with itself. It would indeed not be inconsistent or contradictory to suppose a duty to abstain from further enquiry; but this would not carry the duty to believe the doctrines already reached; it would let them be destroyed without replacing them, and land us in complete uncertainty. It would consequently be the most hopeless of tasks to show that there was a duty to abstain from further enquiry, which would, in religion, be equivalent to maintaining that God loved darkness rather than light. It follows that the evidence of a fact or statement being true, whether it is immediate or inferential evidence, is a negative or limiting condition of a duty to believe that fact or statement. Whatever it is a duty to believe must be evident and certain intellectually; whatever it is and always will be a duty to believe must be necessarily and permanently evident and certain. The duty itself of believing any fact or statement in religion springs solely from the emotion of which it is the framework, and lasts only so long as it is inseparably connected with that emotion. For instance, the belief in the existence of God himself is a religious duty only so long as it is self-evident as a fact and inseparable from the ideal religious emotions which have supreme moral validity. The duty to believe it arises not from its being evident, nor yet in spite of its want of evidence, but from the nature
of the emotions which it embodies. In other words, it is part of the source of duty itself, and is not a duty derived from any higher source.

8. The duties of religion, except so far as the religious emotions themselves are duties, or have validity of their own, are no others than those of morality. Religion, or the religious emotions, are both their own sanction and the sanction of the duties of morality; a sanction not by the imposition of rewards and punishments, but by the elevation and intensity of feeling. The so-called sanctions of law derive this name from the awe, or fear, or intensity of feeling, whether pleasureable or painful, which the connection of reward or punishment with any act attaches to that act in mental association, so as either to encourage or deter. As a term of law it is derived from religion, or from religious emotions, and must therefore not be allowed to lose its significance when imported back again from law to religion. It is a mistake to say that religion has no duties but those of morality which it enforces; the religious emotions are duties of themselves and are their own sanction; but they cannot be enforced by anything not themselves. It is true that in this respect morality differs from law, all laws being commands imposed by sovereigns and sanctioned by penalties separate from the commands themselves; but the logic of law is totally insufficient for application to the object-matter of morality, much more therefore of religion. The imagined pains of hell and pleasures of heaven can add no weight to the validity of the moral or religious law; and all such notions, when regarded in the light of sanctions, are entirely non-religious, foreign, and alien to its nature.
9. Whenever we use the word God, it has some connotation, some meaning; for instance, when it is said that Christ is God, there must be a meaning in the term God, as well as in the term Christ. Many persons however use this term as if it had only a denotation, a designative force. Yet some connotation it must necessarily have. The question is, what connotation? The foregoing paragraphs of this § have been an attempt to show its true connotation. Those who like words in ism will probably call the result, being the Unity of a Personal God, Monotheism. The value of the doctrine of Monotheism has been but dimly seen. It is often supposed to rest on, and to be the expression of, the insight into the fundamental unity of the laws of physical nature, the interdependence of which required the assumption of a single principle of relation between them, and thus to be a doctrine capable of being reached by intellectual processes alone, and, in religion, the natural result or issue of polytheism. The Greeks, it may be said, developed their polytheism, by the aid of science and philosophy, into monotheism; and this is true so far as monotheism rests on a speculative or intellectual basis only; Stoicism was the reduction of moral laws under the same conception. But the emotional element in monotheism has been less attended to. Monotheism was a much earlier and more spontaneous product of the Hebrew people than of the Greek; and among the Hebrews it does not seem to rest upon the development of the intellectual but of the emotional element in their character. They had not a sort of "faculty" for monotheism; but their strong emotional nature, their interest occupied chiefly by the moral side of things, was the
fountain head from which flowed the conception of a single, personal, moral, creator and ruler of the world. Now the great value of monotheism for mankind consists not in the intellectual but in the moral unity which characterises it; it is the unity not of physical but of moral laws, not of laws of nature but laws of volition, which is its chief claim to our regard; the harmonising of the springs of action, of the various conflicting emotions and passions, by subordinating them, not to a mere law without, or with only a prudential, content, but to a supreme and absorbing emotion, the love of God. Henceforth emotion was not opposed with equal right to emotion, passion to passion, as under the Greek polytheism we may see to have been the case, as, for instance, the passions under the protection of Aphrodite to those under the protection of Artemis; see Euripides' Hippolytus; but the unity of man's emotional and passional nature was proclaimed as a duty, and its attainment made possible, by the bringing to light this one master passion, the love of God. It was a real and important advance, a new thing in human development, and at the same time one which was an evolution from, and a deeper discovery of, some hitherto secret springs of his nature. The Hebrew race indeed only gradually attained to conceive of this moral law as one springing from within, not imposed from without; as a law of liberty not a law of bondage; as spirit not as letter; as Gospel not as Law; as a law of love and not a law of terror; as the voice of conscience not a legal ordinance; as spiritual not as carnal; as a law of living faith not of dead works; all which terms are properly significative of one and the same great cardinal distinction.
And it is only in this its true shape as a law of liberty that the moral law has valid and eternal dominion. This was the religion of Christianity as Jesus of Nazareth conceived and preached it; and this it is which makes that religion irreversibly true, the truest of all religions, namely, that in this characteristic it incorporated into its very essence the germ of an infinite development. We live at a time of reawakening; there is a shaking of many foundations; the dawn of a new era had been announced by poets and prophets long before its features could be even dimly seen by analysts; shall we have to pay,—in the new construction which must come,—shall we have to pay for past corruptions by the sweeping away with them of these conceptions of conscience and of God? Surely it is not possible.

§ 45. 1. The two roads spoken of above have been hitherto represented as going in the same direction; but the sameness of direction is not a sameness in all respects. The direction is the same in this respect, that the end desired and tended towards is the same in kind of emotion and of framework. The direction is not necessarily the same in point of situation of its end objectively in time. Moral progress, the first of the two roads, is progress forwards in time both in order of existence, or actual history, and in order of cognition; but religious progress, the second of the two roads, being imaginative, is in this respect to be considered as progress only in order of cognition; its end or object may therefore lie objectively in the infinite distance of past as well as of future time, at the beginning as well as at the end of history. If we suppose, for a moment, the end of the first progress attained, by perfect actual union with
God, it may be supposed also then to turn out that we have attained union with what was from the very beginning, or existed in past time, as far back in time from the starting point as we should then have gone forwards from it. There is nothing in the nature of the case against this supposition; it is not contradictory, since the religious progress, so far as it is imaginative, is a progress only in order of cognition, and only its realisation is a progress in order of history as well. We shall presently enquire what conceptions or phenomena there are which bear out such a supposition as the present, namely, that the Idea and Object of religion is Eternal, or infinite in existence in time both a parte ante and a parte post, and the same in kind at both ends of the imagined progression, as far as we can reach by thought into infinity either way.

2. The Ideal Object, on such a supposition, would appear at the beginning of the time as the complex of causes out of which, and at the end of it as the complex of effects into which, the world was evolved; to the world it would be at once the ἀρχή and the τέλος τῆς κυνήσεως, and, in both characters alike, the world itself, implicitly. Take on the other hand the world itself, the intermediary between these two ends, and it is those ends, which are the same end in kind, explicitly; but inasmuch as it moves only forwards in order of history, from beginning to end, and not at the same time backwards, from end to beginning, it exhibits only the progress towards, and not the progress from, the final goal. The progress from the final goal can only be imagined in that part of the order of history which is the order of cognition. In the order of cognition we who follow that
order, and while we follow it, may conceive that a
progress of evolution and disintegration, to speak
figuratively, of the Ideal Object has taken place, into
a perfect Chaos or what would seem so if we could
imagine it; and that then out of this Chaos has been
evolved, from a point which we may call creation, the
world of history, up to the point at which we, the
imagining observers, are standing. But inasmuch
as we cannot imagine the world or the body of the
Ideal Object in the infinite future, except by the
mere provision that there must and will be such a
world or such a body, so also, and a fortiori, in the
past we are unable to imagine the steps of disintegra-
tion of such a world and such a body, steps by
which it advanced to the perfect Chaos which was
imagined as the point of reintegration or creation.

3. I have said that we can or may imagine such
an evolution and resolution, disintegration and re-
tegration, as the above; that is, that there is no con-
tradiction involved in it. The Alpha and Omega of
the entire progress will be the same in point of na-
ture and one in point of number; different only in
point of time of appearing in the same shape. Yet
there will and can be no repetition, no cycle of
changes, recurring on itself; for this reason, that
the movement both forwards and backwards, in both
directions, is infinite; the term is taken only by us,
the limit is imposed by our present capacities of
knowing and feeling. Beyond the Ideal Object, as
we at present conceive it, there does lie, as we can-
not but think, an infinite time and an infinite pro-
gress of modes of consciousness; and however far
we could reach, still this would be the case, for time
is necessary to, or inseparable from, consciousness,
of which it is the form. How far soever we can go forwards, so far precisely we can go backwards, in time; each stage or object in the one is the mirror of a counterpart in the other; and in neither is there a beginning before or beyond time. All that is known lies between the two points, the Ideal Object in the future and the reflexion of that same Object in the past; and whatever stage of development is contemplated, whether in the reintegration which is imagined as actual history, since the point of creation, or in the disintegration which is imagined to precede creation, that stage contains explicitly, in some mode of explication, the same Ideal Object; and contains also implicitly whatever may lie beyond that Ideal Object in infinite time, either prior or posterior. For the Ideal Object has been so imagined and defined in the preceding § as to include in itself, by its very definition, all the forces and powers of the universe, both physical and conscious, by the elimination or transformation of some, and the subordination of others to the supreme motive principles of love and justice, so that there remains nothing that is not subservient to these principles either consciously as volition, or unconsciously as mechanism of physical nature; the perfection of Power in the Ideal Object consists in, and can be imagined only by imagining, the perfection of this subordination.

4. Again I repeat that in all this I can see no contradiction; it is possible to thought and imagination. But the question remains, what grounds there are for supposing that this imagination is a true mode of conceiving phenomena. I think that there are such grounds, and that they can be ex-
hibited as follows. It is impossible to get rid of the conception of Design in nature; for, whether it is conceived as imposed on the objects of sense by our minds, or as gathered by our minds from those objects as already theirs, it is equally in nature; and if imposed by our minds, still our minds are a part of nature, and how came this to be the nature of our minds? Now this conception of Design is applicable to every phenomenon without exception, to what are called inorganic as well as to organic phenomena, for all stand related to each other. But it is not only from the universality of the applicability of the conception that I shall argue, but from its analysis which shows the ground of that universality. In its nature and analysis, Design is nothing else than the statical mode of regarding phenomena; and every phenomenon regarded statically, or as a whole, is organic, or exhibits design, reference of one part to another, and of the parts to the whole. Dynamically, phenomena exhibit succession and change, but no design; design is found whenever a comparison is made or relation perceived of two or more points in the succession; and this is to take the phenomena statically, or together. Time alone is the foundation of the dynamic mode of existence or consciousness; space is the foundation of the static mode; and a portion of time may be treated statically by marking it out from the rest of time by any two points in its content. A line of space has two ends; a surface has at the least three sides; a solid at the least four. All these exist only in reference to each other. The phenomena are organic or designed. The characteristic of design therefore is, that the beginning implies the end, though we may
not know in what the end will consist; the beginning
is implied in the same way, if we know the end and
treat it as a part of some whole, or statically. The
same holds good of the very largest object we can
conceive or imagine; for the static and dynamic
modes of thought and imagination are founded in
the formal element of consciousness itself, in time
and in space, and we cannot transcend them. In
regarding, therefore, the Ideal Object of religion in
relation to the universe of thought, we necessarily
treat the two together as statical, and this means
mutually implying each other. At every point in
the progression of consciousness and of history, which
are existence, the End is implied; it is present at
the beginning as at the end. But in what way we
shall imagine this implicit presence to have realised
itself in its explication, or in actual existence of his-
tory, this is a question comparatively, and for our
present purpose entirely, immaterial and unimport-
ant. I lay; therefore, no stress whatever upon the
images I have employed above, the sameness of cha-
acteristics in the beginning and in the end, the dis-
integration into Chaos, and the reintegration out of
Chaos again. I affirm only that the Ideal Object
of religion is eternal; ever present in the universe,
at every point of time and of space, when we regard
the universe statically; and that the statical mode
of regarding it is a necessity of consciousness.

§ 46. 1. The foregoing considerations tend to
prove the compatibility of religion with philosophy
and philosophy with religion; for they remove the
difficulties which have hitherto beset the connection
from a double source, first from a basis of belief in
God having been sought in philosophy at all, and
secondly, in a philosophy the ultimate logic of which consisted either in the imperfect notion of cause and effect, the contradictory one of a first or uncaused cause, or the illusory one of an ontological Substance, or Ding-an-sich, with its attributes or properties. But they do not base religion itself upon philosophy, or any of the forms of man’s knowledge; they show, or attempt to show, that it is based, by nature or by God himself, upon the emotional nature of man. The philosophical forms which it may assume or combine with from time to time are like a dress which it may wear or put off as the state of our knowledge may compel; but the emotions of love and of justice are continual and imperative, and, so far as we can see, eternal. Men, even religious men, have usually, all but universally, sought to base religion in some supposedly true system of philosophy. One man finally and for ever, following in the steps and repeating the words of his predecessors, Hebrew prophets, of whom he himself was the greatest, took the opposite course,—Jesus of Nazareth. “In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.” In the scope and spirit of this denunciation are included not only practical and ceremonial observances, which were its immediate occasion, but all doctrines whatever so far as they bear an intellectual character. They are always non-religious, and, when they obscure religion, anti-religious. Religion is not philosophy but “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and all thy mind and all thy strength, and thy neighbour as thyself.” “I will have mercy and not sacrifice;” therefore, not philosophy. This was the whole purpose, scope, and spirit, of his teaching. Not one
word did he utter in favour of the necessity of believing intellectually any doctrine whatever. Yet no sooner was the great teacher laid in his grave, than there began to grow up, around him and around his teaching,—the impulse to which growth was the very love and admiration which his life and teaching had inspired,—a web of philosophy and theoretical doctrine, held as a necessary part of religion, and of a religion called by his name whose life had been devoted to clearing religion from similar webwork. To do him the more honour we have been undoing his work; in his own name we have been disobeying him.

2. When we reflect upon this we understand why it must have been so. The reason lies in the relation of the emotional to the cognitive element in consciousness, in the causes which make one comparatively unalterable, the other comparatively accrescent and progressive. This at first sight appears to conflict with the inseparability and complete correspondence of emotion and its framework; but it is not so. The intensity of religious emotion, as of all feelings, is not communicable to others so as to be felt by them; the quality corresponding to it in its framework is the vividness of the image; and it is the precise parallel to intensity or a high degree of intellectual power, the quality corresponding to which in the framework is clearness and distinctness of parts, or of their relation to other frameworks. Both kinds of intensity, the emotional and the intellectual, are alike incommunicable; both alike influence the disciples by inspiring affection and veneration for the master personally. But there is this difference, that the vividness in the one case has no
separate framework or part of the framework appropriated to it, while the clearness and distinctness in the other case are changes in the framework, separate additions to it, which can be expressed in words, and the knowledge of them communicated to men of less intellectual power. Hence the progressiveness of knowledge, science, philosophy, in contrast to the non-progressiveness of intellectual power and emotional vigour, the work of knowledge being carried on by all workers who add each his own separate elaboration. To use Bacon's image, the disciples are dwarfs, but dwarfs standing on the shoulders of a giant. Now it is the framework of the emotion of the great Master of those who feel that his disciples have taken up and elaborated, but without its vividness; a framework founded in great part upon the very words of the master himself, since he necessarily used the images, shared the intellectual beliefs, and expressed them in the language, which were current in his day. His disciples think that in elaborating the framework they are obeying the commands of the master; but surely they misconceive him; it was not these images, this framework, this philosophy, for which he cared, but his aim was to set religion free from being trammeled by any framework whatever.

3. I am far from saying that there is no progress in emotion, moral and religious; but the great groups or kinds of emotion are to be compared to the great kinds of classes of science, such as those, for instance, which form Comte's hierarchy of the sciences. In both these cases the list of kinds is complete; further changes, the arising of new emotions in the one, of new sciences in the other, will be by compo-
sition and recomposition of sciences and of emotions which lie within the limits thus marked out, by more complete organisation of matters already comprehended generally or provisionally. This in the case of the emotions will be to render them more numerous, more complicated, and more subtil. Their greater vividness or intensity will remain, as hitherto, the prerogative of the great religious teachers, as intellectual power of the great scientific and philosophical leaders. History exhibits an illustrious series of Masters of either kind, majestic in their sublime isolation, like mountain summits unknown to the dwellers at their base, but communing with each other in mutual sympathy and comprehension. But while in the series of the great chiefs of intellect there is no strongly marked superiority of one over another, but all, so far as we can judge them, are equals in dignity and power, in that of religion and morality there is One, Jesus of Nazareth, to whom all the rest do homage, as their Master and Lord, in right of an immeasurable preeminence.

§ 47. Let us now turn back to the consideration of the provisional nature of the embodiment of the Ideal Object of religion. Love and justice are personal qualities, but it is impossible for us to imagine these emotions alone as constituting by themselves an entire or complete person. Hence the immateriality and unsearchability of God, since the remaining qualities of his personality are, by his very definition, unknown to us, and are therefore completely provisional. When however we wish to realise him in thought and feeling, which is a process of imagination idealising truly, we are led by a natural tendency to supply in imagination some embodiment
to complete the image. Dante and Milton have, as poets, taken the physical object Light to serve as this embodiment. Every such choice of object is confessedly poetical and arbitrary. But in the natural tendency to make the choice lies the connection between religion and mythology, poetry, idolatry, worship of heroes, ancestors, and departed friends; or, to express the same thing more generally, between religion itself and particular religious systems. It is not true to characterise all such worship and such imagination as irreligious, or even as non-religious. It has one basis in religion itself, that is, in the religious emotions as they are felt from time to time, or in those emotions which are from time to time felt as religion, and another in the tendency to realise, which is apparently ineradicable in man’s nature. But all such imagination must be strictly criticised, in order not only that it may have its objects truly compatible with the true Ideal Object, but also that it may not substitute for that its own objects, but that, to use St. Paul’s expression, “God may be all in all.” Most, if not all, religious systems have split upon this rock; they have identified an Actual with an Ideal, and therefore involve a logical contradiction. But the selection of such an embodiment can be no arbitrary choice, no merely poetical imagination; it is the religious imagination which makes it, and the embodiment when selected becomes to the mind the manifestation of the Ideal Object of religion, that is, of God himself. If there is an arbitrary or merely poetical choice, the embodiment selected will not be to the mind the manifestation of God, and will not secure belief. The Christian Church has selected a single man, a real person in
history, as the manifestation of God; that man who was the founder of the Church, and who in his own person manifested to his disciples the combination of love and justice in their purest and intensest shape, so that the manifestation was to them originally, and is still to their successors, the revelation of a new life. It was the character of Jesus Christ, displayed in his ministry, which was the actually determinant cause, in history, of imprinting in the conscience of mankind the perception of justice and love as the essential characteristics of God; that is, it was the revelation of God to mankind in that character. And therefore it remains, so long as that perception shall last, its purest realisation and embodiment.

2. If the question is asked, as it is not only necessary but just that it should be, What are the characteristics which define or constitute for us at the present day the person of Jesus of Nazareth, the answer must be something like the following. It is he who gave the precepts known, in their collected form, as the Sermon on the Mount, together with many other of the precepts, exhortations, and parables, which are found in the three synoptic Gospels; whose life corresponded completely to his words; thinking no evil, forgiving, fearless, tender, desiring the love and tenderness of others; who in some form or other instituted the Lord’s Supper; who finally suffered crucifixion as the consequence of his adhering to the law of his life; and these are all points which historical criticism, so far at least as I am acquainted with it, not only does not overthrow, but tends strongly to establish. We know in fact, from the testimony of Papias, preserved by Eusebius, that Matthew made a collection of λόγια, and that Mark
wrote the things said and done by Christ; these are no doubt comprised in the two first Gospels as we read them at present; and to these Luke may have added other trustworthy notices. (See Prof. J. H. Scholten’s work Das älteste Evangelium, translated into German by Dr. Redpenning.) And it must be remembered, that, whatever might be the difficulties in establishing such points as those mentioned above by a consideration of the Gospels alone, as we read them at present, owing to their many discrepancies, their close interweaving of the miraculous in the narrative, and the uncertainty of the dates of their composition, we are yet compelled to assume, as a fact preliminary to the criticism of these documents, that the person of whom they speak was not only an actual person in history, but also one of a most impressive moral and religious character, from the fact of the formation, in his name, of the closely united Church immediately after his death, and from the firmly held beliefs about him in that church, particularly the belief in his resurrection. But this very dependence on, or necessity of appealing to, actual history, and the evidence of particular facts, shows the essential difference between the adoption of this or any other embodiment of the great Ideal Object of religion and faith in, or worship of, that Ideal Object himself; for the latter excludes all inferential evidence, being immediately certain and self-evident. Still, whatever the embodiment, it becomes invested, in the eyes of those who have chosen it, and by the very fact of choice, with some of the attributes of divinity, that is, becomes an object of worship, of faith, and of prayer, a mediation or a mediator between God and the man who seeks to approach him
under this image. Some of these attributes are the consequence of the choice of the worshipper, some are inherent in the object chosen, and are the reason for the choice. The secret of the power which Jesus of Nazareth exerts over individual men lies in the nature of the love which he offers; they hold him to be divine because he offers a divine affection, that is, an affection unconditioned except by the condition of return; superior to every consideration of unworthiness, of disgrace, and even of self-condemnation and remorse; an affection as unmixed as that of a mother, yet not like that involuntary, or which will not bear of shame, but one that faces and overcomes shame in its own strength, knowingly, in order to annihilate it for ever. The moral grandeur of Jesus Christ in this respect is, so far as I know, entirely without a parallel in history; but it is a grandeur which the facile admission of his divinity tends to conceal, by leading us to regard it as a matter of course.

3. Prayer, it has been already said, is the volitional moment or act of communion between the worshipper and the person worshipped. As in the case of the term sanction, so, in that of prayer, the term includes two things, religious and non-religious prayer. It is only the latter which is used as a means of attaining some desired object. Whenever, and so far as, we prefer a request as a means of attaining what we wish for, we are not praying in the religious sense of the term. Yet religious prayer often takes the form of a request, "Give us our daily bread" for instance. The explanation of this is, that prayer is the expression of a strongly felt wish; but the expression of this wish is always combined, in
religious prayer, with the feeling of resignation. The combination of the two images thus wrought in the mind of the worshipper is the end and purpose of prayer. In all strong feelings which are approved by the moral sense, religious prayer is the natural expression of them; in feelings of joy, of whatever kind, the prayer becomes thanksgiving,—the expression of gratitude; in doubt, or on the entering upon any hazardous undertaking, prayer becomes the expression of a wish with resignation; in grief, from whatever cause arising, it becomes an outpouring of complaint; but in all cases alike it is the drawing near in thought, the energetic reproduction in imagination, of the person prayed to, along with renewed dwelling on the objects which occupy our own feelings at the time. The answer to prayer consists in the increase of the joyful emotions, the decrease of the painful ones, either immediately or after an interval; and this is the end or purpose which the prayer itself desires; this and not the obtaining a request is the τέλος of the act. This answer is as certain to follow as the effect on its cause in any of the most certain successions of events in the physical world. It is one case among those which constitute the general law, that voluntary mental energy is accompanied by a certain general mode of pleasure which is its inseparable reward. It may be said that the whole of religion is contained in prayer.

4. It is a feature in religion that doubt and sorrow, whether for calamity from without, or for moral evil in ourselves, are much more readily the beginning of religion than is any form of joy. The call of the preacher is responded to most gladly by those who suffer and by those who repent. This by no means
proves that religion, even in its sublimest moods, is not suitable to, or the natural completion of, the joyful emotions. The reason why it is less frequent in them is this, that the effort of imagination requires a stimulus, and in most men a very powerful one, to exertion. Joy is of itself, when an object is enjoyed, a reason for resting in the same kind of satisfaction as that of the present moment. Neither the effort of thought in any shape, nor that of poetical imagination, is willingly made when we are in the full enjoyment of ease, wealth, and prosperity; a circumstance which must have immense weight in contributing to the decay of prosperous nations and societies. Again, continued or habitual solitude, the isolation from the usual intercourse of common life, so as to throw the mind back upon itself, is an almost necessary condition for really enjoying the most highly imaginative poetry; only in such a way can the mind bend itself to meet the poet on the imaginative heights which he treads, or obtain an insight into the emotional secrets which he describes. Again, sorrow and isolation and disgrace intensify the feeling of tenderness towards those friends whom we have, and the heart bounds towards them with eagerness. Shakespeare's well-known sonnet,

"When in disgrace with fortune and men's eyes
I all alone beweep my outcast state, &c."

and many others which might be cited, is ample proof of this emotional law. The tenderness in religious love is increased by similar circumstances; and, where these are wanting, the effort to kindle it must be proportionately greater. Wherever this effort is made in such circumstances, not by artificial stimulants, but
by continued reflection and watchfulness, the blessing is proportionate to the effort. That religion is the crown and completion of all emotions, joyful as well as painful, is shown by this, that religion alone of all the great passions is calm and peaceful; it is a passion, yet not uneasy.

§ 48. 1. One word in retrospect over the whole subject of religion. No attempt has been made here to prove that religion is true, but only to analyse it and state the result. Religion, like sense, is immediate feeling, and every feeling has its own object or framework, as I have called it, inseparably combined. The truth of religion consists in the permanence of the feeling together with its own framework, under the clearest light that can be thrown on it by historical investigation and analysis, and by new experience in the future. The fact of its permanence must speak for itself. It is useless to try to prove that such and such an object ought to be the object of religion; the only question is this, what object is so. To discover this, it is requisite to analyse correctly religion as an emotion, for this analysis gives emotion and framework at one and the same time. There are no accidents, συμβεβηκότα, in religion. In this as in all cases, the connection between emotion and framework is necessary matter. If a different framework is substituted, on whatever grounds, a different emotion will be found pervading it. Everything depends on the emotion which is in view when religion is spoken of. Now it will be seen, perhaps objected, that I have gone to the Christian Scriptures, the writings of the New Testament, for the account of what religious emotion is. It is true that I have done so, and for this reason, that I find among them the expression of
feelings and of truths which, as Coleridge said, "find me," that is, approve themselves immediately to my mind as accurate and true, in a way which no other writings do, except such perhaps as have drawn their inspiration from the same source. For a precisely similar reason I go to Plato, Aristotle, Berkeley, Kant, Hegel, for the expression of the profoundest insight into the truths of philosophy. I know no criterion of truth, such that it can infallibly decide now what will be true hereafter. We are all seekers of truth, workers towards truth; we take whatever immediately approves itself to our minds, and endeavour to harmonise it into a consistent whole. Of what will be true hereafter we can now say only this, that it will be a consistent whole, for that is part of the definition of what we are seeking; but whether this mass of facts, or that mass of facts, as we now hold them, will form part of that consistent whole which we anticipate,—of this there is no infallible criterion at hand.

2. Turning our view back upon the whole course of this Chapter, the question which I would suggest is this, does or does not the analysis performed in it bear out the view stated in § 39, that the meaning of this world which we inhabit consists in the feelings, and chiefly among them in the emotions; not in the formal part of existence or consciousness, or in the frameworks of the emotions? Purely speculative or logical objects, that is, objects which are defined by formal or logical relations, such as are τὸ ἐν, τὸ ὅν, force, power, substance, cause, first cause, all of which must be conceived as ontological or absolute objects, since they are the union of formal relations alone into some supposed empirical or complete object, cannot
yield any satisfactory truth; and for this reason, that whatever truth they possess is purely formal, and not formal and material in union. The material element in consciousness or existence is Feeling; and of feeling there are two great kinds, sensation and emotion. While sensations alone, and not the form in which they appear, give the meaning, nature, or content, of the objects called from them objects of sense, the emotions on the other hand give the meaning, nature, or content, of objects of representation, so far as they are representations and not presentations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table of Reflective and Imaginative Emotions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1. The poetical emotions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2. The religious emotions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary: Worship, Sin, Sense of justification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary: Faith, Hope, Charity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>