

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-03794-5 - Studies in Hegelian Cosmology
John McTaggart Ellis McTaggart
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE LIBRARY COLLECTION

Books of enduring scholarly value

Philosophy

This series contains both philosophical texts and critical essays about philosophy, concentrating especially on works originally published in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It covers a broad range of topics including ethics, logic, metaphysics, aesthetics, utilitarianism, positivism, scientific method and political thought. It also includes biographies and accounts of the history of philosophy, as well as collections of papers by leading figures. In addition to this series, primary texts by ancient philosophers, and works with particular relevance to philosophy of science, politics or theology, may be found elsewhere in the Cambridge Library Collection.

Studies in Hegelian Cosmology

John McTaggart (1866–1925) was a Cambridge philosopher, famous for his metaphysical theory that time is not real and that temporal order is an illusion. Although best known for his contributions to the philosophy of time, McTaggart also spent a large part of his career expounding Hegel's work. In this book, first published in 1901, he discusses which views on a range of topics in metaphysics and ethics are compatible with Hegel's logic and idea of 'the Absolute'. Some early work on theories for which McTaggart later became well known can be found in this work, such as his beliefs that humans are immortal, that the Absolute is not in any sense a person, and that love is the relation that binds people together. In this book he also discusses punishment, sin, morality and whether Hegel could be considered a Christian.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-03794-5 - Studies in Hegelian Cosmology
John McTaggart Ellis McTaggart
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press has long been a pioneer in the reissuing of out-of-print titles from its own backlist, producing digital reprints of books that are still sought after by scholars and students but could not be reprinted economically using traditional technology. The Cambridge Library Collection extends this activity to a wider range of books which are still of importance to researchers and professionals, either for the source material they contain, or as landmarks in the history of their academic discipline.

Drawing from the world-renowned collections in the Cambridge University Library, and guided by the advice of experts in each subject area, Cambridge University Press is using state-of-the-art scanning machines in its own Printing House to capture the content of each book selected for inclusion. The files are processed to give a consistently clear, crisp image, and the books finished to the high quality standard for which the Press is recognised around the world. The latest print-on-demand technology ensures that the books will remain available indefinitely, and that orders for single or multiple copies can quickly be supplied.

The Cambridge Library Collection will bring back to life books of enduring scholarly value (including out-of-copyright works originally issued by other publishers) across a wide range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences and in science and technology.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-03794-5 - Studies in Hegelian Cosmology
John McTaggart Ellis McTaggart
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Studies in Hegelian Cosmology

JOHN MCTAGGART ELLIS MCTAGGART



Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-03794-5 - Studies in Hegelian Cosmology
John McTaggart Ellis McTaggart
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,
Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Tokyo, Mexico City

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108037945

© in this compilation Cambridge University Press 2011

This edition first published 1901
This digitally printed version 2011

ISBN 978-1-108-03794-5 Paperback

This book reproduces the text of the original edition. The content and language reflect the beliefs, practices and terminology of their time, and have not been updated.

Cambridge University Press wishes to make clear that the book, unless originally published by Cambridge, is not being republished by, in association or collaboration with, or with the endorsement or approval of, the original publisher or its successors in title.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-03794-5 - Studies in Hegelian Cosmology
John McTaggart Ellis McTaggart
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

STUDIES
IN
HEGELIAN COSMOLOGY.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-03794-5 - Studies in Hegelian Cosmology
John McTaggart Ellis McTaggart
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

London: C. J. CLAY AND SONS,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
AVE MARIA LANE.
Glasgow: 50, WELLINGTON STREET.

Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS.
New York: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.
Bombay: E. SEYMOUR HALE.

[*All Rights reserved.*]

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-03794-5 - Studies in Hegelian Cosmology
John McTaggart Ellis McTaggart
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

STUDIES
IN
HEGELIAN COSMOLOGY

BY

JOHN McTAGGART ELLIS McTAGGART, M.A.

FELLOW AND LECTURER OF TRINITY COLLEGE IN CAMBRIDGE,
AUTHOR OF "STUDIES IN THE HEGELIAN DIALECTIC."

CAMBRIDGE:
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.
1901

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-03794-5 - Studies in Hegelian Cosmology
John McTaggart Ellis McTaggart
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY J. AND C. F. CLAY,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

PREFACE.

CHAPTERS V. and VII. of this book appeared, nearly in their present form, in the *International Journal of Ethics*. (July 1896, and July 1897.) The other chapters have not been previously published.

In referring to Hegel's works I have used the *Collected Edition*, the publication of which began in 1832. For purposes of quotation I have generally availed myself of Wallace's translation of the *Encyclopaedia*, of Dyde's translation of the *Philosophy of Law*, and of Spiers' and Sanderson's translation of the *Philosophy of Religion*.

I am much indebted to Mr G. L. Dickinson, of King's College in Cambridge, and to my wife, for their kindness in reading this book before its publication, and assisting me with many valuable suggestions.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-03794-5 - Studies in Hegelian Cosmology
John McTaggart Ellis McTaggart
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

	PAGE
1. Definition of Cosmology	1
2. Hegel's attitude to Cosmology	2
3. The main principles illustrated in these Studies	3

CHAPTER II.

HUMAN IMMORTALITY.

A.

4. The problem of this Chapter	4
5. Hegel's own attitude towards Immortality	5
6. Apparently best explained by his indifference	5
7. The answer must depend on the Absolute Idea	7
8. Two questions arise. Are we among the fundamental differentiations of the Absolute? Is each of these differentiations eternal?	7

B.

9. As to the first of these questions,—firstly, What is the nature of the fundamental differentiations of the Absolute?	8
10. Let us start from Hegel's category of Life	9
11. The unity in this category is in the individuals—but not in each separately	10
12. Nor in the aggregate of them	10
13. Nor in their mutual determination	11
14. The unity must be <i>for</i> each of its differentiations. Thus we get the category of Cognition	13
15. This gives us the relation we require	14

	PAGE
16. We cannot imagine any example of the category of Cognition, except the concrete state of cognition. Dangers of this . . .	15
17. The validity of the transition to Cognition	15
18. Summary of the argument up to this point	17
19. Comparison with Lotze	17
20. Transition to the Absolute Idea	18
21. Nature of the Absolute Idea	19
22. But, though the fundamental differentiations of the Absolute are now proved to resemble selves, it is possible they may not be selves, or may not include our selves	19
23. We must now endeavour to prove that our selves have characteristics which they could not have unless they were fundamental differentiations of the Absolute	20
24. No line can be drawn to separate the Self and the Not-Self	21
25. The usual solution that the Self contains images of an external Not-Self is untenable	21
26. On the other hand, the Self has no content which is not also Not-Self	22
27. The nature of the Self is thus highly paradoxical	23
28. It need not therefore be false, but, if not, its paradoxes must be shown to be transcended contradictions	23
29. In a system like Hegel's it cannot be taken as false	25
30. And no demonstration that its paradoxes are transcended contradictions can be found, except on the hypothesis that the Self is a fundamental differentiation of the Absolute	25
C.	
31. We now turn to the second question stated in Section 8. Are the fundamental differentiations of the Absolute eternal?	26
32. Can the selves change? They are reproductions of the Absolute	27
33. Neither of the two elements of the Absolute can change	27
34. Even if the selves could change, they could not perish	29
35. For the Absolute does not stand to its manifestations in the same relation as finite things to their manifestations	30
36. Change is only possible when reality is viewed under categories having something of the nature of Essence in them	32
37. To maintain that the Individuals could change while the Absolute remains the same implies that we have not transcended the category of Matter and Form	33
38. Our selves, no doubt, are not given as changeless, or as in perfect harmony with the universe	34
39. But it is as difficult for Idealism to deny, as to affirm, the perfection and changelessness of the Self	34
40. Selves can be viewed under the Absolute Idea	36

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ix

D.

	PAGE
41. Personal Identity lies in Identity of Substance	36
42. Further explanation of this	37
43. The theory that Personal Identity lies in Memory	39
44. The theory that Personal Identity lies in continuity of character	40
45. Mr Bradley's objection that the Self is not a sufficiently adequate representation of the Absolute to be Immortal	40
46. This objection considered	41
47. His objection that our desire for Immortality is no argument for Immortality	43
48. His objection that Immortality might not give us that for which we desire it	43
49. Lotze's opinion that we have no evidence of Immortality	45
50. But with Lotze the unity of the Absolute is more fundamental than its plurality	45
51. And it is this, in which he differs from Hegel, that is decisive for his view on Immortality	47
52. Lotze's objection to the pre-existence of the Self. Pre-existence is indeed a probable conclusion from Immortality	47
53. But why should pre-existence be regarded as unsatisfactory?	48
54. Lives not connected by memory would be rather fragmentary. But all life in time is fragmentary	49
55. And the nature of each life would be a free development from that of the life before	50
56. Nor would the change be equivalent to the annihilation of one self and creation of another	50
57. And, in particular, the personal relations of each life would spring out of those of the life before	52
58. And may, in many cases, be held to be actually the same relations	53
59. Indeed, nothing is really lost by the loss of memory	54
60. Although it is inevitable that it should appear to us that something is lost	54

CHAPTER III.

THE PERSONALITY OF THE ABSOLUTE.

A.

61. Hegel's definition of God makes God's existence a truism. The important question is whether God is a person	56
62. Hegel's God is more conveniently referred to as the Absolute	58
63. Hegel regards the Absolute as a spiritual unity. And spirit as personal. But it does not follow that he thought the Absolute to be a Person. Nor do I believe that he did think so	58

	PAGE
64. It is not necessary that the individuals should be <i>for</i> the unity .	59
65. Indeed it is impossible—in the sense in which the unity is <i>for</i> the individuals	60
66. This view cannot properly be condemned as atomistic	61
B.	
67. It does not, however, necessarily follow from this that the Absolute is not a Self	63
68. Lotze's arguments for the personality of the Absolute	64
69. In his contention that the Ego is independent of the Non-Ego we may agree in a certain sense	66
70. But not in the sense in which it would allow of an Infinite Person	67
71. And the possibility that the Absolute should be a Person becomes trivial	69
72. And it would be a Personality entirely unlike ours	69
73. Lotze's asserted immediate certainty that the greatest must exist	70
74. If this be taken as strictly immediate it is only of interest for Lotze's biography	71
75. If it be taken as a conclusion admitting of proof, it has no probability unless the truth of Idealism has been demonstrated	72
76. Even in that case, we cannot infer that what men have always desired is a fundamental demand of spirit	72
77. Nor have all men desired the existence of a personal God	74
78. And no attempt has been made to prove <i>à priori</i> that a personal God is a fundamental demand of spirit.	74
79. Lotze's theory that the differences between the Infinite and the Finite are such as to make the Infinite the only real Person .	75
80. This theory considered. Unities of System and Unities of Centre	76
81. An Individual is not hindered from being self-determined by the existence of outside reality to which he is in relation	78
82. The same continued	79
83. Nor, if he were, would it follow that the Infinite was a Person .	80
84. We have only dealt with those of Lotze's arguments which would be applicable to Hegel's Absolute	81
C.	
85. The individual unity in consciousness	81
86. Such a unity is not found in the Absolute. And it is this unity which gives the direct sense of Self which forms the positive essence of Personality	82
87. Thus even the valueless possibility of Personality mentioned in Section 71 can no longer be predicated of the Absolute	84

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xi

	PAGE
88. The impossibility of this becomes more obvious when we reflect that the differentiations of the Absolute are themselves Persons	84
89. The Absolute could be called a Person if we extended the meaning of the term to cover all spiritual unities. But this would be wasteful and confusing	85
90. It is unmeaning to enquire whether the Absolute is higher or lower than a Person	87
D.	
91. Would the denial of Personality to the Absolute affect our morality? There is no logical justification for its doing so .	88
92. We have not sufficient evidence to determine whether it would do so in fact	89
93. But what evidence is available seems against the supposition.	90
94. We have even less light on the value of the effect that such a denial would have upon our emotions	91
95. At any rate, the belief in a personal Absolute is nearly as far removed from the historical belief in God as is the belief in an impersonal Absolute	92
96. It is better not to call an impersonal Absolute by the name of God	93

CHAPTER IV.

THE SUPREME GOOD AND THE MORAL CRITERION.

A.

97. The nature of Supreme Reality. This is not, as such, the Supreme Good	95
98. In point of fact, however, the Supreme Reality, according to Hegel, is also the Supreme Good	96
99. This Supreme Good is not purely hedonistic	96
100. The Moral Criterion need not be identical with the Supreme Good	96
101. The necessity of a Moral Criterion	97
102. We must judge our actions according to their relatively immediate consequences, as their ultimate consequences are unknown to us	98

B.

103. The idea of Perfection will not serve as a Moral Criterion	99
104. The same continued	100

	PAGE
105. The same continued	101
106. Examples of the ambiguity of the idea of Perfection as a Moral Criterion	102
107. The attempt to use it as a Moral Criterion leads to sophistry	104
108. Again, the idea of Perfection is useless when the question is quantitative. Examples of this	104
109. And an Ethical system is bound to provide the principles upon which such questions can be answered	105
110. Nor would the principle of "my station and its duties" be available as a Moral Criterion	106
C.	
111. On the other hand the calculation of Pleasures and Pains does seem to give us an applicable criterion, whether it is a correct one or not	108
112. We do know the difference between Pleasures and Pains	108
113. The objection that Pleasure is an abstraction	109
114. The objection that Pleasures vanish in the act of enjoyment	109
115. The objection that Pleasures are intensive quantities, and so cannot be added together	110
116. But we are continually adding them, in cases where no one would suppose that the results were completely unmeaning	111
117. And such additions have some place in morality, on any system of Ethics	112
118. And every system of Ethics, which requires a Criterion at all, has either Pleasure or Perfection, in some form, as that Criterion	112
119. Now Perfection as a Criterion also requires the addition of intensive quantities	113
120. Examples of this	114
121. Thus Ethics of every sort seem to stand or fall with the possibility of the addition of intensive quantities	115
122. And there seems, on consideration, no reason why they should not be added	116
123. This is not affected by the impossibility of very precise measurements	117
D.	
124. How far, then, is Pleasure a <i>correct</i> Criterion? The Good may be analyzed into Development and Harmony	118
125. Of Harmony the hedonic Criterion is a trustworthy test, but this is not always the case with Development	119
126. Although, in the long run, the greatest Development and the greatest Happiness are inseparable	120

TABLE OF CONTENTS xiii

	PAGE
127. Examples of this	121
128. When Harmony and Development lead in different directions, the conflict is not between Pleasure and Perfection, but between two elements of Perfection	122
129. The solution of the difficulty adopted by Common Sense	123
130. But neither this nor any other is satisfactory	123
131. Summary of results. There are some cases in which we have no Criterion to trust	123
132. This does not introduce so much practical uncertainty as might be supposed	125
133. Some uncertainty, no doubt, it produces. But it does not deny that there is an objective Right, though we cannot know it	126
134. And everyone must admit that we <i>do</i> not always know the Right. The difference is not great	126
135. Nor is the attainment of the Good ultimately dependent on our action	127
136. No doubt such a view brings out the fact that Virtue is not an ultimate conception. But this is an advantage	127

CHAPTER V

PUNISHMENT.

137. Definition of Punishment	129
138. Theories justifying Punishment	130
139. The vindictive theory has fallen out of favour	131
140. What is Hegel's theory? It has been supposed to be the vindictive theory, but this is incorrect	132
141. Hegel's theory is that Punishment, as such, may cause Repentance	133
142. The objection that all Punishment is essentially degrading	134
143. But can Punishment, as such, produce Repentance?	135
144. It can do so, if inflicted by an authority which the culprit recognizes as embodying the moral law	136
145. But is such a recognition compatible with a violation of the law? Yes. (a) The recognition may not have sufficient strength to enable us to resist temptation	137
146. (b) Or we may fail to see that the law applies to a particular case	138
147. (c) Or we may not know that the authority had forbidden the act in question	138

	PAGE
148. But would Punishment be just in these last two cases? There is no reason that it should not be just	139
149. (d) Or our recognition of the authority, previous to the Punishment, may have been too vague to determine our action	141
150. Thus Punishment produces Repentance by emphasising the element of Disgrace	142
151. Disgrace must be distinguished from Degradation	143
152. It is not advisable to trust exclusively to the Disgrace in- volved in the fault	144
153. It is rarely that the Punishments of a modern State can produce Repentance. The main object of such Punish- ment should be deterrent	144
154. And most offences against such a State are either (a) com- mitted deliberately from a sense of duty	145
155. Or (b) committed by persons in whom the sense of right is, in the matter in question, hopelessly dormant	146
156. And, in the remaining cases, the modern citizen does not conceive the State as the embodiment of the moral law. . . .	146
157. Hegel's mistake lay in supposing that Punishment could have the effect he treats of, when inflicted by the Criminal Law of a modern State. This came from his putting the State too high, and the Conscience of the Individual too low	147
158. He forgets that a State which could be the moral authority for its citizens could only have existed in antiquity	148
159. And that, before the higher unity of the future can be attained, the State, as such, will have ceased to exist	149
160. But although Hegel's theory has no validity in Jurisprudence, it is of great importance for Education	150

CHAPTER VI.

SIN.

161. Statement of Hegel's doctrine of Sin	151
162. The proof cannot be <i>a priori</i> , nor can it amount to demon- stration	152
163. Quotations from the <i>Philosophy of Religion</i>	153
164. Innocence is good. And yet it implies the absence of goodness	155
165. The relation of Innocence to Virtue	156
166. They are the Thesis and Synthesis of a triad	157
167. Of which Sin is the Antithesis	158

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xv

	PAGE
168. But this explanation of Sin presupposes the existence of Evil	159
169. The subordinate triad of Sin. It may be presumed analogous to the triad of Sin, Punishment, and Repentance in the <i>Philosophy of Law</i>	160
170. But Retribution and Amendment will be here more appropriate terms	160
171. Why Retribution must follow on Sin	161
172. And Amendment on Retribution	162
173. The analogy of Retribution to Punishment	164
174. The transition to Virtue from Innocence and Sin	165
175. The transition to Virtue from Amendment	165
176. The process from Innocence to Virtue may be repeated more than once in each man	166
177. Virtue can be increased otherwise than by Sin and Amendment	167
178. But Innocence necessarily leads, through Sin, Retribution, and Amendment, to Virtue	168
179. Yet, in fact, some members of this process are often seen, in individual cases, without being followed by the later ones	168
180. Hegel may have regarded the process as only a tendency in the individual, though an actual fact in the race	169
181. Or he may have regarded the process as completed for each individual in a subsequent life	169
182. Summary	170
183. Comparison with two other theories of Sin	171
184. Moral evil and moral good are not so fundamentally opposed for Hegel as for many philosophers	171
185. But his theory affords no logical justification for immoral action	172
186. Nor is it likely, as a matter of fact, to lead to such action	173
187. The theory certainly does not lend itself to the deification of Virtue	174
188. An application to the principles of Education	174

CHAPTER VII.

THE CONCEPTION OF SOCIETY AS AN ORGANISM.

189. Statement of Hegel's position	177
190. The same continued	178
191. Professor Mackenzie's position	179
192. The intrinsic relations of parts to the whole, as proved by Professor Mackenzie, only implies mutual determination	180

	PAGE
193. And need involve no higher category than Absolute Mechanism	182
194. Although the end of Society is human well-being, it does not follow that it lies within Society	183
195. Illustrations of this	184
196. A definition of Organic Unity proposed	185
197. Is Society the end of man? The ideal Society of heaven is, but not our present Society on earth	187
198. Nor <i>ought</i> our present Society to be our end	188
199. For, in progressing through it, our relation to it is often negative	189
200. Arguments in support of this statement	190
201. The same continued	192
202. Statement of results reached	192
203. Earthly Society does not always improve or deteriorate in proportion as its unity increases or diminishes	193
204. Philosophy can afford us no guidance in acting on Society	195
205. Nor is it to be expected that it should do so	196

CHAPTER VIII.

HEGELIANISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

206. Introductory	197
207. The definition of Christianity	198
208. Division of the subject	198

A.

209. Statement of Hegel's views on the Trinity and Personality of God. The Primary and Secondary Triads	199
210. He identifies the distinctions of the Secondary Triad with those of the Trinity	201
211. But the Secondary Triad forms part of a dialectic process	202
212. And therefore the Synthesis expresses its whole reality	204
213. This would not lead to the ordinary doctrine of the Trinity	204
214. The Personality of God. Hegel's statement of the Primary Triad	205
215. This is again a dialectic process	207
216. And, therefore, if God is really Personal, it must be in the Kingdom of the Spirit	208
217. God in the Kingdom of the Spirit is a Community	209
218. And so can scarcely be a Person—especially as it is bound together by Love	210

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xvii

	PAGE
219. Hegel's use of the word Love	211
220. Its relation to Friendship	212
221. And to Particularity	212
222. Hegel's views on the Personality of God have been obscured by his use of the word God	213
223. And by mistakes as to the nature of the Pantheism which he rejects	213
224. And by supposing that Spirit cannot be Personal unless God is a Person	214
B.	
225. Hegel's doctrine of Incarnation	215
226. Its similarities to the Christian doctrine	216
227. But, for Hegel, God is incarnate in everything finite	217
228. And all the reality of everything finite is only its Incarnation of God	218
229. As to the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation three ques- tions arise, of which the first has been considered above	218
230. Hegel's demonstration for the necessity of the Incarnation being typified in a particular man	219
231. Why the typification in <i>several</i> men would be unsatisfactory	220
232. For Hegel this typification is a necessity to be regretted	221
233. Why Jesus should be taken as the type—not because of his personal perfection	222
234. Nor of the excellence of his moral teaching	222
235. But because he bears witness to the metaphysical truth of the Unity of God and Man	223
236. But the Unity is asserted merely immediately	224
237. And the Unity asserted is itself immediate, and therefore only one side of the truth	225
238. Why the type must be found in a teacher whose assertion of the Unity was immediate	226
239. And why it must be found in a teacher who asserted an immediate Unity	226
240. In what sense the position of Jesus was determined by the choice of the Church	228
241. Hegel's view of Jesus is, at all events, not the usual Chris- tian view	229
C.	
242. Hegel's statement of the doctrine of Original Sin	230
243. The consequences of this doctrine, as held by Hegel	232
244. This doctrine may be true, and may be Christian, but it is by no means specially Christian	233

	PAGE
245. And he regards Sin as, at any rate, superior to Innocence	234
246. As is seen in his treatment of the Fall	234
247. Hegel's statement of the doctrine of Grace	236
248. This doctrine, again, is not specially Christian	237
249. Hegel would seem to attribute the doctrine of Grace to Jesus, and that of Original Sin to his successors	238
250. As to morality—its commands and prohibitions are much the same for Hegel as for Christianity	239
251. But he differs from Christianity in the comparatively slight importance he gives, (a) to Sin	239
252. (b) to Conscience	240
253. (c) to Immortality	241
254. (d) to Purity of Motive	242
255. (e) And, indeed, to morality as a whole	242
256. (f) Moreover, the ideas of humility and contrition for sin have for Hegel only a relative validity	243

D.

257. Summary of results	245
258. Why did Hegel attempt to connect with Christianity a system so unlike the ordinary doctrines of Christians?	245
259. It cannot have been from cowardice, or from a regard for the interests of the non-philosophical public	245
260. Nor can it be attributed to a sympathy for the life and character of Jesus	246
261. The explanation is to be found in his definition of Religion as something which cannot give absolute truth	247
262. His meaning will be that no Religion can ever give a closer approach to absolute truth than is given by Christianity	248
263. And, if Hegel's philosophy is true, it must be admitted that no Religion <i>has</i> approximated to the truth as closely as Christianity	249
264. Historical confirmation of this view	250

CHAPTER IX.

THE FURTHER DETERMINATION OF THE ABSOLUTE.

A.

265. An Idealist philosophy has three stages	252
266. The practical importance of the third stage	253
267. The subject of the present chapter	254
268. The nature of perfected Knowledge	255

TABLE OF CONTENTS xix

	PAGE
269. In which the question "Why is the Universe as a whole what it is?" is the only one which remains, and is illegitimate	257
270. The nature of perfected Volition	258
271. The significance of a life which enjoyed this perfection would be summed up in Love	260
272. And in nothing else	261
273. The apparently unreasoning nature of Love.	262

B.

274. Love is not only the highest reality in the universe, but the sole reality	262
275. For (a) the duality between Knowledge and Volition cannot be maintained in the Absolute	263
276. The distinction between Knowledge and Volition is not in their relation to action	263
277. Nor in the activity or passivity of the mind	264
278. But is that, in a case of imperfect harmony, we condemn, in Knowledge our ideas, in Volition the facts	265
279. The same continued	266
280. This distinction could find no place in perfection	267
281. An objection considered.	268
282. The perfected state of Spirit could not be mere Feeling. There only remains Emotion	269
283. The only form of Emotion which could fill this place would be Love	270
284. And Love does transcend the opposition between Knowledge and Volition	270
285. A second line of argument leads to the same conclusion: for (b) both Knowledge and Volition postulate an ideal which they can never reach, as long as they remain Knowledge and Volition	271
286. The element of the Not-Self is essential to Knowledge and Volition. But it is incompatible with their perfection	272
287. In Knowledge this element shows itself in apparent opposition to the Self	273
288. And this is the reason that we cannot get rid of the illegitimate question "Why is the Universe as a whole what it is?"	273
289. The possibility of knowing that Knowledge is inadequate	274
290. Again, Volition requires that all Experience shall be a Means to the End of the person who wills	274
291. The element of the Not-Self prevents this	276
292. And this gives an appearance of contingency to all satisfaction of Volition	276

	PAGE
293. In a perfected state of Spirit, we must be able to regard the Not-Self as we regard the Self	277
294. The Not-Self of each of us is some other Selves	278
295. In Love we regard the person loved in the same way as we regard ourselves	278
296. Reasons for believing this	278
297. The same continued	279
298. And thus Love supplies the defects of Knowledge and Volition	280
299. A third line of argument leads to the same conclusion : for (c) each Individual must have an unique nature of its own.	281
300. Explanation of this	282
301. This nature cannot be found in Knowledge or Volition	284
302. But may be found in Love	285
303. Thus three lines of argument lead to the same conclusion	285

C.

304. The objection that Love is not at present self-subsistent	285
305. Love, if perfect, would be inconsistent with sense-presentation	286
306. And with time	287
307. The objection that Love does not always at present vary directly with development	288
308. This Love cannot be Love of God	289
309. And still less of mankind	290
310. Its nature	290
311. Its extent	291
312. The mystical character of our conclusion	292