

# ANALYTICAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

## BOOK V. PRESENT EXPERIENCE AND ABSOLUTE REALITY

### CHAPTER XXXII

#### THE INTRODUCTION OF THE EMPIRICAL

SECT.	PAGE
294. In this volume we shall apply the general results of Vol. I to certain empirical questions . . . . .	3
295. In Bk V we shall consider, with regard to certain characteristics which <i>seem</i> to apply to the existent, (a) whether they <i>can</i> , and (b) whether they <i>do</i> in fact, apply . . . . .	3
296. In Bk VI we shall consider how appearance can diverge from reality, and how the two are related when they do diverge . . . . .	3
297. In Bk VII we shall apply our results to questions of practical interest . . . . .	4
298. In Vol. I the conclusions, if true, are certain. In Vol. II the positive conclusions are only highly probable . . . . .	4
299. All empirical knowledge is, or is based on, perception . . . . .	6
300. Which is acquaintance <i>with</i> substances, giving knowledge <i>about</i> their characteristics . . . . .	6
301. And also about characteristics of characteristics. But it must not be confused with the <i>judgment</i> that so-and-so has a characteristic . . . . .	7
302. We shall find that a substance can be perceived as having characteristics which it does not in fact have . . . . .	7

### CHAPTER XXXIII. TIME

303. We shall try to prove that nothing is in time. This is a highly paradoxical conclusion . . . . .	9
304. Yet it has been held by many philosophers and religious mystics. Our reasons are different from theirs . . . . .	9
305. Temporal positions are distinguished as (a) Past, Present and Future, (b) Earlier and Later. The former are transitory, the latter permanent . . . . .	9
306. The two series are called respectively the <i>A</i> and the <i>B</i> series. The <i>A</i> series is as essential to time as the <i>B</i> series, and more fundamental . . . . .	10

SECT.	PAGE
307. All observed events appear to form an <i>A</i> series as well as a <i>B</i> series . . . . .	11
308. Could the <i>A</i> series be merely subjective and the <i>B</i> series objective? . . . . .	11
309. There could be no time unless <i>something</i> changed; and, if anything changes, then everything does so. Could there be change without an <i>A</i> series? . . . . .	11
310. No event could cease or begin to be an event, or merge into another event . . . . .	12
311. The only characteristics of an event that can change are the characteristics of the <i>A</i> series. So the <i>A</i> series is essential for change and therefore for time . . . . .	13
312. The <i>B</i> series involves time and therefore involves the <i>A</i> series . . . . .	13
313. Russell's view of time and change . . . . .	13
314. It involves moments of time, and yet rejects the <i>A</i> series . . . . .	14
315. Substances cannot change unless events do so. And events can change only in respect of <i>A</i> characteristics . . . . .	14
316. If we remove the <i>A</i> series we are left with a series which is not temporal and allows of no change . . . . .	15
317. Our theory involves that some propositions are sometimes true and sometimes false . . . . .	15
318. Russell regards such propositions as ambiguous because elliptical . . . . .	16
319. There are trains of fictitious events which certainly form a <i>B</i> series, yet seem not to form an <i>A</i> series . . . . .	16
320. But, since these events do not exist, they are not in time at all . . . . .	16
321. And, in so far as they are thought to exist, they are thought to be in an <i>A</i> series . . . . .	17
322. Would a plurality of time-series affect the argument? . . . . .	17
323. No. If there were many <i>B</i> series there would be as many <i>A</i> series . . . . .	18
324. Men have wanted to reject the <i>A</i> series and retain the <i>B</i> series in the vain hope of saving the reality of time . . . . .	18
325. We have now to prove that an <i>A</i> series cannot exist . . . . .	18
326. Past, present, and future are relational properties, not qualities . . . . .	19
327. Since these properties change, the relations must be to something outside the time-series. And the relations are indefinable . . . . .	19
328. It is difficult to conceive what this something could be. And there is a more positive objection . . . . .	20
329. For the three characteristics are incompatible and yet every event has them all . . . . .	20

SECT.	PAGE
330. It might be replied that they are had <i>successively</i> , and are not then incompatible . . . . .	21
331. But this answer is found to lead to the same difficulty at the next step . . . . .	21
332. And involves a vicious infinite regress . . . . .	21
333. So the <i>A</i> series must be rejected, and time with it . . . . .	22
334. Broad tries to hold that past and present exist whilst future does not . . . . .	23
335. This theory assumes that judgments about the future are neither true nor false . . . . .	23
336. And this is impossible . . . . .	24
337. It could not be true if the past ever intrinsically determines the future . . . . .	24
338. And the past does sometimes intrinsically determine the future . . . . .	24
339. If it did not it could not intrinsically determine the less remote past or the present . . . . .	25
340. And this would involve almost complete scepticism . . . . .	25
341. And the difficulty about past and present remains even if the future be rejected . . . . .	26
342. Are we so certain of the reality of time that we can reject every argument against it? . . . . .	27
343. Even if time were objectively real, time as <i>perceived</i> would have to be unreal or merely subjective . . . . .	27
344. For specious presents are of various lengths; whilst the objective present, if it had duration at all, would have one fixed duration . . . . .	28
345. And, if the objective present be punctiform, the objective time-series is quite unlike the perceived time-series . . . . .	29
346. So the denial of an objective time-series is less paradoxical than it seems at first sight . . . . .	29
347. There may be a real non-temporal series—the <i>C</i> series—which appears in a partly misleading way as a time-series . . . . .	29
348. The <i>B</i> series will be derived from the <i>C</i> series and the appearance of an <i>A</i> series . . . . .	30
349. Assertions about the temporal <i>order</i> of events will correspond to facts about the order of terms in the <i>C</i> series . . . . .	30
350. This view of time resembles Hegel's rather than Kant's . . . . .	31
351. The <i>C</i> series has some analogy to Russell's time-series. But its terms are not events and its relations are not temporal . . . . .	31

## CHAPTER XXXIV. MATTER

SECT.	PAGE
352. We shall now consider whether Matter exists . . . . .	32
353. Matter is anything that has the five generally recognized Primary Qualities . . . . .	32
354. Secondary Qualities, even if they belong to matter, are no part of its definition . . . . .	32
355. If matter exists it must have parts within parts without end, determined by determining correspondence . . . . .	33
356. The required sufficient descriptions of the primary parts of matter could not be given in terms of non-spatial qualities . . . . .	33
357. And there could not be determining correspondence in respect of spatial qualities unless it could be established in respect of non-spatial qualities . . . . .	37
358. For, if space be relative, bits of matter must be differentiated by non-spatial qualities . . . . .	37
359. The same is true if space be absolute . . . . .	38
360. For one spatial whole can be discriminated from another only by descriptions of its parts . . . . .	39
361. For similar reasons matter could not be divided into temporal parts within parts without end . . . . .	42
362. Nor could it be thus divided in the real dimension which appears as a temporal dimension . . . . .	42
363. Could the conditions be fulfilled by means of other character- istics not involved in the definition of matter? This question postponed . . . . .	43
364. The belief in matter, though not reached by inference, could be justified only by inference from perceived sensa . . . . .	44
365. There is no need for detailed resemblance between sensa and their causes . . . . .	45
366. And arguments based on the principle of resemblance lead to gross inconsistencies . . . . .	46
367. Broad's argument that the existence of matter involves no contradiction and can be rendered highly probable . . . . .	48
368. He assumes that misperception is impossible. And other hypotheses would explain the admitted facts . . . . .	49
369. Though the explanation on our view would be neither so simple nor so complete as on his . . . . .	50
370. All scientific knowledge can be retained even if matter does not exist . . . . .	52
371. And we are in no danger of Solipsism . . . . .	54
372. Some philosophers have used "matter" in a looser sense than we, and our arguments need not apply to them . . . . .	54

## CHAPTER XXXV. SENSUA

SECT.	PAGE
373. Sensa are <i>prima facie</i> neither spiritual nor material . . .	56
374. We shall conclude that sensa do not exist, though other percepta are misperceived as sensa . . . . .	57
375. The qualities which sense-data are perceived as having include some qualities which we attribute also to matter . . .	57
376. Such qualities do not suffice for determining correspondence .	59
377. Nor will intensity or extensity serve for this purpose . . .	59
378. So sense-data must have other qualities which they are not perceived as having . . . . .	60
379. Could they, in addition, have the qualities which they are perceived as having? This question postponed . . . .	60
380. The conclusion would be the same if we had supposed that all qualities of sensa are of the form "being a sensum of <i>x</i> " . .	61

## CHAPTER XXXVI. SPIRIT

381. Spirituality is the quality of having content all of which is content of one or more selves . . . . .	62
382. I could not understand statements about myself unless I knew myself either by acquaintance or by description . . .	62
383. If "I" were known only as "that which is aware of <i>this</i> awareness" I could not know that it was the same I which has this awareness and which is aware of it . . . . .	63
384. And it is doubtful whether the proposed description would be exclusive, for several selves might be aware of the same awareness . . . . .	65
385. Though the same awareness could not be a state of several selves . . . . .	67
386. If "I" were known only as "that which has <i>this</i> awareness" the description would be exclusive, but the difficulty of § 383 would remain . . . . .	68
387. And it could not be overcome by inference, for the identification of the "I" in the two cases is immediate . . . . .	69
388. Hume's attempt to describe "I" as a certain bundle of mental states . . . . .	70
389. Not every group will be such a bundle. Nor can we find any direct relations between mental states which will distinguish a group which is a bundle from one which is not . . .	71
390. The attempt to describe a self by the causal relations of certain mental events to a certain organism would make all statements of the form "I did so-and-so" totally untrustworthy	73

SECT.	PAGE
391. And meaningless to anyone who does not accept the cerebral causation of all mental events . . . . .	74
392. There is no reason to accept Bradley's view that a self could not be acquainted with itself . . . . .	75
393. The existence of self-acquaintance is hard to establish by direct inspection, but can be proved by the above arguments	75
394. Selfhood is a simple quality like redness . . . . .	76
395. It is certain that my self has persisted throughout the specious present . . . . .	77
396. And highly probable that it has existed at least since my birth and will exist at least till the death of my body . . . . .	78
397. Need a self be self-conscious? . . . . .	79
398. There could be beings which were conscious without being self-conscious . . . . .	79
399. And it would be inconvenient not to call them selves . . . . .	81
400. There can be no experience which does not belong to some self . . . . .	81
401. And no two selves can have any part in common . . . . .	82
402. A self can manifest a whole of which it is a part, and can manifest another self . . . . .	84
403. A self could perceive another self or parts of another self . . . . .	84
404. Multiple personality is no objection to our views. The universe cannot be a self . . . . .	85

### CHAPTER XXXVII. COGITATION

405. If anything spiritual exists it must fulfil the requirements of determining correspondence . . . . .	87
406. Classification of mental states. We shall show that perceptions are the only cogitations that could fulfil these requirements	87
407. Perception need not be either exhaustive or infallible as to the qualities of the object perceived . . . . .	88
408. We here make three assumptions about possible perceptions, which we shall justify later. And we suppose a set of selves related in a certain specified way . . . . .	89
409. Rather less rigid conditions would do equally well for our purpose . . . . .	89
410. In this hypothetical case all the five conditions for determining correspondence would be fulfilled . . . . .	90
411. A self could perceive another self and its parts. So the first assumption is justified . . . . .	92
412. Various reasons for holding that perceptions are parts of the percipient self, thus justifying the second assumption . . . . .	92

SECT.	PAGE
413. In <i>some</i> cases the perceptions of the parts of a whole are parts of the perception of the whole . . . . .	96
414. And it is possible that this might be so in <i>all</i> cases, which justifies the third assumption . . . . .	97
415. Need the selves be perceived as being selves and the perceptions as being perceptions? If a self is to have two different perceptions at once it must perceive the perceptions as differing in some quality . . . . .	98
416. It is not enough that the perceptions should in fact differ in some quality . . . . .	100
417. It is, however, just possible that two perceptions might be differentiated by differences in their own intensity . . . . .	100
418. But this possibility would cease at some stage in the infinite series of perceptions, and below this level all the perceptions must be perceived as being such . . . . .	101
419. The same conclusion can be proved for the perceptions at and above this level . . . . .	102
420. Acquaintance with characteristics could not fulfil the conditions of determining correspondence, for two reasons . . . . .	104
421. Nor could judgments or assumptions . . . . .	105
422. Could imaging do so? Definition and discussion of imaging . . . . .	106
423. We can image something as having characteristics which nothing in fact has. Yet the imaginatum exists whenever the imaging does so . . . . .	108
424. Such imaging is misperceived misperceiving of an existent perceptum . . . . .	110
425. Memory is a special form of judgment, and therefore could not fulfil the conditions of determining correspondence . . . . .	112
426. Spirit then can exist, but only if it contains no parts except perceptions and groups of them . . . . .	112

## CHAPTER XXXVIII. IDEALISM

427. There is good reason to hold that spirit exists. But must every existent substance be spiritual? . . . . .	114
428. This could not be rigorously proved, but it is reasonable to believe it . . . . .	115
429. But might not what exists be material or sensual as well as spiritual? There is nothing in our experience to suggest that this is possible . . . . .	116
430. And there is a positive incompatibility between spiritual and material or sensual qualities . . . . .	117

SECT.	PAGE
431. What is spiritual may, and in fact does, appear as being material or sensal . . . . .	118
432. This doctrine may be called Idealism. We do not profess to have demonstrated it . . . . .	119

## CHAPTER XXXIX

## FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS ON SELVES

433. All the primary parts of the universe are selves, and the converse is also true . . . . .	120
434. This refutes Solipsism and the doctrine that the universe is a self. But the differences between selves, as they appear, and the primary parts, as they must be, raise difficulties which will be dealt with in Bk VI . . . . .	120
435. We can preserve the spirit, though not the letter, of Bradley's argument against Solipsism . . . . .	121
436. The number of primary parts may be finite or infinite . . . . .	123
437. It is neither necessary nor impossible that each self should perceive all selves . . . . .	123
438. There may be selves which are not perceived by any self . . . . .	125
439. Definition of "indirect perception." It is neither necessary nor impossible that each self should indirectly perceive all selves . . . . .	125
440. The fact that I have knowledge of the universe does not imply that I perceive all selves . . . . .	127
441. We cannot tell whether all selves belong to the same primary whole . . . . .	129
442. But there is only one kind of determining correspondence and only one set of primary parts . . . . .	130
443. And our results severely limit the other qualities which the parts of the universe could possibly possess . . . . .	131

## CHAPTER XL. VOLITION

444. Volition is taken as identical with desire. Desire is indefinable. Volitions are parts of the self which desires . . . . .	132
445. Desire, though not reducible to cogitation, is very intimately connected with it . . . . .	133
446. Every volition is a cogitation which has the further quality of being a desire . . . . .	134
447. There is no uniform relation between desire, on the one hand, and pleasure, goodness, or any other known quality, on the other . . . . .	135



SECT.	PAGE
448. Desire is not necessarily directed towards change. It may be identified with acquiescence . . . . .	137
449. Aversion is merely desire for a negative object, not negative desire . . . . .	138
450. In this life most desires are cogitatively either judgments or assumptions . . . . .	139
451. But a desire is sometimes a perception or an imaging . . . . .	140
452. If a true judgment or a correct perception be a desire it must be a fulfilled desire . . . . .	141
453. So nothing in absolute reality could be either an unfulfilled desire or the object of such a desire . . . . .	142
454. But we cannot at present decide whether any or all perceptions in absolute reality are desires . . . . .	142

## CHAPTER XLI. EMOTION

455. Emotion is indefinable. Unlike volition, it has many species	144
456. An emotion towards an object is a cogitation of the object having an emotional quality . . . . .	144
457. Any kind of cogitation can be an emotion; and a cogitation can be at once an emotion and a volition . . . . .	146
458. The indirectness of our cognitive relations to other selves in present experience makes it dangerous to argue from it to what our emotions towards selves are in absolute reality . . . . .	146
459. But one emotional relation in absolute reality will be love, which is a passionate liking for persons . . . . .	147
460. Love must be distinguished from benevolence and from sympathy . . . . .	148
461. Nor must it be identified with sexual desire . . . . .	149
462. Love need not cause or be caused by pleasure . . . . .	149
463. It can exist without benevolence or sympathy, and it can coexist with moral disapproval . . . . .	150
464. A sense of intimate union is the necessary and sufficient condition of love . . . . .	150
465. Love may arise <i>because of</i> qualities in the beloved, but it is not felt <i>in respect of</i> qualities . . . . .	151
466. The intensity and value of love bear no relation to the value of the qualities that determine it . . . . .	152
467. Nor do we condemn love where we can see no cause to produce it	153
468. And we hold that love should survive even if the qualities of the beloved, or the beliefs of the lover about them, have changed . . . . .	153
469. It is not possible, strictly speaking, to love oneself . . . . .	155

SECT.	PAGE
470. In absolute reality every self will love every other self whom he directly perceives . . . . .	155
471. The unrest of love in present experience is due to the indirectness of the cognitive relations between selves . . . . .	157
472. Every self will love someone. But it is not certain that every self will be loved or that all love will be reciprocated, though this is possible . . . . .	158
473. The intensity of this love will be greater than that of any which exists in present experience for five reasons, of which the most important is the greater unity involved in direct perception of others . . . . .	158
474. The states of others will be viewed with complacency unchecked by repugnance . . . . .	161
475. Those selves whom we perceive only indirectly will be objects of affection though not of love . . . . .	162
476. We cannot tell whether any emotions will be felt towards groups of selves . . . . .	163
477. A self which perceives itself will reverence itself as loving others. Our whole emotional attitude, so far as we can determine it, will depend on love . . . . .	164
478. All perceptions will be gratified volitions . . . . .	165
479. There can be no emotions of hatred, anger, jealousy, regret, remorse, hope, fear, wonder, or curiosity in absolute reality. It is possible, but very unlikely, that there might be malignancy . . . . .	166
480. There might be courage and cowardice, though their importance will be trivial. Disapproval and humility may exist, though there will be little to call them forth . . . . .	167
481. Pleasure and pain are not emotions. There will be pleasure and there may be pain. But the pain will be acquiesced in . . . . .	168

## CHAPTER XLII. DISSIMILARITY OF SELVES

482. The selves must be dissimilar. This could arise in three ways . . . . .	170
483. Selves could not all be distinguished simply by having different differentiating groups . . . . .	170
484. But they might be distinguished simply by the different numbers of selves in the groups with which they are connected . . . . .	171
485. But this is not necessary, and seems very unlikely. The dissimilarity might consist in differences of intensity in the states of the selves . . . . .	172
486. And it seems possible that the same kind of mental state might be capable of differences of quality . . . . .	174

SECT.	PAGE
487. The differentiating group of a self might consist of those selves whose states have some quality which is specially related to the quality of his own states . . . . .	175

## CHAPTER XLIII. GOD AND IMMORTALITY

488. By "God" we mean a being who is personal, supreme (though not necessarily omnipotent), and good (though not necessarily perfect morally) . . . . .	176
489. The term has been used in a wider sense by some philosophers. But in this sense "the Absolute" is a better term . . . . .	176
490. Nor is our usage too wide, though most Theists in fact believe God to be omnipotent and morally perfect . . . . .	177
491. God cannot be identical with the universe, since a self cannot contain other selves as parts . . . . .	178
492. There cannot be a self which creates all the other selves. For all the selves are primary parts. And, again, the causal relation must be reciprocal if time be unreal . . . . .	178
493. Nor is there any other relation which could reasonably be called "creation" . . . . .	179
494. Nor any relation which would appear, <i>sub specie temporis</i> , as creation . . . . .	180
495. There could not be a really controlling, though non-creative, God . . . . .	181
496. But it is possible that there might be a self which appeared, <i>sub specie temporis</i> , as a controlling God . . . . .	182
497. It is doubtful whether such a being would be of much religious value . . . . .	183
498. Our conclusions give no reason for accepting such a being, and invalidate the usual reasons for doing so . . . . .	183
499. For we have proved that a chaotic universe is <i>a priori</i> impossible . . . . .	184
500. And we shall prove that, <i>sub specie temporis</i> , the universe must improve as time goes on . . . . .	185
501. We are certainly timeless, and therefore immortal, in the sense that there is no moment at which we shall cease to exist . . . . .	186
502. Spinoza reached this conclusion by confusing the timelessness of propositions with that of facts . . . . .	187
503. The ordinary sense of "immortality" is endless existence in future time. We shall prove that every self will appear to have an endless existence in future time . . . . .	188
504. We can form a fairly adequate picture of absolute reality by means of materials given in present experience . . . . .	189

## BOOK VI. ERROR

## CHAPTER XLIV. ERROR

SECT.	PAGE
505. The differences between the apparent and the real nature of the universe can be reduced to five heads . . . . .	193
506. If it were impossible or very improbable that the appearances could be reconciled with the reality we might have to doubt our previous results . . . . .	194
507. There is no difficulty in rejecting the belief in matter, for this rests on inference . . . . .	195
508. But the remaining points of difference require for their explanation the existence of erroneous perception . . . . .	195
509. The proposition that there is no knowledge contradicts, not itself, but the assertion of itself. But this is enough to condemn it . . . . .	196
510. The proposition that there is no error conflicts with manifest facts, and the attempt to deny the reality of error involves a vicious infinite regress . . . . .	197
511. This may be contrasted with the denial of the reality of time, which involves no such regress . . . . .	198
512. Even what appears to us as a self-evidently true judgment must in reality be a perception . . . . .	199
513. When <i>A</i> is perceived as having the quality <i>X</i> it must exist and have that quality . . . . .	199
514. But <i>A</i> need not exist and have <i>X</i> at any other time. Restatement in terms of the specious present . . . . .	201
515. This is the only limit on the self-evident correctness of perception. But it must be restated in terms of position in the <i>C</i> series, since time is unreal . . . . .	201
516. The only error that need be present in all perceptions which appear as such is that their percepta are perceived as being in time . . . . .	202
517. Some apparent judgments may contain less error than any apparent perceptions. But there must be error <i>about</i> them, if not <i>in</i> them, since they appear as judgments though they are really perceptions . . . . .	203
518. The existence of misperception is asserted by Leibniz, and implied in Kant's theory of time. Hegel's theory probably requires it too . . . . .	204
519. It is reasonable to ask whether all error can be due to a single cause . . . . .	205

SECT.	PAGE
520. Wherever the cause may be, the error itself must be in the mind of some individual. Some philosophers have overlooked this fact . . . . .	206

CHAPTER XLV. ERROR AND THE *C* SERIES

521. The <i>C</i> series must be a part, if not the whole, of the explanation of error . . . . .	208
522. The question of the erroneous perceptions which appear as false judgments about what is timeless postponed . . . . .	208
523. Men have claimed to perceive certain objects as timeless. But they have probably confused immediate judgments with perceptions . . . . .	208
524. If perceptions all appear to be in time when introspected their percepta must all be perceived as in time . . . . .	210
525. Some perceptions have been thought to be timeless. But this is partly because their percepta have been thought to be timeless, and partly because emotional excitement disguises the lapse of time . . . . .	211
526. The relation in the <i>C</i> series which appears as "earlier than" must be transitive and asymmetrical . . . . .	212
527. Since time is a misperception there must be as many time-series as there are percipients who misperceive any <i>C</i> series as a temporal series . . . . .	213
528. The <i>C</i> series which <i>G</i> misperceives as a time-series in <i>H</i> must be in <i>H</i> itself . . . . .	214
529. But the fact that <i>G</i> misperceives <i>H</i> 's <i>C</i> series as a time-series depends on the <i>C</i> series in <i>G</i> . . . . .	215

## CHAPTER XLVI

THE *C* SERIES—CONDITIONS OF THE PROBLEM

530. Statement of seven general conditions which the terms of the <i>C</i> series must fulfil . . . . .	216
531. Three further conditions required by the apparent changes and oscillations in the content of experience . . . . .	218
532. There must be some relation (though it cannot be a simple one) between the content of the series and its apparent place in the apparent time-series. This is the Eleventh Condition . . . . .	220
533. No such relations are known <i>à priori</i> , but many seem to be known empirically . . . . .	221
534. Any causal law would involve such a relation . . . . .	222

SECT.	PAGE
535. But causality cannot itself be the relating relation of the <i>C</i> series; for it would not order the terms in a single order corresponding to the apparent order of events in the <i>B</i> series	222
536. We have to determine the nature of the terms and the nature of the relations in the <i>C</i> series . . . . .	223

CHAPTER XLVII

THE *C* SERIES—NATURE OF THE TERMS

537. There could be a one-dimensional series of determining correspondence parts, although the determining correspondence system itself has two dimensions . . . . .	224
538. The primary parts might have a certain order, and the parts of each part might be arranged in the order of their determinants . . . . .	224
539. But the recurrence of perceptions with the same content in the same self makes this impossible when the primary parts are selves and the secondary parts are perceptions . . . .	225
540. So the <i>C</i> series cannot fall within the determining correspondence system. It must therefore have simple and indivisible terms . . . . .	226
541. Whenever a self, or a determining correspondence part of a self, appears as in time it must be divided in some other dimension than that of determining correspondence, and its parts in this dimension form the <i>C</i> series . . . . .	226
542. Each term in such a series is sufficiently described if it can be distinguished from other terms in the same series in the same self or determining correspondence part of a self . .	227
543. $G!H$ is a correct perception of $H$ . The parts of $G!H$ in the <i>C</i> series are misperceptions of the terms of $H$ 's <i>C</i> series . .	227
544. Perceptions which appear as such are at the same stage of the <i>C</i> series as their percepta. But the converse does not hold . . . . .	227
545. We see then that error is closely connected with the <i>C</i> series, and, through the <i>C</i> series, with the time-series . . . .	228
546. Must perceptions in the determining correspondence system be correct in every respect? . . . . .	228
547. $G!H!K$ could not be a misperception of $H!K$ as a whole in either of the first four ways mentioned in Chapter XLIV, p. 193 . . . . .	228
548. Nor could it be a misperception of the fragmentary parts of $H!K$ in either of those four ways . . . . .	229

SECT.	PAGE
549. Nor could it be a misperception of the fragmentary parts of $H!K$ as being in time, unless it be a misperception of $H!K$ as a whole as being in time . . . . .	230
550. $G!H!K$ could not be a perception of $H!K$ as in time, and of its fragmentary parts as together filling up the duration occupied by $H!K$ . . . . .	230
551. Nor could $G!H!K$ be a perception of $H!K$ and of its fragmentary parts as occupying durations which do not overlap. Hence neither $H!K$ as a whole, nor its fragmentary parts, could be misperceived in $G!H!K$ as being in time . . . . .	231
552. And there are no other respects in which $G!H!K$ could be positively erroneous . . . . .	232
553. We must now consider what are the relations in the $C$ series which appear as temporal relations in the $B$ series . . . . .	232

## CHAPTER XLVIII

THE  $C$  SERIES—NATURE OF THE RELATIONS

554. The relations of the $C$ series must be transitive, asymmetrical, connexive, and generative of a one-dimensional order . . . . .	233
555. In each self there are $C$ series whose terms are cognitions which oscillate in accuracy as time appears to go on . . . . .	233
556. Even if the <i>total</i> cognition of each self grew steadily more or steadily less accurate as time appeared to go on we could not take this as being the relation which orders <i>every</i> $C$ series . . . . .	233
557. There would be the same objection to supposing that the relations in the $C$ series are those of "more and less clear" or "more and less extensive" . . . . .	234
558. Though all the content of $G!H$ falls within the $C$ series of $G!H$ it does not follow that the terms of this $C$ series form a set of parts of $G!H$ . For part of the content of $G!H$ might occur several times over in the $C$ series of $G!H$ . . . . .	234
559. If a misperception be taken away from a correct perception the remainder cannot consist of a certain misperception . . . . .	235
560. Now, although the terms of the $C$ series are in some respects misperceived, they must really be misperceptions . . . . .	236
561. In no matter what order misperceptions were combined they could not compose a correct perception . . . . .	236
562. It is possible that every misperception should be a member of a certain set of parts of a correct perception provided that it is the only misperception in this set of parts . . . . .	237

SECT.	PAGE
563. The validity of Hegel's dialectic would not be affected by the result of § 559; for (i) no two of the lower categories would be members of the same set of parts of the Absolute Idea . . . . .	237
564. And (ii) thesis and antithesis are not really parts of their synthesis . . . . .	238
565. Recapitulation of the eleven conditions which any satisfactory theory of the <i>C</i> series must fulfil. The result of § 559 constitutes a twelfth condition . . . . .	239
566. It follows that of any two terms of the <i>C</i> series one must include the other. It is possible that the relations which appear as "earlier" and "later" are the relations of "included in" and "inclusive of" . . . . .	240
567. The question whether "included in" appears as "earlier" or as "later" deferred for the present . . . . .	241
<i>[End of Draft C, and beginning of Draft B]</i>	
568. The terms of the <i>C</i> series must have magnitude, and this magnitude must be intensive . . . . .	241
569. But the differences between terms of the <i>C</i> series constitute a series of increments, and these have extensive magnitude . . . . .	241
570. Pleasures are intensive magnitudes, but the differences of strength between pleasures are extensive magnitudes . . . . .	242
571. The series of increments is called the " <i>D</i> series." If the <i>C</i> series has a first term it will be identical with the first term of the <i>D</i> series; but no other term of the <i>C</i> series will be a term of the <i>D</i> series . . . . .	243
572. The increments may consist of additional perception of the same perceptum. <i>G</i> 's additional perception of <i>H</i> cannot consist in perceiving more parts or more characteristics of <i>H</i> . It must be increased perception of <i>H</i> as a whole . . . . .	244
573. There is no accurate analogy in ordinary perception to this notion. Waking from sleep, and perceiving the same object through a thicker or thinner mist, give faint and imperfect analogies . . . . .	245
574. There is no direct evidence for the existence of the <i>C</i> and the <i>D</i> series. But there seems no way of explaining the facts without assuming their existence . . . . .	246

## CHAPTER XLIX

### THE RELATIONS OF THE THREE SERIES

575. The relations of the Inclusion series, the Misperception series, and the <i>C</i> series, are now to be considered . . . . .	247
576. The inclusion series for any substance contains that substance as one of its terms . . . . .	247



SECT.	PAGE
577. It will therefore contain at least one term which does not belong to the misperception series . . . . .	247
578. Every term of an inclusion series must be a perception . . . . .	248
579. And no term in the inclusion series of $G!H$ except $G!H$ itself could be a correct perception . . . . .	248
580. For the terms are distinct from each other only in so far as each misperceives itself as having a content which is not shared by the other . . . . .	249
581. If $G$ perceives $H$ as in time some part at least of $H$ 's inclusion series forms a $C$ series for $G$ . . . . .	249
582. And if $G$ perceives some of $H$ 's inclusion series as in time he must perceive all of it, and therefore $H$ itself, as in time. $H$ will never be perceived by $G$ as present, but as the earliest term in the past or the latest term in the future . . . . .	250
583. Nonentity is a limit, and not a term, of the inclusion series and the misperception series. It therefore is not a term of the $C$ series . . . . .	251
584. Whenever $H$ appears to $G$ as in time the $C$ series on which this appearance is based is identical with the inclusion series of $H$ . . . . .	252
585. Does every term of every misperception series misperceive its perceptum as in time? . . . . .	252
586. It is not theoretically impossible that a self should misperceive an inclusion series otherwise than as in time . . . . .	253
587. But the relation of inclusion could not be misperceived as a spatial relation . . . . .	253
588. Nor as a causal relation; nor as any relation connected with characteristics which appear to oscillate in time. In fact we know of no other relation except the temporal relation which could be the appearance of the relation of inclusion . . . . .	254
589. If any self be not self-conscious all its perceptions will be correct perceptions . . . . .	255

## CHAPTER L. COMPLIANCE WITH THE CONDITIONS

590. Our theory of the $C$ series satisfies the first condition laid down in Chapter XLVI . . . . .	256
591. Every perception in the $C$ series will be partly correct and partly erroneous . . . . .	256
592. The question of perceptions that appear as other kinds of cognition deferred . . . . .	257
593. The $C$ series, on our theory, is one-dimensional, and its generating relation is transitive and asymmetrical . . . . .	258

SECT.	PAGE
594. The <i>C</i> series, on our theory, can have as many terms as may be needed to account for the <i>B</i> series . . . . .	258
595. The perception which appears as my knowledge at any point of the <i>B</i> series is infinitely more differentiated than this knowledge itself is. Can this be explained on our theory? .	259
596. A misperception might be infinitely differentiated into parts which are not themselves perceptions . . . . .	259
597. To perceive <i>H</i> as less differentiated than it really is, or to perceive an aggregate of units in the determining correspondence system as an undifferentiated whole, is to have a confused perception. But, in our view, this is very different from a confused perception in Leibniz's sense . . . . .	260
598. Persistence of certain contents in time is compatible with our theory. Recurrence after an interval is a part of the general problem of oscillation in time . . . . .	261
599. The clearness of perception may oscillate even though the amount of perception steadily increases or diminishes. For an increase in the amount of perception may make it less internally harmonious, and a further increase may make it more internally harmonious; or conversely . . . . .	262
600. Whether this will happen or not will depend in part on the nature of the percipient; and some of the characteristics of the percipient will be misperceived as change in his internal states . . . . .	263
601. Do any of the terms of the <i>C</i> series correspond to intervals of apparently dreamless sleep? . . . . .	263
602. We must assume that they do, or it will be impossible to construct a common <i>C</i> series for all percipients. There is no empirical objection to this assumption . . . . .	264
603. Changes in the apparent extent of knowledge are really changes in the amount of differentiation which is perceived . . . . .	265
604. The part of the total content which is perceived as undifferentiated constitutes the background of our perception. When anything that is sometimes perceived appears not to be perceived it is really perceived as part of the undifferentiated background . . . . .	266
605. The apparent entry of new contents and exit of old contents into the field of consciousness can be explained in the same way. Oscillations in the clearness of our knowledge of objects which apparently remain in the field of consciousness are less extreme cases of the above . . . . .	266
606. We can explain why such oscillations appear to depend sometimes on ourselves, sometimes on our bodies, and sometimes on the objects themselves . . . . .	267

SECT.	PAGE
607. Changes in the accuracy of perceptions which appear as such can be accounted for on the above principles. Changes in the accuracy of perceptions which appear as judgments will be considered later . . . . .	269
608. Our theory fulfils the eleventh condition . . . . .	270
609. And also the twelfth . . . . .	270

## CHAPTER LI

## FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS ON TIME

610. All error, in our view, is closely connected with the illusion of time . . . . .	271
611. The present has duration. Successive presents overlap each other. Presents have no constant duration, either in the same self or in different selves . . . . .	272
612. Four questions about time . . . . .	272
613. If time be a <i>phenomenon bene fundatum</i> so must a common time-series be . . . . .	273
614. All inclusion series correspond to each other, and therefore we can talk of a common time-series . . . . .	274
615. Terms in different inclusion series correspond when each term contains the same proportion of the whole content of its series . . . . .	274
616. Hence each self will appear to endure through the whole of time; which answers the first question . . . . .	275
617. Can we distinguish between "apparent" and "real" duration if time itself be unreal? This is the second question . . . . .	276
618. Two causes of apparent lengthening and shortening of a duration. Both depend on retrospection . . . . .	277
619. That stretches of an inclusion series, which involve equal increments in the proportion of the total content, appear as equal stretches of time is a <i>phenomenon bene fundatum</i> . That, from special causes, they may appear as unequal stretches of time is not a <i>phenomenon bene fundatum</i> . Thus the distinction can be drawn . . . . .	278
620. Since the inclusion series has a limit at one end and a last term at the other, it must appear as a finite time-series. This answers the third question . . . . .	279
621. The ultimate terms of the time-series must be indivisible. But we cannot tell whether the series is compact or not. So much for the fourth question . . . . .	280

## CHAPTER LII

## APPARENT MATTER AND APPARENT SENSА

SECT.	PAGE
622. Will our theory allow for the apparent existence of matter and of sensa? . . . . .	282
623. The belief in matter is inferential, and there is no difficulty in supposing that the inference is mistaken . . . . .	282
624. If we admit the possibility of misperception we can admit that certain entities can be misperceived as sensa . . . . .	283
625. Does the fact that an entity is perceived as being a sensum involve that sensa are <i>real</i> even though <i>non-existent</i> ? . . . . .	284
626. An incorrect cogitation does not need a real object to correspond to, though a correct cogitation does . . . . .	285
627. The constituents of a real cogitation must be real; but the objects of a cogitation are not constituents of it . . . . .	285
628. Though the <i>description</i> of a cogitation will contain as a constituent the <i>description</i> of the cogitated object . . . . .	286
629. Unless there are descriptions which do not describe anything real we shall be involved in hopeless difficulties, <i>e.g.</i> , in true propositions about round squares . . . . .	287

## CHAPTER LIII. APPARENT PERCEPTIONS

630. Perceptions which appear as such nevertheless differ in three respects from their appearances . . . . .	289
631. They appear to be in time, to be completely correct, and not to be the terms of an inclusion series. But this is neither impossible nor even paradoxical . . . . .	289
632. Perceptions which appear as such are much more limited in range than those which appear as judgments, assumptions, etc. . . . .	291
633. When a perception appears as such, it and its perceptum are at corresponding points of their respective inclusion series . . . . .	292
634. This is rendered necessary by the nature of the temporal limitation on the infallibility of perception . . . . .	293
635. When our perception of a contemporary object appears, not as a perception, but as some other kind of cognition, <i>some</i> relation between perceptum and perception must be less close than in the opposite case. But we cannot always say <i>what</i> this relation is . . . . .	293
636. Apparent judgments can be quite true, whilst apparent perceptions must be partly erroneous. This raises a difficulty which is deferred to the next chapter . . . . .	294

## CHAPTER LIV. APPARENT JUDGMENTS

SECT.	PAGE
637. Judgments appear to exist when we introspect. But introspection is certainly erroneous in some respects, and it may be so when it perceives certain entities as judgments . . . .	295
638. The theory that no judgments exist itself consists of judgment. But this involves no contradiction or vicious regress . . . .	295
639. Some information which is given in apparent judgments is also given in apparent perceptions. It is therefore possible that all information is really given in perceptions . . . .	296
640. Some apparent judgments must be completely correct. And others must be completely false. Yet, in present existence, all perceptions are partly correct and partly erroneous. How can these facts be reconciled? . . . .	297
641. We consider first existential judgments, <i>i.e.</i> , those which assert characteristics of existing substances . . . .	298
642. It is admitted that we may both perceive a substance as having a characteristic and judge that it has this characteristic. It is therefore possible that what appears as an existential judgment may be a misperceived perception . . . .	299
643. When a perception is misperceived as a judgment there are three factors which help to determine which of the characteristics that the perception is perceived as having shall appear as the subject and which as the predicate of the apparent judgment . . . .	300
644. When a perception is misperceived as a judgment only a part of the original information is perceived. And this part may be wholly correct or wholly erroneous . . . .	301
645. The second-order misperception accounts, not for the presence of truth in a true judgment, but for the absence of falsity in it . . . .	302
646. This theory implies that I can have states of knowledge which I do not fully know. There is no objection to this . . . .	303
647. The characteristics which I perceive, and perceive that I perceive, are probably in some way more important than those which I perceive but do not perceive that I perceive . . . .	304
648. It might be suggested that true apparent judgments are completely correct perceptions misperceived as judgments . . . .	304
649. This theory could not deal with apparent non-existential judgments; and it would involve the existence of completely correct perceptions at intermediate stages of the inclusion series. We may therefore reject it . . . .	305

SECT.	PAGE
650. When there is an apparent perception and a simultaneous apparent judgment with the same object, and when the characteristics perceived and asserted are either identical or compatible, there is only one perception, and this is perceived both as an apparent perception and as an apparent judgment . . . . .	306
651. But the perceived and the asserted characteristics may be incompatible. In such cases I perceive the object both as being <i>X</i> and as being <i>W</i> , and I perceive <i>W</i> as being incompatible with <i>X</i> . . . . .	306
652. We have now to raise the same two questions about non-existential judgments as we have raised about existential judgments . . . . .	307
653. All perceptions are cognitive of existent substances, but non-existential judgments profess to be cognitive of something else . . . . .	307
654. They all assert that certain characteristics do or do not intrinsically determine certain others. What really happens is that we perceive a certain substance as having a certain characteristic, and we perceive this characteristic as having the characteristic of entailing a certain other characteristic. And this perception is misperceived as a judgment . . . . .	307
655. But we make assertions about characteristics that do not belong, and do not even appear to belong, to any substance . . . . .	309
656. We may do this by perceiving a substance as having a characteristic <i>Y</i> which is perceived as having a certain relation <i>W</i> to the characteristic <i>X</i> which itself neither belongs nor appears to belong to anything . . . . .	310
657. We need not suppose that our perceptions give us information, either direct or indirect, about <i>all</i> characteristics, but only about those which enter into our apparent judgments . . . . .	311
658. Apparent judgments about admittedly non-existent characteristics are always suggested in the long run by characteristics which are presented in apparent perceptions . . . . .	312
659. The perceptions which appear as judgments need not, <i>sub specie temporis</i> , be contemporary with their objects . . . . .	313
660. The complete truth or falsity of certain apparent non-existential judgments can be explained in the same way as was suggested in the case of apparent existential judgments . . . . .	313
661. When a perception is misperceived as a judgment the plurality of parts which it really has is not perceived, whilst the plurality of characteristics in its perceptum is misperceived as a plurality of parts in the apparent judgment . . . . .	314

## CHAPTER LV. APPARENT INFERENCE

SECT.	PAGE
662. The kind of indirectness involved in inference is different from that involved in "indirect perception" as defined by us . . . . .	315
663. We have to consider what in reality corresponds to the <i>prima facie</i> dependence of one cognition on other cognitions . . . . .	315
664. The content of a judgment is independent of whether it be self-evident or inferred, and of whether it be inferred deductively from self-evident premises or inductively from perceived facts . . . . .	316
665. Of course facts which have to be cognized in different ways may differ in certain objective characteristics . . . . .	317
666. Definition of the statement that <i>P</i> has been inferred from <i>Q</i> and <i>R</i> . . . . .	317
667. <i>P</i> may in fact be implied by <i>Q</i> and <i>R</i> although I know it directly and not by inference from <i>Q</i> and <i>R</i> . . . . .	318
668. A perception <i>P</i> may have such causal relations to perceptions <i>Q</i> and <i>R</i> that when all three are misperceived as judgments the former will be said to be inferred from the two latter . . . . .	319
669. Although the objects of all three perceptions are known directly we may also know that the truth of <i>Q</i> and <i>R</i> implies the truth of <i>P</i> . . . . .	319

## CHAPTER LVI

## OTHER APPARENT FORMS OF COGITATION

670. An assumption has the same content as a judgment, but differs from both perception and judgment in not being a cognition. If perceptions can be misperceived as judgments they may be further misperceived as assumptions . . . . .	321
671. However wild an assumption may be it may occur as part of the content of a judgment. The assumption is a further misperception of the perception which is misperceived as this judgment . . . . .	322
672. Apparent awareness of characteristics can be explained on the same lines . . . . .	323
673. When a perception is misperceived as a judgment we misperceive its internal structure; when it is misperceived as an imaging we misperceive it as not being a cognition; when it is misperceived as an assumption both kinds of error are committed . . . . .	324

SECT.	PAGE
674. A single perception may appear both as the apparent judgment and the apparent imaging which are involved in memory. Since this perception may be partly erroneous, the imaging and the judgment may be so too . . . . .	325
675. Some imaginata are constructed, on the occasion of judgments or assumptions, out of materials given in past perceptions .	326
676. In such cases several past perceptions are misperceived as the imaging of a single imaginatum which combines the qualities most prominent in the percepta of these past perceptions	327
677. It is conceivable that some apparent imagings are perceptions of objects of which the same self has never yet had an apparent perception . . . . .	328
678. But this is certainly most uncommon here and now, even if it be possible. A reason for this suggested . . . . .	328

## CHAPTER LVII. EMOTION AND VOLITION

679. Recapitulation of the results of Chapter XLI about emotion .	329
680. A fragmentary perception of an object may differ, in its emotional characteristics, from the correct perception of this object, of which it is a fragment. The emotional characteristics of the two may be even incompatible . . . . .	330
681. This involves that a state of hatred could be part of a state of love, though not that a state of love could be wholly composed of states of hatred . . . . .	331
682. Similar remarks apply to volition . . . . .	331
683. Fragmentary perceptions, in so far as they are partly erroneous, can be unsatisfied volitions. And the percipient can recognize this if he recognizes that they are partly erroneous .	332
684. When a perception is misperceived as some other kind of cogitation we have no guarantee that the emotional qualities which it then appears to have really belong to it . . . . .	333
685. But we need not doubt the hypothetical proposition: "If this perception were cogitatively what it appears to be (which it is not), it would also be emotionally what it appears to be"	335
686. Does this not make it impossible to know whether we love anyone, or feel moral approval or disapproval of anything, here and now? . . . . .	336
687. If a perception which appears as a judgment also appears as a state of love it really will be a state of love . . . . .	336
688. If two people, on supposing the same state of affairs, feel different kinds of moral emotion towards it, this will indicate real differences in their moral characters at the time . . . . .	337



## CHAPTER LVIII. APPEARANCE AND REALITY

SECT.	PAGE
689. Summary of the conclusions of this Book . . . . .	338
690. Our ground for accepting these is that they fulfil the twelve conditions of Chapter XLVIII, and that we can think of no other theory that will do so . . . . .	339
691. Are the conclusions so improbable as to cast doubt on the results of the earlier Books? . . . . .	340
692. The existence of erroneous perception is essential to our theory. But it is not improbable if we reject the reality of time. And this has been done by so many philosophers that it cannot be regarded as excessively paradoxical . . . . .	341
693. The most paradoxical result is that the contents of my own mind should be so different from what they appear to me to be. But no philosophy can avoid paradox . . . . .	341

## BOOK VII. PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCES

## CHAPTER LIX

THE FUNDAMENTAL SENSE OF THE *B* SERIES

694. Does "earlier than" correspond to "included in" or "inclusive of"? . . . . .	345
695. The <i>B</i> series and the <i>C</i> series can each be taken in two opposite senses . . . . .	345
696. There is no obvious intrinsic characteristic by which we can tell whether "earlier than" corresponds to "included in" or "inclusive of" . . . . .	346
697. It might be that in each series one sense was more important than the other, and we might argue that the important senses are those which correspond to each other . . . . .	346
698. In the <i>B</i> series the sense from earlier to later is the more important, for this is the sense in which change takes place. This may be called the "Fundamental Sense" . . . . .	347
699. Has the <i>C</i> series also a Fundamental Sense? And does it appear as the Fundamental Sense of the <i>B</i> series? . . . . .	348
700. We may expect to find that there is a qualitative difference accompanying different positions in the <i>B</i> series . . . . .	348
701. The anticipation of future good or evil affects us more than the memory of past good or evil . . . . .	348
702. Though memory of past good or evil does have <i>some</i> effect on our present happiness both for intrinsic and collateral reasons . . . . .	349
703. No reason can be assigned for the greater importance attached to the future than to the past. But it is not contrary to reason . . . . .	350

SECT.	PAGE
704. This greater importance is not destroyed, though it may be diminished, by the doctrine that time is unreal . . . . .	350
705. The greater importance is attached primarily to the future as compared with the past, and only indirectly to the later as compared with the earlier . . . . .	351
706. But the later an event is the more points are there from which it is future. So that the characteristics, if any, which are peculiar to all events after a certain date are specially important . . . . .	352
707. The fact that it is desirable that "later" should correspond to "inclusive of" should make us scrutinize very carefully any alleged reasons for believing that this correspondence in fact exists . . . . .	352
708. Could we argue that the reason why the future is more important than the past is that what appears as future includes all and more than all that appears as past? . . . . .	353
709. No. The fact might be ultimate. And the proposed explanation would make the later more important than the earlier even if both were future or both past . . . . .	354

## CHAPTER LX

### THE FUNDAMENTAL SENSE OF THE *C* SERIES

710. The fact that the <i>B</i> series has a fundamental sense raises a presumption that the <i>C</i> series has one also . . . . .	355
711. Nor is this refuted by the fact that the fundamental sense of the <i>B</i> series depends on the order in which change takes place, and that change is unreal. For certain characteristics which are real do manifest themselves in terms of change . . . . .	355
712. If the <i>C</i> series has a fundamental sense this cannot be because of anything to do with change . . . . .	356
713. But one can say that there is a fundamental sense of some non-temporal series; <i>e.g.</i> , a chain of inferences, or the categories of the Hegelian dialectic . . . . .	356
714. In the Hegelian dialectic each category has an intrinsic instability in the direction of the Absolute Idea . . . . .	357
715. But the <i>C</i> series is not a series of inferences. Nor is it correlated with such a series . . . . .	357
716. Causation will not give a clue to the fundamental sense of the <i>C</i> series, for causation can refer backwards or forwards . . . . .	358
717. One end of any <i>C</i> series is a whole in which all its other terms fall . . . . .	359
718. Any term other than this whole has its position in the series determined by the fraction of the content of the whole which it contains, whilst the whole owes its position simply to the fact that it is a determining correspondence part of the universe . . . . .	359

SECT.	PAGE
719. Of course any description of the place of the whole in a series does involve a reference to other terms. But this is irrelevant for the present purpose . . . . .	360
720. Thus the relation of the whole to the parts is more fundamental than that of the parts to the whole . . . . .	360
721. This is confirmed by the fact that the whole has the intrinsic characteristic of being a correct perception, whilst each of the parts has the extrinsic characteristic of being a more or less incorrect perception of the same perceptum . . . . .	361
722. And each term other than the whole is intrinsically unstable in the direction of the whole . . . . .	361
723. In Hegel's dialectic the instability of each term is primarily towards the next above it, and only indirectly towards the Absolute Idea . . . . .	362
724. We now have good reason to correlate the sense from earlier to later with the sense from less to more inclusive. For, otherwise, we shall have to assume errors in ordinary perception for which there is no evidence . . . . .	362
725. We have good enough evidence now for our conclusion, in spite of the danger of accepting it because it is desirable . . . . .	363
726. We can still assign no reason for our greater interest in the good or evil of the future than in that of the past . . . . .	364

## CHAPTER LXI. THE FUTURITY OF THE WHOLE

727. The term which includes all the rest of a <i>C</i> series will always be perceived as future if it is perceived as in time at all . . . . .	365
728. Yet the perception of this term from its own standpoint will appear as perception, and will thus resemble the perception of a term as present and will not resemble the perception of a term as past or future . . . . .	365
729. Moreover this perception will have the peculiar "aggressiveness" which we find in the perception of a term as present . . . . .	366
730. It is therefore an appropriate <i>metaphor</i> to say that the perception of the whole from its own standpoint is a perception of it as present. But it is only a metaphor; whilst this term <i>is</i> future in the only sense in which anything is so . . . . .	366
731. If we had arrived at the opposite conclusion about the fundamental sense of the <i>C</i> series the whole would have appeared at the beginning, and nonentity would have appeared as the upper limit of the time-series . . . . .	367
732. Though the <i>whole</i> is neither present nor past, and is as future as anything can be, this is not true of the <i>eternal</i> as such. For	

SECT.	PAGE
the other terms of the <i>C</i> series are eternal as well as the whole. But there is an eternal term which appears only as future, and this is the only term which perceives itself as eternal	367
733. This eternal term does include all the content of all the other eternal terms . . . . .	367
734. And, <i>sub specie temporis</i> , it and it only appears to begin and not to end. So it is more <i>obviously</i> eternal than any other term of the series . . . . .	368
735. Summary of the above . . . . .	368
736. It has been asserted that what is eternal must be manifested as <i>present</i> at every moment of the time-series. This we have now seen to be wrong . . . . .	368
737. Such a view seriously restricts the possibilities of goodness in the universe; and, when combined with the view that the universe is very good, makes ethical predicates meaningless	369
738. The futurity of the whole, <i>sub specie temporis</i> , invalidates certain criticisms which have been made on the Christian view of Heaven as timeless and yet future . . . . .	370
739. Though the supporters of the Christian view did not as a rule realize why they were right . . . . .	371

## CHAPTER LXII. IMMORTALITY

740. A self may be called "immortal" if it appears to have an endless existence in future time . . . . .	372
741. If a self appears to end, this must be either because time goes on after the self ceases, or because time ends . . . . .	372
742. The first alternative must be rejected, because the latest terms of all <i>C</i> series are simultaneous, <i>sub specie temporis</i> . . . . .	372
743. The life of the self has a last term; but this has no term beyond it, and therefore is unending, <i>sub specie temporis</i> . . . . .	373
744. The last stage in the <i>present</i> life of a self of course is not endless	374
745. The apparent <i>endlessness</i> of the last term must not be confused with the real <i>eternity</i> which it shares with all other terms . . . . .	374
746. The final stage of a <i>C</i> series is simple and indivisible, though it appears, <i>sub specie temporis</i> , as unending . . . . .	375
747. The appearance of paradox arises because we forget that the last term of any <i>C</i> series is also the last term of time . . . . .	375
748. So every self is immortal. And parts of selves and groups of selves have also an endless existence in the future, in the same sense; though we do not call this "immortality" . . . . .	376
749. But the members of a group of selves will not necessarily remain in those relations which they have at certain times . . . . .	376

SECT.	PAGE
750. And the same applies to groups of parts of selves. So particular bodies appear to begin and cease in time . . . . .	377
751. We appear to have existed throughout all past time; but past time does not appear as ending with a term which itself appears as endless . . . . .	377
752. The view that we have come to involves pre-existence of the self	378
753. Our view that past time is finite and future time infinite does not depend on the view that an infinite progression is logically harmless whilst an infinite regression is logically vicious . . . . .	378

## CHAPTER LXIII

## PRE-EXISTENCE AND POST-EXISTENCE

754. Have we lived before the birth, and shall we live after the death, of our present bodies? . . . . .	379
755. The existence of the self throughout all time involves both pre-existence and post-existence . . . . .	379
756. Pre-existence is an unfamiliar doctrine in the West, though common in the Far East . . . . .	379
757. It is probable, though not certain, that, <i>sub specie temporis</i> , our present life is very short compared with our future and our past life . . . . .	381
758. This probability is increased when we take account of possible oscillations in the extent and accuracy of a self's knowledge	382
759. And our theory, combined with what science asserts about the past duration of the material world, gives a very long past duration to every self . . . . .	383
760. It seems most likely that our past and future lives will be subdivided by repeated births and deaths . . . . .	383
761. The case for a plurality of subsequent lives is strengthened by the doctrine of pre-existence . . . . .	385
762. It seems probable that at each re-birth we shall lose memory of our previous life . . . . .	385
763. Loss of memory does not involve loss of identity. For the <i>C</i> series which appears as stages in the history of a single self comprises the whole content of a certain primary part of the universe . . . . .	386
764. And the relation between successive stages is that of inclusion	387
765. And there will be continuity of character between the successive stages . . . . .	387
766. But, although permanent loss of memory would be compatible with personal identity, there will not in fact be permanent loss of memory . . . . .	387

SECT.	PAGE
767. At pre-final stages there are certainly perceptions of previous stages, though they may appear as memories or judgments, and not as perceptions . . . . .	387
768. Hence it is reasonable to suppose that at the final stage there will be explicit perception of all the pre-final stages . . . . .	388
769. They will not indeed appear to the final stage as past. But they will be perceived as stages which perceived themselves as present and were perceived by certain other stages as past . . . . .	388
770. This gives an additional factor of identity among the pre-final stages. For each pre-final stage will have to the final stage the kind of identity which depends on the fact that the former is remembered by the latter . . . . .	389
771. Even permanent loss of memory need not render immortality worthless. <i>A fortiori</i> the temporary loss, restored in the final stage, need not do so . . . . .	389
772. If this life has value, though we cannot remember past lives, why should not future lives have value, though we shall not be able to remember this life? . . . . .	390
773. Could there be improvement in future lives if memory ceases at each transition? If not, it will be doubtful whether the final stage can have the high value which we shall ascribe to it in future chapters . . . . .	390
774. Memory enables the past to increase wisdom, virtue, or love in the present. Can the past help the present in these respects without memory? . . . . .	391
775. We can acquire present skill and delicacy through experiences which we have forgotten. And the accumulation of details would be overwhelming if they were not forgotten . . . . .	391
776. It is still more obvious that moral character can be improved by past moral struggles which have been forgotten . . . . .	392
777. Can past love, which is forgotten, strengthen present love? . . . . .	392
778. It is clear that the love of two people in one life can be greater because of the love which they had for each other in a previous life, provided they meet and love again . . . . .	393
779. If the conditions which determine the meeting of a given pair of selves were disconnected with the conditions which determine love between them, it is very unlikely that the same pair would meet and love again . . . . .	393
780. But, if <i>G</i> loves <i>H</i> in <i>any</i> life, then <i>H</i> must be in <i>G</i> 's differentiating group. This does not imply that in <i>all</i> lives <i>G</i> will recognize <i>H</i> as a self, and love him. But it does make it almost certain that this will happen in <i>many</i> lives . . . . .	394
781. We cannot tell how many such recurrences there will be, or at what intervals they will happen . . . . .	395

SECT.	PAGE
782. There is not the same consolation for loss of memory of one's country or one's school. But, although loyalty to such groups has very high value, it is trivial compared to love of persons. And this, we have seen, will not be lost . . . . .	395
783. And the loss of memory, with all other losses which it may entail, will be, <i>sub specie temporis</i> , of finite duration . . . . .	396
784. The doctrine of a plurality of future lives opens up possibilities of very great evil in the immediate future . . . . .	396
785. But it also makes it possible that we shall experience in one life what we have missed in another. And, after a finite time, however long it may be, there will be no more death . . . . .	397

#### CHAPTER LXIV. GOOD AND EVIL

786. We shall now attempt to estimate the relative amounts of intrinsic good and evil in the universe . . . . .	398
787. Good and evil are indefinable. Those who have doubted this have confused a definition with a simply convertible universal synthetic proposition connecting these terms with some non-ethical term . . . . .	398
788. Only what is spiritual can have value. We must distinguish between the value <i>of</i> a thing and the value <i>in</i> a thing . . . . .	399
789. There is no value of a group of selves, though there is a value in it . . . . .	399
790. Hence the universe, on our view of it, has no value, though there is value in it . . . . .	399
791. This doctrine has been condemned as too atomistic. But it does not deny that the value of a self depends largely on its relations to other selves . . . . .	400
792. Does a self have value, or is it only parts of selves which have value? This can be discussed separately of those parts which appear as simultaneous states and those which appear as successive stages in a single self . . . . .	400
793. When we say that a feeling of pleasure, <i>e.g.</i> , is good we may mean only that a self who has such a feeling is good . . . . .	400
794. But the fact that selves are metaphysically fundamental raises a presumption that they are the only substances that have value. Not much weight can be attached to this . . . . .	401
795. The value determined by a virtuous volition is more closely connected with the self of which this volition is a part than with any other substance of which this volition is a part . . . . .	401
796. This fact is not completely explained by the fact that the unity of the self is closer than that of any other substance. It probably implies that selves, and not simultaneous parts of selves, have intrinsic value . . . . .	401

SECT.	PAGE
797. The arguments for holding that successive total states of a self have no value, but determine the value of the self, are the same as those given above for simultaneous parts of a self	402
798. If good belongs to the self, it will be wrong to say, <i>e.g.</i> , that the good determined by a past or future pleasure is itself past or future. But it will be right to say this if the good belongs to the state of pleasure and not to the self. And it does seem reasonable to say this	403
799. No conclusive answer can be given to the question raised in § 792. But this will not affect anything in the rest of the work	404
800. In some cases where there is value <i>in</i> a whole this value must be <i>of</i> the whole	404
801. Value is only of substances, not of qualities; but it belongs to a substance because it possesses certain qualities	404
802. Are unconscious, as well as conscious, parts of selves ethically relevant? Ambiguity of the phrase "unconscious states of selves"	406
803. There can be no unconscious states of selves, in the sense of states which lack the quality of consciousness	406
804. And, in our view, no self which was self-conscious could have any states which were unconscious in the sense that this self did not perceive them	407
805. Does this conflict with what modern psychology is alleged to have proved experimentally about unconscious states? Certainly not in rejecting states which lack the quality of consciousness	407
806. We have admitted that much which we perceive is perceived only as a vague background. And this is all that the psychology of the unconscious requires	407
807. States of ourselves which we do not introspectively discriminate will in part determine our value. Does this remove all hope of making any accurate judgment as to one's own moral condition?	408
808. Such states must be either very faint or confused or else must be past or future. If the former, they will make little difference to the value of the self. If the latter, they introduce no uncertainty into our judgments about our present moral condition	408
809. Are there two positive qualities— <i>good</i> and <i>evil</i> —or only a single relation— <i>better-and-worse</i> ?	409
810. On the latter alternative <i>qualities</i> would still be positively good or evil, in the only sense in which they could be so on any view	410



SECT.	PAGE
811. But, on this alternative, no judgment of the form: "If $x$ had such and such a nature it would be desirable that he should not exist" could be justified. As some such judgments are clearly true, we must reject the purely relational theory . . .	410
812. Evil and good are <i>both</i> indefinable . . . . .	411
813. There are six characteristics, each of which has been admitted by many people to give a good or evil value to selves which possess them. Enumeration of these . . . . .	412
814. There is no intrinsic maximum or limit to the amount of knowledge, or of love, or of pleasure, or of consciousness, or of harmony when we take into account the number and magnitude of the parts of the harmonious whole . . .	413
815. Even if there were a maximum of virtue this would not imply that there was a maximum of good. For we shall see that the doctrine that virtue is the only good is untenable . . .	414
816. And there is no maximum of virtue; since there is no maximum possible temptation, and the measure of virtue is the temptation that it would just have resisted . . . . .	414
817. So there is no maximum of good. And there is, for similar reasons, no maximum of evil . . . . .	415
818. There is thus no intrinsic maximum to the amount of good or evil in the universe, though of course the actual amount is determined by the actual nature of the universe . . .	415
819. Though there cannot be a state of <i>complete</i> good or evil, there can be a state of <i>unmixed</i> good or evil . . . . .	416
820. A state may be called very good if it exceeds in value the best state that we have experienced by more than the latter exceeds in value the worst state that we have experienced . . .	416
821. Can we find any connection between existence and value which will enable us to determine the proportion of good to evil in the world? . . . . .	417
822. There can be no analytical connection between existence and value, since neither good nor evil nor existence is definable . . . . .	417
823. There is no direct synthetic connection, which we can see to be intrinsically necessary, between existence and either good or evil . . . . .	417
824. Nor is it self-evident that whatever exists must have a certain other characteristic such that anything that possessed that characteristic must be good or must be evil . . . . .	418
825. Attempts to establish by reasoning an indirect connection between existence and goodness have generally assumed that evil is mere absence of good. This is false; and even Mr Bradley's argument, which does not use this premise, must be rejected . . .	419

SECT.	PAGE
826. Do our own conclusions about the nature of the existent enable us to determine the proportion of good to evil in the world? The rest of the book will be concerned with this question .	420

## CHAPTER LXV

VALUE IN THE FINAL STAGE OF THE *C* SERIES

827. We shall find that the final stage of the <i>C</i> series is a state of great and (with one possible exception) unmixed good. This result will hold on any generally admitted view as to what characteristics determine goodness . . . . .	421
828. The consideration of virtue must be deferred till the other characteristics have been dealt with. In the final stage a being will not be virtuous unless all that he perceives is really good or useful. For he will acquiesce in all that he perceives, and he can be under no mistake about its value, and virtue consists in acquiescence in what seems to the agent to be good or useful . . . . .	421
829. In the final stage, if virtue were the only good, there could be no good. But there might be good, even if virtue were the only good, at stages where there is an erroneous belief that there are other goods beside virtue . . . . .	422
830. In the final stage there may be ignorance but there will be no error. And the ignorance will not involve the presence of unsolved problems. The final stage will therefore be one of unmixed good as regards knowledge . . . . .	423
831. And, both in extent and directness, knowledge in the final stage will greatly exceed our present knowledge . . . . .	423
832. No intrinsically evil emotions are possible in the final stage .	424
833. And love will certainly be more intense, and almost certainly more extensive in its range, than it is at present . . . . .	425
834. There may indeed be love that is not returned; but, if so, the non-reciprocation will be acquiesced in . . . . .	426
835. And <i>C</i> will fail to regard <i>B</i> with love or affection only if he perceives <i>B</i> neither directly nor indirectly, <i>i.e.</i> , only if he is totally unaware of <i>B</i> 's existence . . . . .	427
836. There is certainly pleasure in the final stage. But the fact that there is complete acquiescence does not exclude the possibility that there may also be pain . . . . .	427
837. There can be no physical pain in the final stage, for this is bound up with the illusion of matter and sensa . . . . .	428
838. The only possible kind of pain in the final stage is the pain of sympathy for evil in the pre-final stages. Consideration of this is deferred to Chapter LXVII . . . . .	428

SECT.	PAGE
839. With this reservation, the final state is one of unmixed and very great pleasure . . . . .	429
840. If amount and intensity of consciousness be a good it must be an unmixed good, since it has no correlative evil . . . . .	429
841. And consciousness will be far greater in extent, intensity, and clearness than it is here and now . . . . .	430
842. The same remarks apply to harmony, or harmonious self-development, so far as this is a genuine characteristic distinct from the rest. So it remains only to consider virtue . . . . .	430
843. In the final stage we shall acquiesce in all that we perceive. Much of this will be very good, and much of it that is not good will not be evil and will be involved in the existence of what is good. All such acquiescence will be virtuous . . . . .	431
844. But we shall also perceive the sympathetic pain which exists in the final stage, and the evil which exists in the pre-final stages. We shall acquiesce in this ; and it might seem that this would prevent our virtue from being unmixed. This question is deferred till Chapter LXVII. But, at any rate, the final stage is one of very great and (with this one possible exception) unmixed virtue . . . . .	432
845. There are certain determinate kinds of good ( <i>e.g.</i> , the pleasure of swimming, and the love of God) which can exist in pre-final stages, but cannot exist in the final stage . . . . .	432
846. This only shows, what we knew already, that the final stage is not one of <i>complete</i> good. It does not show that it may not be one of <i>far greater</i> good than the present . . . . .	433
847. It might be suggested that some goods which cannot exist in the final stage are such that the lack of them is a positive evil. If so, the final stage could not be one of <i>unmixed</i> good. And, even if not, the final stage might be less good than some of the pre-final stages through lacking certain goods which they possess . . . . .	434
848. The suggestion often depends on two confusions : viz. ( <i>a</i> ) confusing the mere absence of a good with a positive evil, and ( <i>b</i> ) confusing the simple absence of a good with the combination of its absence and a desire for its presence . . . . .	434
849. Or, again, on confusing a determinable quality which makes a state good with a certain determinate form in which this quality is manifested at certain stages . . . . .	435
850. Love is, in some sense, uniquely and supremely good. But it is not the only good, nor a necessary condition of all other goods, nor the only good that is eternal, nor the only good that appears to be eternal. Nor is it incommensurably better than every other good . . . . .	436

SECT.	PAGE
851. But it might be that love is capable of being so good that no possible goodness arising from any or all other sources of good could equal it . . . . .	437
852. This is quite compatible with our conclusion that no kind of good has a maximum. For the other kinds of good might have limits, though not maxima, whilst love might have no limit as well as no maximum . . . . .	437
853. It is doubtful whether there is a certain amount of love which is more good than any amount of pain would be bad. And hatred does not hold the supreme place among evils which love does among goods . . . . .	438

## CHAPTER LXVI

VALUE IN THE PRE-FINAL STAGES OF THE *C* SERIES

854. We can say very much less about the value of the pre-final stages than about that of the final stage . . . . .	440
855. The value of my present experience (and therefore that of the pre-final stages of the universe) is partly good and partly evil . . . . .	440
856. Scarcely anyone has denied the existence of some good. But the existence of evil has often been denied, partly on general philosophical grounds, and partly because men want to believe that good predominates over evil . . . . .	441
857. An appearance of error or of pain would be really erroneous or painful; and, even if it were not, would be a real evil . . . . .	442
858. It is certain that knowledge, amount and intensity of consciousness, and pleasure exist. So, if any of these be good, some good exists . . . . .	443
859. A delusive appearance of virtue or of having a good emotion would not itself be good. So, if virtue and certain emotions were the only good things, it would be conceivable that nothing good exists. But there is no reason to distrust our perceptions to this extent . . . . .	444
860. If the final stage contains no evil but sympathetic pain, whilst it contains all the pre-final stages, how can the latter contain any evil but sympathetic pain? . . . . .	445
861. The parts of a whole may have qualities which do not belong to the whole, and conversely . . . . .	446
862. It would be absurd to doubt that the value in some other selves is mixed, as it is in myself . . . . .	446
863. The aggregate value in the universe is a quantity which is dependent on other quantities in five stages . . . . .	447

SECT.	PAGE
864. Such a view would be rejected by many ; (a) as involving the possibility of a calculus of values. But there is no real objection to the possibility of such a calculus . . . . .	447
865. And (b) as implying Ethical Hedonism and Psychological Hedonism. But it does not imply Ethical Hedonism, and the latter does not imply Psychological Hedonism . . . . .	449
866. And (c) because it is held that the quantities in question would vary according to the order in which they were combined, and therefore could not be summed. But for each determinate order of combination of given quantities there will be a certain determinate sum ; so this objection is also invalid . . . . .	449

## CHAPTER LXVII. TOTAL VALUE IN THE UNIVERSE

867. To determine the relative amounts of good and evil in the total value of the universe we must first determine the relative amounts in the final stage as compared with those in the pre-final stages . . . . .	451
868. When two states appear as being in time their values vary, <i>cæteris paribus</i> , with the times which they appear to occupy ; and these are proportional to the stretches of the <i>C</i> series which the two states really occupy . . . . .	451
869. Hence any value of finite intensity which lasts for a finite time can be surpassed by a value of less intensity which lasts longer . . . . .	452
870. This must be accepted even if moralists be right in finding it repugnant to their feelings. But probably they find it repugnant only because they find it difficult to imagine very long periods or to be affected by the prospect of a very remote future . . . . .	453
871. Any portion of the <i>C</i> series which is bounded at both ends by other portions, or is bounded at one end by nonentity and at the other by a portion of the <i>C</i> series, will have a finite value. This may be called <i>Case Z</i> . . . . .	453
872. If the <i>C</i> series were bounded on both sides by nonentity (which it is not) its total value would be finite. This may be called <i>Case Y</i> . . . . .	454
873. If in at least one direction of the <i>C</i> series there were a term of it beyond every term (which is not the case) its total value would be infinite. This may be called <i>Case X</i> . . . . .	454
874. The actual position is that the <i>C</i> series is bounded by nonentity in the direction which appears as the earlier, and has no boundary in the direction which appears as the later. This may be called <i>Case W</i> . . . . .	454

SECT.	PAGE
875. In <i>Case X</i> the <i>C</i> series will appear to every term in itself as occupying infinite time; in <i>Case W</i> the last term will appear to the other terms as endless in time, but will not appear to itself as in time at all. Again, in <i>Case X</i> the infinite value of the whole is due to the finite values of an infinite number of terms; but, in <i>Case W</i> , if anything has infinite value, it will be the last term only which has it . . . . .	455
876. In <i>Case X</i> the series has no boundary towards the apparent future; and it is made up of an infinite number of terms, each of which appears to be of finite duration and has a finite value. In <i>Case W</i> the last term is unbounded towards the apparent future; but it is not made up of an infinite number of terms each of which has a finite value . . . . .	455
877. Does the infinity of value depend simply on the unboundedness, or on the infinite number of terms? The two hypotheses lead to the same results in <i>Cases Z, Y, and X</i> , but to different results in <i>Case W</i> . . . . .	456
878. If the first hypothesis be accepted the last term of the <i>C</i> series will be of infinite value. It is <i>prima facie</i> plausible. But we must be cautious here because it would lead to highly optimistic conclusions . . . . .	456
879. If the second hypothesis were true, the final stage, being simple and indivisible, would occupy a smaller proportion of the <i>C</i> series than any stage which appears as a divisible duration. Hence its value would be less (and might be infinitely less) than that of a state which appeared as lasting for a second . . . . .	457
880. This result is absurd, as we can see by considering examples . . . . .	458
881. The final stage is not in the <i>C</i> series in the same fundamental way in which all the pre-final stages are. Hence the fact that the value of each pre-final stage is determined by the amount of the series which it occupies does not imply that the value of the final stage is determined in the same way . . . . .	458
882. The final stage is in the inclusion series in the same sense in which the pre-final stages are. But it occupies an unique position, since it is the only term which includes and is not included . . . . .	459
883. The value of the final term is infinite, in the sense that it is greater than any finite multiple of any finite value . . . . .	460
884. The value of the final term is purely intensive; whilst the values with which we compare it are extensive magnitudes. But intensive magnitudes can be compared with extensive ones. Examples of this . . . . .	460
885. The final stage, then, has infinite value because it is unbounded . . . . .	461

SECT.	PAGE
886. If the first term had been unbounded it would have had infinite value. But it would have interested us less because it would have appeared as an unbeginning past instead of an unending future . . . . .	461
887. The infinite value of the final stage is not due to its qualities being infinitely intense (this they cannot be), but simply to its boundlessness . . . . .	461
888. Though the final stage contains the content of all the other stages, yet its value does not contain the values of the other stages. <i>A fortiori</i> , its value is not the sum of their values .	462
889. It is conceivable that there may be selves which have no inclusion series of perception, but only the one stage which includes all the content. Such selves would have value. Would it be infinite? . . . . .	462
890. The argument of § 879 shows that it would be infinite . . .	462
891. So the infinity of value depends on the negative property of <i>not</i> being a bounded stage in an inclusion series, and not on the comparatively positive property of <i>being</i> an unbounded stage in an inclusion series . . . . .	463
892. The value of the final stage is infinitely greater than the aggregate of all the values of the pre-final stages. And it has, apart from this, the importance for us that, <i>sub species temporis</i> , it is future, will be present, and will never be past . . . .	464
893. The only possible qualifications of the goodness of the final stage are in respect of pleasure and virtue. In the final stage we perceive the pain and other evils which are contained in the pre-final stages, and we acquiesce in them. Can such acquiescence be virtuous, and can such perception be devoid of sympathetic pain? . . . . .	464
894. The cause of my acquiescence in anything that I perceive is the fact that it is a part of some self for whom I feel either love, or affection, or self-reverence. Since these emotions are good, it is virtuous to acquiesce in the existence of their necessary conditions. Now they could not exist unless the selves which are their object existed, and these could not exist unless their parts existed . . . . .	466
895. We acquiesce in the existence of states with undesirable qualities, because they have the desirable quality of being necessary conditions of the existence of what is good. And, since there can be no suppositions in the final stage, we do not at that stage contemplate the possibility that these states might have retained their utility without their undesirable qualities . . . . .	467

SECT.	PAGE
896. It would not be virtuous to acquiesce in the existence of an otherwise very undesirable state merely because it was a necessary condition of some slight good. But love is the supreme good, and it is virtuous to acquiesce in states of sin and pain if they be necessary conditions for the existence of love. Analogies from present experience . . . . .	467
897. It is not certain that in the final stage we shall acquiesce in all the evil that we shall perceive in the pre-final stages; we may be emotionally indifferent to it. But neither indifference nor acquiescence will be vicious . . . . .	468
898. Although virtue will be unmixed in the final stage, pleasure will not. There will be sympathetic pain . . . . .	468
899. For we always feel sympathetic pain in contemplating the pain of those whom we regard with love or affection. Since pain, especially when undeserved, is an evil, the final stage is not one of unmixed good . . . . .	469
900. Although pain is the only evil at the final stage, and there are other goods at that stage which are unmixed, we cannot compare quantitatively the hedonic evil with the non-hedonic good and strike a balance . . . . .	470
901. The hedonic value of the final stage consists of infinite and unmixed non-sympathetic pleasure and of sympathetic pleasure and pain. The sympathetic pain is wholly due to the contemplation of the pain in the pre-final stages; and this is finite. The sympathetic pleasure is due to the contemplation of both the finite pleasure of the pre-final stages and the infinite non-sympathetic pleasure of the final stage. Hence in the final stage sympathetic pleasure infinitely exceeds sympathetic pain . . . . .	470
902. This assumes that the amount of sympathetic pleasure or pain which we feel is proportional to the amount of non-sympathetic pleasure or pain which we perceive. In present experience we feel less sympathy for past pleasure and pain than for present pleasure and pain. If this difference does <i>not</i> depend on the real relations which appear as past and present, it will not affect our argument. And, if it <i>does</i> depend on these relations, it will strengthen our argument . . . . .	471
903. Our conclusions about the proportion of good and evil in the final stage, and in all the stages taken together, depend on our conclusion that the final stage has infinite value . . . . .	472



## CHAPTER LXVIII. CONCLUSION

SECT.	PAGE
904. Can we tell anything about the value of the stages which come between the present and the final stage? . . . . .	473
905. We might think that we could count on a steady increase of goodness, though its rate would be uncertain . . . . .	473
906. But this is not justifiable. For all the qualities which determine goodness can oscillate, and the amount of goodness will oscillate with them . . . . .	473
907. Since time is finite, the number of oscillations and the duration of each must be finite. The existence of many short oscillations would be better than that of a few long ones, for two reasons . . . . .	475
908. We know that a period of deterioration may last through the whole of a man's life in one body. Whether it can last longer we do not know . . . . .	475
909. We cannot draw conclusions from observing long periods of deterioration in the history of a nation or race or planet. For we do not know that the successive generations are composed of the same individuals . . . . .	476
910. There is no reason why a process of deterioration which was going on at death should not be continued in the next life . . . . .	477
911. The smallness of our field of observation makes all inductive conclusions about the future of the universe as a whole almost worthless. The immense scale of the universe and our own insignificance are somewhat depressing to consider . . . . .	477
912. Hegel is an example of a great philosopher who could never quite face these facts . . . . .	478
913. We can set no limits to the evils that we may have to endure before reaching the final stage. But we know that, however great they may be, the goodness of the final stage will infinitely outweigh them . . . . .	479
INDEX . . . . .	480