

7812 Not in row
10 May 20

18 192

THOUGHTS ON THEISM,

BY THE

23

REV. J. C. ELGOOD,

Curate of Kirby Muxloe, near Leicester.

A response to the interrogatory of the Lecture
delivered by Charles Bradlaugh, Esq., M.P., at
Leicester last year and entitled

“What can Theism say for itself.”

THIS MATERIAL MAY BE PROTECTED BY THE
COPYRIGHT LAW (TITLE 17, U.S. CODE)

NOVEMBER 1880.

PRICE THREEPENCE.

LEICESTER:

SPENCER BROS. & RUSSELL, PRINTERS, 46, CANK STREET.

L. Bradlaugh, . What can
theism say for itself?

A Lecture delivered at the Temperance Hall,
Leicester, on November 22nd, 1880.

thinking that no one in this age of free thought, and of which I by no means complain but rather welcome, should be deterred or be unwilling to say a few words, I am about to venture, in humility and reverence as befit such a Theme, to lay before you what I consider Theism may say for itself.

The first idea which I think should strike every one on contemplating all which surrounds us is that there are two things which appear to have no true connection with each other and which we may not hesitate to say are absolutely distinct from one another—and these two are Matter and Mind. I would have you observe these words for on them depends the force of the line of argument I am about to bring forward. Let me repeat. I do not hesitate to say that you and I on considering the structure of the Earth, the forms and organisms by which we are surrounded, and which forms and organisms we can only conceive of by the aid of thought within us, cannot fail to conclude that the material things around us, and which are called by us, according to their properties, fire, water, the metals, the gases, the various earths, with the manifold organic forms of living creatures &c. thus conceived of by us and that inward thought of ours which so conceives are two things essentially and absolutely diverse and different.

But let us enquire why we should consider them as such. This will require a definition of the two. First then—What is Matter? It is that which thinks not—which cannot think—which would never be able to think whatever might be the forces of matter, similar to itself, exerted upon it, *purely of themselves*—not, of course, being put in action by any Intellect, for this at once brings another agent into the field, which at present we are leaving out. For instance if I hold in my hand a piece of flint and place it on the table we may feel confidently assured that, though it remained there for everlasting, it would not, and could not, move from its station and would continue the same unthinking motionless piece of matter. And, on the other hand,

feel equally assured that no amount of fire, water, or other purely material elements, acting upon it, without intellectual guidance and manipulation (I do not like this word but know of no other to express my meaning) from a Being infinitely wiser and more powerful than ourselves, could ever convert such an unthinking piece of matter into a thinking one.

I have spoken of matter in a form not interfered with by human hands, taking a piece of flint as an illustration and representative. Anything else would have done as well but this seemed specially appropriate because the elements of fire and water appear to have greatly exerted their forces upon it without producing mind within it. But the argument equally applies to anything which the skill and art of man have constructed out of matter say, a book, a pane of glass, &c. Man shapes these, with innumerable artistic productions out of unthinking matter, combining various kinds of matter together, but nothing he can do alters the same result, and the transformation of one material form into another leaves matter in precisely the same state as before—unable any the more, to move, to think, or to be capable of attaining the power of thought, although it should continue for everlasting.

Now let us attempt to distinguish Mind from Matter and to define what Mind is. We have given a definition of Matter—that, in whatever form it exist, and it has innumerable ones, it neither possesses, nor, of itself, could ever acquire the power of thought. Nor also could it ever obtain it from any material forces, *similar to itself*, being exerted upon it for any length of duration and under any condition. Mind then we define as that which thinks and which, by that faculty, adapts mental means to obtain material ends, proposes action by a process of pure thought, and is able by the intervention and employment of forces which it sets in motion, to guide, control and regulate matter.

In the same way that we can have no hesitation in concluding that a piece of flint, a pane of glass, or a book neither possesses thought, nor could acquire it from itself, nor yet through the action of any *purely* material forces exerted upon it, so, in the same way, we can have no hesitation in concluding that neither a piece of flint, a pane of glass, or a book, and these may stand as representatives of every possible species and form of matter, could have become the parent and originator of thought elsewhere—in other words, of Mind—the term we oppose to Matter.

But then what does this reasoning lead us to? It decides that Matter and Mind are perfectly distinct—that, although, as in a human being, we find them side by side and in union, this union and connection, though we cannot explain it, does not impugn nor destroy this essential difference—and that, although we cannot demonstrate it, nevertheless, from the foregoing reasoning, our minds and bodies must be considered as two absolutely separate things—concerning one of which, our minds (or the power of thought within us) we may confidently affirm that it could never have been the offspring of our bodily structure, *per se*, or, in other words of that general unthinking matter of which our bodily organism is a part.

Before passing on I would say a few words on the power and nature of Mind in Man to prepare us for considering it presently in a higher form. Human thought acts upon matter and brings all matter that is within its reach under its control. It analyzes the air, navigates the ocean, and subdues the earth. It measures the Sun, Moon, and Stars, and, when it reaches in imagination the invisible, peoples that with ideas which may or may not be true. Let us soar with higher wing. Let us pass the furthest Star and conceive of space as having no limit to stop us. And, with this, let us also conceive of an Infinite Past—a Past to which we cannot attribute a commencement. We shall pres-

ently speak a little more on this deep subject and I would now only say that it is more reasonable to believe in infinite space than that, if we could reach a certain place in the Universe, it would there terminate and nothing be—and more reasonable also to believe in an Infinite Past than to believe there was a time when nothing whatever was.

So far have I considered Mind and Matter as pertaining to the world we inhabit and we must now enquire whether both of these are to be found elsewhere and beyond it. That matter exists will at once be granted for it is evident to our senses. The sun, moon, and stars are a proof of it. Then, as to mind—does *that* exist elsewhere, or is it restricted to human beings in the whole Universe so that our little tiny circular sphere of unthinking matter possesses the glorious and powerful attribute of thought but which exists nowhere else. If mind exists nowhere save in our world it is plain that an old Greek Philosophy was right when it thought that the formation of the earth, the sun, moon, stars, and space arose from a blind concourse of fortuitous atoms, that these particles by pure chance and at haphazard arranged themselves and produced the bright orb of day, the moon walking in her brightness, the stars in their courses, and the earth in her regular and constant motion and complicated means of providing for her varied inhabitants. But even if we conceded this—that unthinking matter in this way produced and arranged the material forms with which we are acquainted we have yet to enquire how then came mind to be in our world. Whence arose it? These are most pertinent questions, and affect the very solution of the problem at issue. We have shewn conclusively, I think, that unthinking matter could never produce mind. A fortuitous concourse of atoms could not have generated it and we are driven to seek the solution of its existence in some other way. Yet if there be, as there is, mind in our world, existing in ourselves, why may we not go further, and believe that it exists in other regions, at work there as well as

here. In a word why may we not equally credit the rational hypothesis that thought with its attribute of action is at work directing and governing that vast region of space which extends on every side of our own world *because so much is effected* in the way of governing and directing things on earth by human thought carried into active operation. For it is rational to argue thus. The human race, by the exercise of their mind, can control and regulate matter within its reach, altering and employing it in an infinite number of ways. They can take it, make houses, ships, warlike and peaceful implements, and all manner of things artistic and scientific. If then it be allowed that mind may exist and act beyond our earth, and we have shewn that it is not reasonable to conceive it otherwise, this permits us to suppose it credible that it may have so controlled and directed matter elsewhere as *to have placed* and to preserve the sun, moon, and stars, and *to have determined and* accomplished those phenomena, as connected with our world, by which the earth performs her annual orbit, brings forth her fruits and nourishes our race. But if we may thus attribute to Mind the possession of action over so large a field of space as belongs to that portion of the Heavens visible to our sight we are entitled to go further and conceive of the power and knowledge of the same Mind as not confined to ninety millions of miles, the distance of us from the sun, nor to that far larger amount of space which is bounded by the remotest star we can see, but as existing and acting, in an infinite direction everywhere.

And this Mind, thus considered, is simply another name for GOD.

And these conclusions conduct us to four hypotheses on this most deep subject.—

1. That neither Mind nor Matter are from everlasting, and that subsequently either both of these originated themselves simultaneously, or that one of them originated itself and afterwards produced the other.

2. That Matter alone is from everlasting—or (to use an expression which means the same thing) has a Past Infinite—and has created mind.

3. That Mind alone has a Past Infinite and has created matter.

4. That both Mind and Matter have a Past Infinite and are from everlasting.

But before we treat of these let us consider what a Past Infinite implies. A Past Infinite is that which never had a beginning. Can we have a conception, in any way, of this so as to believe in it? I do not hesitate to say we can. Can we, in any way, compute it so as thereby to credit it? This is an impossibility. We can in no wise form the slightest computation. Nevertheless I contend that this does not destroy the power of conceiving it as having been so. Our power to conceive it has been called in question and I will quote the words of a writer on this subject. These are his words—“To conceive existence through a Past Infinite implies a conception of Infinite Past Time which is an impossibility.” To this I demur. I do not hesitate to say that we may conceive of existence as having been through an Infinite Past Time although it be impossible to compute it or arrive at the slightest approximation to a computation. This distinction will permit the possibility. Excluded from the necessity of computation we have simply to conceive of existence never having had a commencement *in precisely the same way* as we have to conceive of existence never having an end. Can we doubt our ability to make a conception of this latter? We know that while scores of generations of men have lived and died the sun which now lights up this world has continued to shine and the conception is, certainly, realizable that it might *always* continue to shine and, therefore, exist during an infinite

Future. Now if we are able to conceive of an Infinite Future the conception of an Infinite Past, as a conception, is neither harder nor easier and in both cases the deep mystery seems an equal one.

Computation of it, as I have said, is indeed impossible. There is scarcely a single person in this room who knows what a Quadrillion is and can realize it. Yet that is contained in a few figures—but what is a Quadrillion to a few lines of figures round the ceiling of this room and we may go on increasing the amount with the same result—an impossibility of computation. But I again ask does this fact destroy our power to conceive that a Past Infinite has been. Of course it would be manifestly absurd to say that *it proves the contrary*. I cannot think so—for a pure conception will relieve us from any computation, which is, confessedly impossible, and will, simply, ask us to credit that it never had a beginning. And, to repeat, an Infinite Future, if *that* is credible by us, and to my mind this cannot be denied, renders the conception of an Infinite Past *equally* credible. And if there be not an Infinite Future will that same writer, whose words I have quoted, tell us what is then to become of the Universe—how is that to be reduced into nothing and so nothing at all, either in the shape of mind or matter exist.

We have then four Hypotheses to deal with and I can conceive of no more:

- 1.—Can neither mind nor matter have existed from everlasting or an Infinite Past and either of them come into existence at some subsequent period and afterwards produced the other. Or can both have simultaneously sprang into existence—there yet being duration anterior to them but nothing else. An Hypothesis of this nature, I conceive, cannot be entertained.

- 2.—Can unthinking Matter have existed from a Past Infinite and, in some way, created Mind? To this I say No—because the argument I have used, and which I deem incontrovertible, admits not of it.
- 3.—Can Mind, without Matter, have existed from a Past Infinite and have created matter either in the form or forms with which we are acquainted or with which we are not acquainted? In truth this is putting the Hypothesis according to the old and generally prevailing belief “that the Divine Being created all things out of nothing.” This third Hypothesis is therefore to this effect—that in the Infinite Past *Pure, Abstract, Mind* (or, as we may say, omniscience possessing omnipotence as its attribute) existed without, however, there being anything in existence to be acted upon and afterwards created all things. I must confess that this Hypothesis does not commend itself to me yet I would not say that it is not true. Were it true it would at once establish Theism, but, to my mind, there is much difficulty in thus conceiving of pure, abstract, Thought with creative power belonging to it and existing by itself prior to unthinking matter. As I have said, this may be so and a solution as to the truth of Theism is found. Let whoso will hold this hypothesis—he then believes in a Divine Being—but I myself prefer the last and fourth one which is free from the difficulties attending the third and which, not less, leads us to the Temple of Faith.

The 4th Hypothesis then is that both Mind and Matter are from everlasting—have a Past Infinite equally with a future one—that Mind, in the sense here used, is but another expression for a Divine and Personal Agent, and matter the sphere in which He works, and over which He has always had and always will have absolute and sole control.

Let us investigate and try to warrant this hypothesis. It would be overthrown if it were true that mind existed nowhere but in our world. But is this supposition tenable? If it be restricted to our race how did it arise? From itself, or did Matter generate it? I think we have proved that the latter *could not be*, and the former case must be deemed absurd. Then the only alternative, in order to account for the existence of *mind in our world*, remains, that MIND, existing elsewhere and beyond our globe, in a way and by a process which is indeed concealed from us but none the less credible, *produced and originated* those powers of mind which exist in us and are a part of us.

We should presume, till we knew to the contrary, that in those worlds (we call them Planets) which, like our own, revolve round the Sun there are *analogous* operations of mind as well as material forms, like or unlike ourselves, and then, mounting higher, that there may be more worlds revolving round *their* Star-Suns in which are mind and matter—but any number of these alters not the conditions of the great Problem and the question still remains, whence originated those mental ideas and perceptions, and no better answer is forthcoming but that the FOUNTAIN OF MIND, OMNISCIENT and OMNIPRESENT, in other words, GOD—created them as well as those within and belonging to ourselves.

In support of what Theism may say for itself there is the argument, so well enforced by Paley, and which I must briefly allude to, arising from design in Creation. I might prefer the word, adaptation. The word, Design, seems to beg the question, whereas that of adaptation would rather leave it open to argument as to whether it is the result of a designing and executing Mind or otherwise. Adaptation may not of itself demonstrate Theism but it adds great weight as presumptive evidence for it. And adaptation is everywhere. The human frame is so constituted

that in a normal state, every part is adapted to each other, are strong and healthy, and the constituent parts of the atmosphere a man breathes are exactly adapted to suit his life whilst his stature is adapted to his mode of existence. The earth has a diurnal rotation to give his required rest, and is inclined at an angle for various beneficial purposes. Sunshine and rain combine in their mighty-forces for his support and nourishment, and this is but one example out of a multitude which display adaptation. Shall we not then acknowledge that it is *more rational* to attribute these adaptations (which surround us on all sides and which every one may see with his eyes) to the design of a designing and executing mind, all-wise and all-powerful, than to mere chance or haphazard through the coming together of unthinking material particles. Yet if we admit adaptation to be the result of design from a Designer, with respect to the organism of ourselves and our world together also with the Heavenly Forces which are intimately connected with it, we must go further and conceive of the same design operating in all parts of the Universe—for it would be manifestly irrational to allow of adaptation being present in that portion of space with which we ourselves are connected and not to allow it elsewhere.

But whither do these conclusions lead us? Do they not lead us irresistibly to believe in Mind as present everywhere throughout space and having the absolute and perfect regulation of matter under its control and guidance—that what we know, by experience, of the manner in which matter exists in our world, in ourselves, and in the general constitution and fabric of the earth demands that we believe the same holds good everywhere—and, that, as we can come to no other conclusion but that Mind, which, by such reasoning, is necessarily, of a higher, different, and more powerful character than resides in us, has the knowledge and direction of those material forces which are around us and above us, so this same conclusion sends us further to believe that it equally acts in every other part of the Universe.

Then—if we are thus compelled to admit that the first mental spark which appeared on this earth, in whatever quantity it was first kindled and wherever it first shone, could not have been originated by matter, properly so-called, nor from itself which must be deemed absurd, but have been originated by a *mind*, wise to design and able to execute,—for we find this mental spark in various degrees of ignition and light residing in ourselves now grown into such a large family of mankind—and are likewise compelled to admit that the just inference from all this is that this originating mind is no less than co-extensive with the Universe—and since it appears irrational to conceive of more than ONE such MIND what, I ask, is all this but to establish Theism—to give credit to there existing a *Divine Being, Personal and Real*, who has organized our world, peopled it with its inhabitants, and has it ever under His ruling and guidance.

And when I say *Personal* I do not clothe Him with any material form or shape but I do assign to Him a Personality and an individual consciousness which grasps and surrounds the Universe and of which our human minds are living drops. And there is here a true resemblance which fitly argues the parentage and source of the human mind for we, to a certain extent, are able to think and execute and possess control and power over matter. And this, logically, results, if, as I contend, the origination of the human mind was the creation of an Omniscient and Omnipotent one. Again—our true personality and individuality lies in our mental consciousness and the power inherent in it of action—in no wise whatever in our material frame. And, similarly, the AUGUST PERSONALITY AND INDIVIDUALITY OF GOD (whom no man hath seen nor can see) is the OMNIPOTENT MIND everywhere present and everywhere in action.

An Atheist, who is honestly and sincerely such because the mystery of a Divine Being overwhelms his thought and on that account cannot receive it, by no means merits contempt but should rather evoke our sympathy and such persons, it is easily

conceivable, may exist. I admit fully the awful intensity of the mystery, and therefore desire now to bring before you an argument which is, I think, of such force as may dispose us to consider such a mystery receivable. The argument is drawn from the Rule in Mathematics of Ratio or Proportion. We are all probably, familiar with this rule yet it may be as well to state it. The Rule of Ratio or Proportion takes letters to represent figures, say the letters a b c &c.—and the law is that as a is to b so is b to c , or whatever part or parts a is of b the like is b of c . Thus the letter a may represent 1 and b 2 and then c must be 4 because a being the half of b , c is required to be double of b in order that b may be its half—in this manner a ratio or proportion is maintained between the several figures. Or a may represent 4 and b 2 then it follows that c must be 1 to be the half of b as b is the half of a , or, to put the figures higher, a may be 1 and b may be hundreds of millions, then c must stand for hundreds of millions of hundreds of millions in order to preserve the proportion and *vice versa*. Figures, of course, represent things and under the law of proportion every kind of thing in quantity or in quality may be compared.

Now, with deep reverence, as treating on such a subject, it has occurred to me that not indeed a perfect comparison, such as the law of proportion requires, but an *approximate* one, sufficient to answer to the argument, may be instituted in the manner following as being sufficiently near to establish a very large amount of credibility in Theism—and this is all I ask for here. And the 4 proportions in this way will be that as a piece of matter is to man, so man is to the Divine Being. We will then enquire into the force and value of this proportion. Let us take any piece of matter whatever, a pane of glass, a flint, a book, a leaf of a tree. It would be acknowledged that man (not indeed in his material frame—I put that entirely on one side) in his capacities and powers of mind *infinitely*, and the word here is not inexact, excels any of them. And, to make the proportion

between these even still stronger I am legitimately entitled, for this purpose, not to confine myself to the genius, mental powers, and discoveries of one single man—but, and it is this point I specially desire to impress upon you for herein lies the force of the comparison, I am entitled to take those of *all* men who have ever lived and to concentrate them in *one* single brain. But I even go further. I take a wider scope and include all men who shall *hereafter* live, whose mental powers, instructed and enriched by those of their predecessors, shall give to the world far greater discoveries and modes and appliances in all departments of art and science than have yet been attained—and, viewed thus in all these respects it cannot but be agreed what an *infinite distance* separates a piece of glass from the collected knowledge and power of all men, past, present, and to come, gathered, as it were, into one focus.

And these two out of the three Factors are evident to us and are certain.

Then for the concluding one for which we are seeking. May we not (in humility and unpresumption) put as the other, and the approximate, Factor *that Divine Being* whom all history attests that the world, in every age, has been groping after.

It may even be considered, I venture to think, a *true* proportion—because if the mental perceptions and powers of the human mind *infinitely* excel unthinking and inactive matter, as they must do, so the perceptions of an omnipresent mind with its attribute of power acting in all directions *cannot do more than infinitely* excel those of the human mind. Yet would I rather suggest an approximate proportion in order to give, even in this way, a strong ground of credibility for Theism to the Atheist and to strengthen the conviction of it in those who are Theists.

For myself such a comparison appears of great force and value for, seeing how *infinite* a distance separates, in all ways of knowledge and power, mind and matter and yet we must believe in both since they are evident to our senses, it becomes rational

to credit the existence of a Divine Being and to assign to Him knowledge and power pervading the whole system of the Universe because this may be conceived to bear a proportionate ratio to human knowledge and power in the way we have just described them as these latter do to either one of the aforesaid specimens of matter.

Do I then conceive of mind combined with power thus operating everywhere and governing everywhere as a PERSONAL BEING? Unquestionably I do. We ourselves are, properly speaking, only personal through our mental qualities and powers of action—in, no-wise through our bodily forms which are mere matter—and, on the assumption for which I have argued in this Lecture that a mind for thought with accompanying power for action—though both of these limited and greatly limited in degree—were given to our first parents (or, as some say, to what developed our first parents) and proceeded from that Mind and Power which are from everlasting and absolutely infinite then it must, necessarily, follow that such combination of mind with power is *personal*—as truly personal as we ourselves though infinitely removed and exalted above us—is that GOD SUPREME whom I worship and adore, whom Athenian philosophy groped after, whom Rome Pagan sought in the majesty of her idolatry and whom Christendom believes in by her acknowledgment of the Unity of the Godhead.

But it may be said by some one—you draw a perfect and absolute separation and difference between Matter and Mind, *but there is Life*. In what manner is this to be regarded? will it not be an impediment in the way if be not even the destruction of the aforesaid Theory? True, there is Life—and in answer to such remarks I venture to say that Life in no-wise destroys the most absolute difference between Matter and Mind. For, as it seems to me, that which we call life is simply another name for matter in motion. It represents, if this be true, merely *some* descriptions of matter possessing an inward capacity for movement

as contradistinguished from other matter possessing no such capacity, but, in both cases, the matter where life exists and where it does not exist are identical, as unthinking substances and the reason of the movement of one of them is to be attributed to the action of mind.

Let me endeavour to show this. If we take the bodily structure of man and the structure of a tree we find their organisms to be akin in principle though not in appearance. Both move, as far as growth is concerned, in every direction. Both have a breathing apparatus and receive food which forms their life. A tree therefore lives and performs the functions of life in precisely the same manner that we do. The fact of life is identically the same, though the manner of it is very different. Let us imagine a human being standing—say for 10 or 20 years—in the same attitude, never altering his position, and merely receiving his food from others, to all intents and purposes his life in this way would neither be superior nor inferior to that of a tree. The organism of the matter composing his bodily structure might, possibly, be considered more intricate than that of a tree but, as far as any thing else was concerned, short of mind, there appears no difference between the two and both would be, simply, arrangements of unthinking matter.

We may put this even stronger in another way. A human being during sleep lives, moves, and, for a certain period, grows, but all true operation of mind is suspended. He in these circumstances and a tree present no difference and are but mere masses of unthinking matter although possessing internally a capacity for movement.

But the bodily structure of man has another movement which distinguishes it altogether from a tree. It moves itself to other situations which a tree does not. A tree lives and moves in growth but cannot change its position whereas man can move the mass of matter which is his frame and be constantly changing his position. How does he do this? *By the power of his mind.*

This mind of his combined with power is the lever that gives him movement at his will and which, as I argue in this Lecture, has been bestowed on him by the One Supreme and Everlasting Mind. Did he not possess this mind with the power attached to it enabling him, among its manifold functions, to exercise that of increased movement over his own body he would resemble and be to all intents and purposes, as a tree—and then I contend (in harmony with all that the Lecture contains) his bodily organization would be pure unthinking matter under a different and, apparently, far higher arrangement to that of a pebble, because possessing movement in growth and decay which we denominate life but yet identical in essence with it and, together with a pebble, have been constituted and formed by that ONE MIND whose omnipotence and omniscience were capable alike of forming the two.

Hence it seems to me deducible by reasoning that the presence of life brings no new element into the field but leaves Mind and Matter the alone two and absolutely different things which exist in our world as far as our knowledge can teach us or our reason conjecture.

I have now concluded what I think Theism may say for itself—but let me recall to your remembrance what I have said—that four hypotheses alone seem possible with regard to Theism and that the first two appear to me only necessary to be stated to be rejected * and that the

3rd is—That Mind alone is from everlasting—pure, abstract mind—and hath originated all things—that is to say, infinite space and the matter, which fills that space—and has, moreover, imparted to us in a material frame particles of mind with corresponding particles of power from itself, as the Infinite and Unlimited source. To my mind such difficulties attend this view that I prefer and receive the

* See page 10.

4th.—That both the *Matter* of Infinite Space and the *Immaterial Mind* having sway over that matter, as its attribute, or, in other words, *God* are from everlasting. The mystery is, confessedly, of the intensest nature but this hypothesis commends itself to me as far preferable to the other although both may be considered perfectly and exactly equal in declaring to us thereby the Theistic Tenet of an **EVERLASTING AND SUPREME GOD** in whom we live and move and have our being.

And as the final word on this sublime subject and intense mystery I would desire to give, a quotation from the poetry of James Montgomery and the writings of Sir E. Bulwer Lytton afterwards Lord Lytton. James Montgomery writes:— *

Is there a God—all nature shows
There is—and yet no mortal knows.
The mind which could this Truth conceive,
Which brute sensation never taught,
No longer to the ground would cleave
But grow immortal with the thought.

And in that great work of fiction, *My Novel*, ** Lord Lytton writes, speaking of Leonard, "He was carried along the ocean of the universe. In that ocean, O seeker, study the law of the tides and seeing chance nowhere—thought presiding over all—fate that dread phantom, shall vanish from creation and providence alone be visible in heaven and on earth."

* *Vide.*—James Montgomery's Poems.—Vol. 2. Page 347. Longman and Co., London, 1836.

** *Vide.*—*My Novel*. Knebworth Edition, 1875. Vol. 1. Book 7. Chapter 2.