The item of Williams which begins this issue was sent to us by
Francis Sparshott. It is the entire entry for James Mill in The
Scottish Nation, or the Genealogy, Families, Literature, Honour,
and Biographical History of the People of Scotland by William
Anderson, Author of Life, and Editor of Works of Lord Byron, etc.,
etc. The work contains no entry for John Stuart Mill, but Pro-
fessor Sparshott has asked us to note the masterly characteriza-
tion of him in the last sentence:

"MILL, James, the historian of British India, was born in the
parish of Logie-Port, Firthshire, April 6, 1773. The early part
of his education he received at the grammar school of Montrose,
on leaving which, through the patronage of Sir John Stuart, bar-
onet, of Fettescairn, one of the Barons of the exchequer in Scot-
land, on whose estate his father occupied a small farm, he was
sent to the University of Edinburgh to study for the church. In
1800, after being licensed as a preacher, he went to London as
tutor in Sir John Stuart's family, and settling in the metropolis,
he devoted himself to literary and philosophical pursuits. By his
powerful and original productions, as well as by the force of his
personal character, he soon earned for himself a high reputation
as a writer. During the first years of the Edinburgh Review, he
contributed to it many articles on Jurisprudence and Education,
and he was also the author of a number of masterly papers in the
Westminster, the London, the British, The Elects, and Monthly
Reviews. In politics he belonged to the Radical party, and among
other articles which he wrote for the Westminster Review were the
celebrated ones "On the Formation of Opinions," in No. 11, and
"On the Bailot," in No. 25,"
About 1806 he commenced his 'History of British India,' which occupied a considerable portion of his time for more than ten years, and was published about the end of 1817, in three volumes 4to. The information contained in this valuable work, with the author's enlarged views on all matters connected with India, tended greatly to the improvement of the administration of our empire in the East, and induced the East India Company to appoint him in 1819 to the second situation in the examiner's office, or land revenue branch of the administration, at the India House. On the retirement of Mr. William M'Culloch, he became head of the department of correspondence with India. In 1821 Mr. Mill published his 'Elements of Political Economy,' containing a clear summary of the leading principles of that science. In 1829 appeared, in two vol. 8vo, his 'Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind,' a work on which he bestowed extraordinary labour, and which displayed much philosophical acuteness. Besides these works he contributed various valuable articles to the Supplement of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, principally on Government, Legislation, Education, Jurisprudence, Law of Nations, Liberty of the Press, Colonies, and Penitentiary Discipline, which were also published as separate treatises. In 1835 he produced, without his name, his 'Fragment on Hume's,' in which he severely criticises Sir James Mackintosh's 'Disquisition on the History of British Philosophy.' Mr. Mill died of consumption, June 23, 1836, and was buried at Kensington, where he had resided for the last five years of his life. He left a widow and nine children.


* * * *

The issue proper is chiefly concerned with Mill's letters. It begins with two letters discovered by Gerald Sirk (Department of Economics, City College, City University of New York) and Natalie Sirkin. The letters are interesting in the light of Mill's involvement with Indian education. Readers may wish to refer to Sirk and Sirkin, "John Stuart Mill and Distillationism in Indian Education," Journal of General Education, 21 (Jan., 1973), 221-85, wherein the second of these letters appeared; the other is published here for the first time. We conclude with another previously unpublished Mill letter sent to us by Ged Martin (Department of History, Australian National University) which supplements the correspondence between Mill and John Plummer, and with two unpublished letters sent by J.B. Schaar (Department of Political Science, University of Pittsburgh) which reveal something of Mill's attitude to Sidgwick's Ethics. Finally we have a letter sent to us by Shiro Sugihara (Faculty of Economics, Kanazawa University, Toyama, Japan).
in which Mill is thanked for advice he has given concerning a lady's marital problems. A thesis abstract, information concerning recent and forthcoming publications and a section devoted to queries close the issue.

We would like readers to note that WJL has switched from publication in the Spring and Fall to publication in the Summer and Winter; issues have, of course, carried on consecutively.

---

**MILD IN INDIA HOUSE**

A LITTLE BUREAUCRATIC TALE IN TWO LETTERS

Gerald Sirkin & Natalie Robinson Sirkin

These two recently-discovered letters by John Stuart Mill were written to Horace Hayman Wilson (1786-1866), who, during his career in India from 1811 through 1833, had gained a reputation as a Sanskrit scholar and had become the dominating figure in the Government's education programme. These letters are from a large collection of letters to Wilson which we found in England while engaged in research on Wilson.1

Sir,

I have the honor of receiving and laying before you the letter of the 6th ultimo; and I am desired to express to you my acknowledgments for the readiness with which you have consented to afford your valuable aid in the selection of a competent person for the office of Head Master in the Anglo-Indian College,2 and which was no more than he expected from your zeal for the interests of Native Education in general, and of that Institution in particular. I have also to express his obligations to you for your remarks on the nature of the office, and on the qualifications which it requires; and, above all, for your public spirited offer to give preparatory instruction in the native languages to any gentleman whom the Court may nominate to it.3 Such instruction, and the continued communication with yourself which it would involve, are advantages of the value of which, to any person who may be selected for the duties in question, Mr. Loch is deeply sensible.

Your observations on the expediency of attaching a higher salary to the office than that now appropriated to it from the Education Fund, have been perused by Mr. Loch with every attention. But while he feels the force of your reasons, and the weight due to your opinion, he would not consider himself justified in proposing to the Court the adoption of the measure which you recommend, until trial shall have been made of the possibility of procuring a competent person on the terms.
originally proposed.\textsuperscript{5} He will therefore feel greatly indebted to you if you will endeavour to obtain a person qualified for the office, and willing to undertake it on the present conditions. Should this be found impracticable, it will no doubt be advisable for the Court to take into consideration the expediency of increasing the Salary.

I have the honor to be

Sirs

Your most obedient Servant

John S. Mill

\[ \text{in Mill's hand} \]

India House
29th March
1836

\[ \text{entirely in Mill's hand} \]

India House
5th January
1836

My dear Sir

Some months ago, by the desire of the then Chairman, I had the honour of placing myself in communication with you with a view to obtain your valuable aid in procuring a person qualified to superintend the Indigo Indian College & to be the principal teacher in that Institution, and you kindly consented to look out for a fit person. The Managers of the Institution have since withdrawn their application, stating that they have now no doubt of being able to select a competent person in India and I am consequently directed by the Revenue & Judicial Committee to apprise you that any further continuance of your endeavours to procure a person in this country will be unnecessary.

Having thus fulfilled my instructions permit me in my individual capacity to say how much pleasure I have derived from your letter in this month's Asiatic Journal.\textsuperscript{6} The Government of India in their recent conduct have gone directly in the teeth of all the instructions they have received from this country—as well as violated the most obvious rules of policy & common prudence.

Believe me

My dear Sir

Very truly yours

J. S. Mill

\textbf{NOTES:}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[1] The letters are now in the N.L. Wilson Collection (MS Bar. E. 302) in the India Office Library through whose kind permission they are published here.
  \item[2] John Loch was the Chairman of the Court of Directors of the East India Company that year. The East India Company, which had started as a trading company, was governing India on behalf of the Crown.
\end{itemize}
This College, also known as the Hindu College and as the University, was organized in 1855 by a group of leading Hindus in Calcutta for the purpose of teaching English and Western science to high-caste Hindu boys. The College soon ran out of funds because of mismanagement, and by 1852 it was asking government for financial assistance. Government agreed and soon was providing nearly all the required funds, although the management remained in the hands of the "native managers."

Wilson was never called upon to fulfill his offer, which was probably just as well, since it is likely that he would have taught the prospective Head Master Sanskrit rather than Bengali, the spoken language of the Hindus in Calcutta. A representative statement of Wilson's conviction in this matter is given in his testimony before Parliament in 1853: "I think it is most desirable to teach the young civil servants before they go out to India: [Ans.] I confess I should be very much disposed to recommend merely Arabic and Sanskrit. The vernacular languages are much more readily learnt in India."

Minutes of Evidence Taken Before Select Committee of the House of Lords, 5th July, 1853, Parl. Papi., 1853-4, vol. 32.

A letter from James Mill states the anticipated salary as follows: "The salaries [are] 4500 per an., with the addition of an allowance for house rent." (James Mill to Moey Kaplur, British Museum, Add. MSS 34615, f. 109, 1 June, 1853. We are indebted for this reference to Mr. Robert F.S. Tate.)

After twenty-one months, Wilson had not found a candidate for a position which should have attracted suitable men. The salary of £500 per year was generous by English standards, though less so for an Englishman living in India. James Baillantyne came to India to fill a similar position in the Hewares Sanskrit College in 1846, a much less desirable location than Calcutta, for a salary of only £250. Baillantyne was Wilson's candidate. Generally, the average salary for that position was higher than £250 but lower than £500. In the 1840s, four men were brought from England to fill professorships at a salary of £300 per year, which, while adequate for single men, was found inadequate for married men. The salary was raised to £600. (J. Kerr, A Review of Public Instruction in the Bengal Presidency, From 1836 to 1852 (London, 1853), Part I, pp. 43, 53.)

It seems, therefore, that Wilson's failure to find a candidate was owing to his lack of zeal for the task rather than its difficulty. We can only conjecture about Wilson's reasons: it is probable that he preferred that the "native managers" of Anglo-Indian College, with whom he was on very friendly terms, be left free of European interference. Though he had on all occasions described European supervision as essential to the proper management of the Indian Colleges, he was chiefly concerned with the promotion of the traditional Oriental education, and therefore set no great store by the improvement of the competing Western education.

5
This view of Wilson's indifference and even outright resistance to introducing modern, Western, education, is at variance with the standard interpretation of historians, who take Wilson at his word, that he was equally energetic in promoting both systems of education, modern and ancient. Nevertheless, all the evidence of what Wilson did rather than of what he said supports our interpretation. (Sirkin and Sirkin, "John Stuart Mill and Pan-Indianism in Indian Education," Journal of General Education, 21 [Jan., 1971], 231-85. Sirkin and Sirkin, "The Battle of Indian Education: Macaulay's Opening Salvo Neatly Discovered," Victorian Studies, 11 [June, 1971], 477-92.)

The "letter" to which Mill refers is actually a sixteen-paged article, "Education of the Natives of India," in The Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register of British and Foreign India, China and Australasia, No. 19 (Jan.-April, 1836). Wilson in this article violently attacked the Indian Government's new "Anglo-Irish" education policy, which replaced Wilson's own long-standing "Orientalist" program, that he had established and continued against sporadic opposition in India and from the Court of Directors in England.

Some of the despatches from the Court of Directors, criticizing Wilson's Orientalist program, were written by Mill himself. Not only were they critical, but they repeatedly urged just such a shift from the Orientalist to the Anglo-Irish approach as had recently been introduced. Therefore Mill's statement, that the new policy went "directly in the teeth of all the instructions" from the Court, needs to be explained.

The explanation seems to be that Wilson's article had a powerful effect on Mill (why this was so, we attempt to answer in our article in Journal of General Education), and thereby came close to having the same effect on government policy in India. Mill, under Wilson's guidance, was as much in the dark about Indian education policy as he was about the feasibility of finding a superintendent for Anglo-Indian College. In subsequently drafting the despatch on behalf of the Court, strongly condemning the Indian Government's new education policy, Mill relied entirely on Wilson's arguments in his article, and even on Wilson's words.

Mill's draft was accepted by the Court of Directors, but was rejected by the final authority, Sir John Cunard Moorhouse, President of the Board of Control. (See Sirkin and Sirkin, op. cit.)

After we had written our article, The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill, 1849-1873 appeared, containing an earlier letter bearing on Mill's draft despatch:

"Do not think that a style so controversial as that of this paper is what I think desirable or what I generally practise in official correspondence; it is by no means so—but this paper was written in ill health, in the domestic distress of last year, and I may add, against time, having to be written before I could get away, to go abroad for my health: I left it in hands quite capable of moderating the tone, and altering what seems palæstical in its
characters; and we often find it necessary to write our opinions first for effect here, upon the Directors and the India Board, and afterwards shape them into something more suitable to the dignity of official authority exercised over gentlemen by gentlemen...."

(Letter to Henry Taylor [No. 1473], Collected Works, XVII [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972], 1970.)

Though taste and ill-health explain the style, they do not explain the content. Mill goes on to indicate that he remains convinced of the correctness of his position. This letter establishes the time when he wrote the despatch as close to July 30, 1856, when he left for the Continent.

* * * *

A LETTER FROM JOHN STUART MILL TO JOHN PLUMMER

Gael Martin

The letter given in this note supplements the correspondence between Mill and John Plummer, a working-class writer, published in Later Letters (Collected Works, XIV-XVII). The letter was recently discovered bound inside a pamphlet in the National Library of Australia. The letter has been catalogued as MS9123.

John Plummer was born on 3 June 1831, and until his early thirties worked as a play-maker at Kettering in Northamptonshire. He began to write on trade union and co-operation during the 1860's, and came to the notice of Mill and Lord Brougham. Correspondence between Mill and Plummer apparently began in 1859. Mill valued Plummer's opinions on subjects of importance to the working class, and regarded him as one of the few self-educated men who could write with real style. Mill also admired his struggle to overcome his own disabilities, for Plummer was lame and partially deaf.

Plummer was an enthusiast for working-class exhibitions as a means of self-improvement, and persuaded the reluctant Mill to be president of one in North London in 1866. In 1867 he visited Paris for the International Exhibition, and in 1879 travelled to Sydney to report its Exhibition for the Graphic. He remained in Sydney, writing both for Australian and British papers, and died on 9 March, 1914.

Although Mill had a high regard for Plummer's ability, his relation remained that of an interested patron rather than a close friend. This letter is a typical example of Mill's relations with intelligent working men.

Saint Véran, Avignon

Jan. 21, 1864

Dear Sir,

I thank you for your two letters, and their various inclusions,
by which I have been much interested. I hope that your connection
with the Sydney Morning Herald will continue as satisfactorily as
it has begun. I have read all your articles in the Penny Newsman,
some of which I liked very much and I have little doubt that I
shall like your Essay on Colonies; but I will, as you desire,
criticize it freely. If I do not, say more then you, agree entirely
with Mr. Goldwin Smith. 3 I think that a sort of modified feder-
at ion between a mother country and colonies may be usefully main-
tained as long as neither party desires to separate.
Do not send anything more to this address at present, as we re-
turn to England in a fortnight. 8 I need hardly say that we shall
be glad to see you at Blackheath when you are in town and it is
convenient to you to come.
With our kind remembrances to yer Plummer, I am
very sincerely yours

J.S. Mill

NOTES:

1 Biographical information on Plummer is scattered. This para-
graph based upon obituary notices in Sydney Morning Herald, V, 
11 March 1914; Fred John's Annual (3rd year, London 1914), p.106: 
Bulletin (Sydney), 25 May 1886, p.5; review notices in Plummer's 
Our Colonies (London, 1864) and Collected Works, XV-XVI (Toronto: 
University of Toronto Press, 1972), esp., pp.569, 734, 875, 1029, 
1146, 1236, 1252.

2 Mill had been staying at Saint Vrain since 3 September 1863.
(Plummer, XVI, 480.)

3 Plummer was London correspondent of the Sydney Morning Herald,
the leading newspaper in New South Wales, until superseded by the
cable service. On 7 February 1866 Mill thanked Plummer "for the
pleasant things you have written about me in the Sydney Morning
Herald." (Sydney Morning Herald, 11 March 1914; Collected Works,
XVI, 1146.)

4 A newspaper published by Edwin Chadwick and addressed to a
working class readership.

5 Plummer had won first prize of 400 in a national mechanics' 
essay competition organized by the Rev. J.P. Gell of Nottingham.
His views are summed up in the title of his essay: Our
Colonies: an Essay on the advantages accruing to the British Re-
public from the Possession of the Colonies, considered economically, 
politically and morally (London: Kettering and Sydney, 1864). On
6 March 1864 Mill wrote to Plummer: 'I like your Essay on the
Colonies very much, though I do not go the length of all you say
respecting their advantages.' (Collected works, XV, 945.)

6 Cobden-Sandys (1829-1910) published a series of lectures in the
Daily News in 1862-1863, advocating independence for the colonies.
These were revised in an attempt to add consistency to their ar-
uments, and published as The Empire (Oxford, 1863). On 8 November,
1862, Mill wrote to J.B. Cairnes, "I do not at all agree with Goldwin Smith in thinking the severance actually desirable." (Collected Works, XV, 924.)

"In Representative Government, Mill had described the position of the self-governing colonies as follows: "Their union with Great Britain is the slightest kind of federal union, but not a strictly equal federation, the mother country retaining to itself the powers of a federal Government, though reduced in practice to their very narrowest limits." But Mill did not believe in "Imperial Federation." In 1838 he had written that "the notion of giving the colonies representatives in the H[ouse of] C[ommons] cannot be entertained by anybody who has one grain of statesmanship in his head." In 1859 he described such schemes as "so inconsistent with rational principles of government that it is doubtful if they have been seriously accepted as a possibility by any reasonable thinker." (On Liberty and Considerations on Representative Government, ed. R.E. McAlpin [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962], 309, 310-11, Collected Works, XIII, 393.)

Mill sent a similar request to Thomas Hume on 27 January, 1862. He was at Blackheath again on 17 February, 1862. (Collected Works, XV, 929-30.)

"Mill invited the Planners to dine several times at this period. (Collected Works, XV-XVII, 508, 1083, 1175, 1235, 1441.)"

---

TWO UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF JOHN STUART MILL TO HENRY SIDGWICK

J.B. Schneewind

The two letters printed below are among the Sidgwick papers in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. 1 Henry Sidgwick (1838-1900) is generally considered to be the last great classical utilitarian moral philosopher. Though he greatly admired Mill, there has, up to now, been no evidence of any contact between the two philosophers. 2 These two letters show that Sidgwick turned to Mill for advice about the most serious problem of his personal life.

In 1859 Sidgwick, newly graduated with high honours, began a lifelong career of teaching at Cambridge. Ten years later he resigned his position on the grounds that he could no longer conscientiously subscribe to the Thirty-Nine Articles, as by law required (a new position was immediately created for him). He began worrying about religion and subscription as early as 1860, and he tells us that it was while he was considering whether or not he ought to resign because of his doubts that he "went through a great deal of the thought that was ultimately systematized in the Methods of Ethics" (published in 1874). 3 In 1870, he published two immediate results.
of this long deliberation: a letter on "Clerical Engagements" in the Pall Mall Gazette of January 6, and a pamphlet entitled "The Ethics of Conformity and Subscription." The present letters suggest that he sent a draft of the latter to Mill.

Mill's praise of the lines of thought indicated in the draft may have been encouraging, but as Sidgwick had by this time already worked out the main points of his nature ethics, it should not be supposed that Mill's letter turned him to the subject.

Aug. 3, 1867

Dear Sir,

The questions raised in your letter of July 28 are very important, and extremely difficult. It is not impossible to decide by a general rule, without many allowances for differences of position which point out to different persons different paths of usefulness. As you say, it is absurd to refer each man to his individual conscience since the very question is, what his conscience ought to prescribe. While I sympathize fully in your perplexities, I do not know when I should be able to fix a time for discussing them at length, either in a letter or in writing; but I would endeavour to find time for reading the statement you speak of, and for giving some sort of opinion respecting it. I am

Henry Sidgwick Esq.

Dear Sir

yours very sincerely

J.S. Mill

Avignon

Nov. 26, 1867

Dear Sir

Owing to absence from England I did not receive your paper on Tests until long after it was sent, and had to wait much longer before I could give it proper attention. I think it an exceedingly fair and clear statement of many of the considerations and counter considerations which really exist in the minds of conscientious men and influence their personal behaviour in the matter of Tests. And I agree with you in thinking that an ethical theory—a fixed moral principle, or set of principles—respecting the bindingness of the obligation of a test, would be very desirable. But it seems to me that such fixed principles cannot be laid down for the case of tests by itself; that the question requires to be taken up at an earlier stage, and dealt with as part of the much larger question, What, on the principles of a morality founded on the general good, are the limits to the obligation of veracity? What ought to be the exceptions (for that there ought to be none, however few, exceptions seems to be admitted) to the general duty of truth? This larger question has never
yet been treated in a way at once rational and comprehensive, partly because people have been afraid to meddle with it, and partly because mankind have never yet generally admitted that the effect which actions tend to produce on human happiness is what constitutes them right or wrong. I would suggest that you should turn your thoughts to this more comprehensive subject. You possess several, far from common, qualifications for dealing with it: a strong conscientious interest in it, and the power of representing to yourself clearly and distinctly, without prejudice or partiality, the pro's and con's of a moral question. There is therefore good reason to hope that your meditations on the subject would not be unfruitful. Apart from this more general subject of consideration, there would be little use in any remarks that I could make on the special question of Testa; the discussion of which, in the way in which you have treated it, cannot perhaps be carried, with any useful result, much further than you have done. I am Dear Sir

Yours very sincerely

J. S. Mill

Henry Sidgwick Esq.

NOTES:

1 Add. MSS c 94/132 and 133. I am grateful to the Master and Fellows of Trinity College for permission to publish these letters. The research during which the letters were discovered was supported by a grant from the American Council of Learned Societies, to which I should like to express my thanks.

The remarks on this subject made in Terence T. Hall's, "Sidgwick's Concept of Ethical Science," Journal of the History of Ideas, 24 (Oct. 1963), 594-9, are astonishing.


A LETTER TO MILL FROM MADAME DE ROTE

The following letter to Mill from Madame de Rote of Vienna was written in response to a letter from Mill advising her to remain with her husband despite her inclination to leave him because of incompatibility, which Mill describes, apparently quoting her first letter, as "a difference in your 'ways of thinking and feeling'" (Collected Works, XVII, 1715). A notation in Mill's hand on the envelope of Madame de Rote's original letter making the advice indicates that Mill burned it. The MSS of Mill's letter and her acknowledgment are in the Library of Kansas University, Osaka, Japan.

II
May 4, 1870

Dear Sir,

With the one word, "endurable" you have given me the longed for advice. It was that, what I wanted to know. I wanted to know, if in marriage mere endurance, patient suffering are a right thing. I could not trust my own judgment, and therefore in an hour of great perplexity and doubt I took the great liberty of asking one who could believe more than myself. I could not help thinking, that one has no right to condemn unborn beings to partake of the curse of an ill-assorted union. But I accept your opinion. you surely know, what is right from the highest point of view. And it is almost easier to suffer us, to endure patiently and silently as I have done till now, than to consent an act, by which the very foundation of my being must be shaken, and a new, hitherto unknown sorrow, that of giving through a willful act of mine pain to others, fall upon my life. I wonder, will there ever come any light in these dark questions that—I feel out to sure of that—people the world with witchness unanswerable! And now, ere my name drops out of your memory, let me thank you, dear Sir, for the letter you wrote to for your great generosity. I thought it more than likely, that my letter should never be answered, for after it was gone, I felt the sadness of having ever written it, it was however, and I am utterly thankful for it.

Believe me dear Sir, yours most respectfully,

[Signature]

Thesis Abstract:

MILL OF HAMILTON: A RE-EXAMINATION
OF SIR W. HAMILTON'S PHILOSOPHY
(Ph.D. Thesis, University of Minnesota)

D.L. Omran.

Mills examination "proved" that Hamilton's philosophy was a tissue of inconsistencies, week grunts and scraps of emotion. Mill thought that the weaknesses of Hamilton's "Intuitionism" would rebound to the credit of Associationism in the Battle of the Two Philosophies. The Main Contradiction of Hamilton is usually characterized as an attempt to mix oil and water, i.e., Reid's dogmatic realism and Kant's critical phenomenalism. A more adequate interpretation of Hamilton's philosophy must begin with his own professed allegiance to Aristotle and the Schoolmen. "Peripateticism" is the basis for many of his (generally ignored) distinctions.
The initial, mainly historical, sections of the thesis (a) chronicle the decline and fall of Hamilton's once "quite fantastic" reputation, (b) discuss his relation to Reid and the Scottish school (especially on two issues: what Hamilton calls (3) Reid's error of commission," i.e., Reid's discrimination of consciousness as a special faculty directed upon our other acts, and (2) his "error of omission," i.e., his failure to appreciate the real problem of "representationalism" or the distinction of the scholastics between intuitive and abstractive knowledge), and (c) discover in a philosophia perennis based on the catholic conception of "Common Sense" as Knox a principle of unification for his "massive erudition."

The latter half concentrates on Hamilton's Philosophy of Consciousness and his Natural Realism. Hamilton's appeal to the facts of consciousness is, for Mill, mere "dogmatism in disguise." Hamilton's "seems" from the circle of our ideas, Mill argues, involves an illicit "stretching" of what is properly self-consciousness to include consciousness of a non-ego. If, on the other, Hamilton's "indication" of consciousness grounds knowledge ultimately on Belief, his analysis of perception, on the other, distinguishes sharply between perceptual knowledge and the mere "belief" of representative knowledge. If "the object specifies the act," the sense given by Hamilton to "the object" should be carefully noted.

Mill is interested in genetic questions such as how the concept of a non-ego arose in us. The traditional distinction between conception and perception is reflected in Hamilton's distinction between the gestation of concepts and the mediation of representations. A two-fold meaning can be thereby given to the adage that "the knowledge of opposites is one." This "equivocation" is the basis for a reconciliation of Hamilton's realism with his "agnosticism." For Hamilton, non-comparative knowledge is central to the realism/idealism issue. The Natural Realism of Hamilton and Reid may vary on the "precise object" of perception, but not on the question whether the object of perception be real or ideal. Representative knowledge has a single, representative knowledge a double, object. Hamilton seems to be a "representative realist" on the perception of distant objects. Hamilton argues rather that if Reid's "sense" is merely an objectum cop which suggests that perception must be an objectum cop, then Reid's realism collapses into a "representationalism." Ockham noted two senses of the distinction between intuitive and abstractive knowledge. "Intuition" may be of a term or of an existent. If Reid allows "immediate knowledge" for Memory and the Sun alike, then his sense of "immediate knowledge" is merely Ockham's first sense. Reid may be a Representationalist of what Hamilton calls "the third and subtlest variety." Hamilton argues that Ockham's second sense is crucial to the problem of perception. Perception proper has a single object. Representative knowledge, whose object is double,
is not as such knowledge, but merely "belief." Other considerations such as Hamilton's espousal of Aristotle's Primary/Secondary Quality distinction over that of the Moderns are adduced to prove the importance of "Aristotelian" for a consistent "Hamiltonian."

Recent Publications:


Forthcoming Publication:


Queries:

From Eugene R. August (Department of English, University of Dayton):

I am trying to trace the author of a phrase quoted in Mill’s review of Tennyson’s poems. (Mills *Essays on Literature & Society*, ed. J.B. Schumewind [New York: Collier Books, 1969], 145-6.) Mill’s sentence reads, ‘We predict, that, as Mr. Tennyson advances in general spiritual culture . . . he will come more and more diligently, and, even without straining, will be more and more impelled by the natural tendencies of an expanding character, toward what has been described as the highest object in poetry, “to incorporate the everlasting reason of man in forms visible to his sense, and suitable to it.”’

From John M. Robson (Department of English, Victoria College, University of Toronto):

In editing Mill’s *Essays on Politics and Society* (Vol. VI of the Collected Works) I have reached the point, only too well known to all editors, when certain references just refuse to be found. It is, of course, somewhat embarrassing to admit publicly that one is ignorant of matters that are, very commonly, known to many, but the good of the greatest number must triumph over individual pride. I should, therefore, be most grateful for any help (even fragile hints) about the origins of the following references:

Bacon, "they [questions] resolve of themselves."

“One of the writers of M. Thiers’ school.” (Before—probably not long before—the publication of “Centralisation” in April, 1862): “We are saturated with government. It requires a great strength of conviction to enable me to write as I do, namely in favour of centralisation and state interference.”

Casimir Perier, “A quoi un paître est-il bon?”
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Two natives of Corfu, the one who became a minister in the Russian Empire, the other who became President of Greece (before the arrival of the Bavarians). (The reference is in Considerations on Representative Government, 1861.)

"A recent writer, in some respects of considerable merit, proposes (to use his own words) not a crusade, but a civil war, against the Normans. (The reference is in On Liberty, 1859, the defeated city gives JSN's usage as the earliest known.)

Anon., "sabbathless pursuit of wealth" (1860).

Anon., "Alla res speetram, Alla spectare."

Anon., "the deep plumber of a denied opinion" (1859).

Anon., "opinion tolerates a false disclaimer, only when it already tolerates the thing disclaimed" (1861).

Anon., "a person without the vote is in the position of one who "has no business with the laws except to obey them" (1861).

Anon., "whatever is not a duty, is a sin" (1859).

Anon., "things which "are easy growing" while the "are sleeping" (1861).

Anon., "you shelter and weather-send him from the elements of experience" (quoted by JSN from Samuel Bailey, who says it is the "phrase of a masterly writer") (1835).

Anon., "thou shalt not" predominates unduly over "thou shalt" (1859).

Anon., "passions of his quarry from afar" (quoted by JSN from Henry Taylor, 1836).

Anon., "the old remark" that "as the schoolmaster is, so will be the school" (1861).

Anon., "Idleness is the mother of vice" (1861).

As I hope to get the manuscript into the press this autumn, early clues would be most welcome; but better some time than never.

---

COLLECTED WORKS

A System of Logic (Vols. VII and VIII of the Collected works) has now appeared, and so the edition has (probably) passed the midpoint, with thirteen volumes published, and about twelve still to appear. As indicated in the query section above, the next volume scheduled is Essays on Politics and Society (Vol. VI), to be followed by Essays on Philosophy (Vol. XI), and An Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy (Vol. IX). Inevitably one may predict that they will appear at roughly yearly intervals, beginning in 1975.
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