

Prince Henry or Prince Rupert?

The drawings of Prince Henry and Prince Rupert at Windsor are too well known for ~~it~~ it to be necessary that I should attempt a description of their ~~features~~ <sup>features</sup>. Prince Henry, the elder of the two, <sup>was</sup> somewhat the taller; but Prince Rupert weighed more than his brother. In mind and temperament <sup>however</sup> of the two were singularly diverse. <sup>But</sup> this

is not the place to speak of the loss caused to the monarchical principle by <sup>both were born to rule, and the true presence of the one was only equalled by the ready address of the other.</sup> their early death. The following dialogue was discovered by <sup>Queen Caroline</sup> <sup>and the Duke of Devonshire</sup> <sup>in a drawer at Kensington Palace.</sup> <sup>and the Duke of Devonshire</sup> <sup>assigned to the two</sup> <sup>that it</sup>

in a drawer at Kensington Palace. I should judge from internal evidence <sup>that it</sup> may have been composed, not by the <sup>young princes</sup> <sup>themselves</sup>, but by some other person, perhaps Mr. John Prince Rupert. I still think, Henry, that you attach too much importance to the convolutions of the mind. Emotions, at any rate, are really bodily sensations at bottom.

Prince Henry. But they take place in the mind, don't they? I don't think it well quite do to say that emotions are the same thing as sensations.

Prince R. Perhaps not. What I meant was that the thing which goes on in the mind must be accompanied by a bodily sensation, if ~~we~~ we are to have a real emotion. We think something or other and at the same time we have a diffused feeling in our body. This we call having a feeling or an emotion. If there were no feeling we should simply have had a thought or a judgment. If I had no body, I can't conceive myself having an emotion.

Prince H. There's no logical objection to that, of course; and I suppose we often do have sensations at the same time as emotions and caused by them. But I don't agree that they are essential to the nature of emotions. We might quite well have one without the other.

Prince R. We sometimes think we do; but then we very often think that we



have feelings, especially aesthetic feelings, when as a matter of fact we are only making judgments. The presence of sensation is the test of genuine emotion. Do you remember Bedford's saying recently that since he passed thirty he seldom experienced a feeling in his back from the reading of poetry? Did not that simply mean that poetry no longer gives him emotions? He reads it, no doubt, and knows what is good and what is bad and enjoys making these judgments and very likely makes better judgments than he used to. But I don't believe that he can have lost the faculty ~~power~~ of sensation and kept that of emotion. And the same thing is true of pictures. We often look at ~~pictures~~ <sup>them</sup> with enjoyment; but we are having no feelings towards them if they leave our bodies unmoved. Those who are most sensitive to these things are the most frequently and violently affected in their bodies.

Prince H. You seem now to be adopting the aesthetic theory of that aesthetic and applying it to other things besides pictures.

Prince R. No, I don't think I am. He says that pictures affect the mind through the body. I think the state of the mind is responsible for the state of the body. Our thrill need not <sup>even</sup> necessarily be due solely to the intrinsic qualities of the picture. <sup>merely</sup> The picture may suggest some image or circumstance or idea which produces this effect upon us. But if it produces no such effect and leaves us cold, then I think we have no feelings towards the picture, however much we may admire it.

Prince H. I still think you are confusing an effect with a cause. If we have an emotion, it will often happen that the <sup>consequent</sup> disturbance to our nerves will lead to vague bodily ~~sensations~~ sensations. But it is a confusion to say that these sensations are part of the emotion.



Prince R. I don't much care if it is. It will not affect my point. The important thing is this, that these sensations are a critera of the genuineness of our emotion. If my theory is accepted, we shall be able to know much more clearly than we do at present when we are really feeling. We so easily deceive ourselves about it. An unemotional state of mind towards poetry or pictures may have value, I daresay; but it has not the peculiar value which we attach to genuine feeling unless there is something not merely mental about ~~our~~ state. it.

Prince H. Do you apply your theory only to aesthetic feelings or to others as well?

Prince R. Oh, to others especially. The people who feel sensations towards poetry or pictures at all frequently are very few; and that is why there is so much self-deception in the matter. I doubt if our sensations ever show really bad taste. But in other affairs most people have emotions and experience the sensations I mean.

Prince H. <sup>How can they</sup> You say <sup>that</sup> sensations are infallible in matters of taste? People's feelings ~~with~~ are, surely, as various as their judgments.

Prince R. Different people often have different feelings on the same occasions; but it does not follow that they are leaning them towards the same things. They may think their feeling is towards one thing when it is really towards another. ~~They~~

will call a picture beautiful, perhaps, <sup>because</sup> ~~because~~ it has given them an emotion; when their emotion has been towards something quite different <sup>and not towards</sup> from the beauty of the picture. Some apparent bad taste is due to this; ~~and~~ <sup>but</sup> most bad taste is the result of their making judgments when they <sup>have</sup> had no feeling at all. I think it is very rare to have a <sup>real and</sup> bodily emotion which is in bad taste. If people only called <sup>a picture</sup> ~~things~~ beautiful when its appearance, and nothing



else about it, neither its subject nor its associations nor its suggestions, had given them a bodily feeling, there would not be very much difference of opinion. But everybody thinks it his business to make these judgments, although most people seldom or never have these feelings.

Princk H. You still seem to be talking about something very like tactile value or life enhancing properties or whatever the right phrases in this theory are.

Princk R. No, I don't think I am. According to <sup>the</sup> ~~this~~ theory, <sup>you are speaking of ought to have</sup> a picture ~~of~~ the same kind of effect on one that a hot bath <sup>has</sup> and produces mental effects by throwing the body into a certain state, just as the hot bath does. This is not what I hold. The emotion works through the mind, but it appears in the body. Certain mental perceptions cause a certain state of the body, and when this happens we say that we are having emotions.

Princk H. What have you got to say about the non-aesthetic emotions? I think I interrupted when you were beginning to explain them.

Princk R. They are <sup>the</sup> best evidence of the truth of my theory; for in most people they are much commoner and much stronger than the aesthetic emotions. And I can appeal to everybody to agree with me that they never have an emotion without a feeling in some part of the body, in the head or the back or the stomach. Of course there is the sexual emotion which everybody admits to be physical; and it can be physical without in the least degrading for that reason into mere sensuality. For in ~~the~~ <sup>being physical</sup> respect it is not out of the way or different from any other emotion. Anger and grief and affection are equally physical when we truly feel them.



Prinice H. But do you think that when we are slightly angry or rather sorry we have a physical feeling?

Prinice R. It may be so slight that we hardly notice it; if there is actually no feeling at all, then we are making judgments without having the emotions corresponding to them. What you say suggests another <sup>point</sup> ~~point~~ ~~test~~. Do we not measure the intensity of an emotion by the intensity of feeling to which it gives rise? A strong emotion is one that moves our bodies strongly. ~~Therefore~~, in these cases of non-aesthetic emotion the bodily sensation is the best test of what is genuine. Who can feel grief without a certain physical sensation in the head? Do not tears move us because we regard them as a proof of real feeling? They seem to me to be directly caused by the sensation in the head characteristic of <sup>certain</sup> ~~some~~ emotions.

Prinice H. Well it seems that disembodied spirits will be cold creatures and we must hope for the resurrection of the body.



28 Nov 1908

Holthouse

Norton

Marsh

Brooke

Shepherd

Moderator

11