

Ans is bound by ye time & Apostolic  
Faith to regard the phenomenon  
truly as relative, Oct. 1889



Are we compelled by the true & Apostolic  
Faith to regard the standard of ~~the~~ ideal beauty  
as relative?

For like as we are compelled to regard truth  
as absolute so also are we bound to regard  
morality as absolute & beauty as absolute  
Yet not these absolutes but these relations.  
For as we are to regard truth as relative so  
also is morality relative & beauty relative  
but these absolutes, &c.

Yet not these relations ~~are~~.

To which if I cannot convert <sup>my brethren</sup> ~~the society~~  
~~I shall~~ without doubt <sup>they shall will</sup> be eternally  
confounded ~~not today~~ & confused in  
their views of the nature of beauty.

The standard of beauty is not like the poor  
or the Universal consciousness or the Hegelian  
dialectic which we have always with us  
but it comes round at regular intervals  
like Halle's Comet or the young man who



Collects for the church missionary Society. ~~The~~  
~~question has the advantage of being unanswerable~~  
~~Let us try to answer it.~~

It is never daunted by the fact that it never  
 receives an answer any more than the young  
 man is suppressed by not receiving subscriptions.

For the sake of As a sop to our Classical  
 brethren rather than as throwing light on the  
 subject I will quote a passage <sup>from the Symposium</sup>

"When a man's education in love has reached this  
 point after a consistent & correct investigation of  
 beautiful things <sup>there</sup> ~~he~~ with now does he reach the end  
 suddenly flash upon him some one <sup>marvelous</sup> ~~wonderful~~ &  
~~beautiful~~ thing essentially beautiful & this is the  
 goal of all his former labours. In the first  
 place it is eternal it is not subject to birth nor  
 death nor growth nor decay & in the 2nd place  
 it is not merely beautiful in part nor merely at  
 certain times nor with regard merely to certain  
 considerations nor & under certain circumstances  
 nor in the eyes of certain people."



We see that ~~men~~ Plato tries to excuse ~~them~~ <sup>his</sup> love of beauty by imagining some thing beyond of which ~~our beauty~~ <sup>our beauty</sup> is only a suggestion just as the Jews excuse themselves for their rather peculiar moral views by saying please sir it was not me sir God did it.

The Jews explained the fact that it was more satisfactory to see two people ~~to rendering~~ <sup>helping</sup> one another mutual help than to see them quarrelling by saying that some one else called Jah preferred it so.

The upholder of the absolute theory of beauty says that an unresolved discord in music is less satisfactory than a resolved one not because his nervous system is so constructed that one is a pleasurable the other a painful sensation but that one is a reflection of something he knows nothing about an ideal beauty the other is two



sounds, and therefore <sup>a</sup> purely physical phenomenon & is unsatisfying to the soul; or rather he does not say this because the example I have taken puts the question in its simplest form and the absolutist looks to attack it in its most complex because there ~~is~~ <sup>he finds</sup> floating words of emotion where he may escape his own notice telling a lie.

If this ideal beauty towards which all human beauty is an approximation ~~is a~~ <sup>thing</sup> of which we ~~may~~ <sup>shall</sup> become cognizant in a future state is a ~~thing~~ of beauty of sense wherein we might ask does it differ from our own beauty and if not how can a beauty that is purely unknown have relation to it.



5 2/10

If when we <sup>perceive</sup> are able to ~~attain~~ to the ideal beauty we have ceased to require a digestive apparatus ~~what~~ how can the torso of the Venus de Milo please us; surely it can only <sup>be satisfactory</sup> ~~appeal~~ to people with a <sup>similar</sup> ~~certain~~ physical organization.

Besides what <sup>have we</sup> evidence in experience that by perfecting our sense of beauty we shall suddenly find ourselves in the palm of Plato's ideal beauty which is <sup>unfettered</sup> ~~unconfined~~ by space & time

Is it not merely a convenient reserve which he has invented to explain all that is unanalysable in the phenomena of sensuous beauty?

The facts as we find them are something like this certain proportions of ~~obj~~ ~~the~~ lines in space or certain proportions of rapidity of vibration in air or ether ~~so~~ arouse in us intense emotional activity ~~which other which~~ proportions of

exactly similar matter or rate of vibration of matter are either indifferent or positively







Structure of our sense organs.

If then we ~~reject~~ <sup>reject</sup> ~~refer~~ an absolute standard as we left to wallow in the slough of individual caprice - is there no proper study of aesthetics and is that deadly bore or often quoted motto of the Philistine to say or justibus non disputandum est to say us ~~for ever~~ entirely. May to Tommy make room for your Uncle be as high a perfect a work of art as Lycidas.

To then nothing more permanent in our dislike ~~liking~~ of Burne Jones or Botticelli than in our love of the top-hat or the bustle. To then no standard <sup>of beauty</sup> ~~but~~ <sup>that</sup> ~~our~~ <sup>which</sup> a passing fashion or our individual whim imposes upon us.

I think there is. ~~I~~ I think <sup>one</sup> ~~a~~ <sup>that</sup> <sup>thing</sup> may be said to be more beautiful than another of its kind when it ~~arouses~~ <sup>is</sup>



But if we reject an absolute standard of beauty  
~~it~~ we shall



is calculated to prod  
 more perfectly adapted to <sup>arouse</sup> ~~bring out~~  
 the keenest pleasure in a man whose <sup>1370</sup>  
 senses had been educated to their highest  
 conceivable pitch. i.e. the ideal beauty  
 wld. be the beauty which appealed to the  
 ideal man. It is needless to say that this  
 is not a fixed standard that we can ~~so~~ ever  
 apply but we can get approximation towards  
 it and it is noticeable that certain that if  
 a <sup>number of people</sup> ~~person~~ devote themselves to the study  
 of what is & is not beautiful they ~~come~~  
~~to certain~~ arrive at similar results within  
 very wide limits. In music for instance the  
 agreement is so striking that the results can be  
 formulated to some extent with mathematical  
 accuracy.

But it may be objected what do you  
 mean by your ideal man and have you  
 any right to postulate him. is not each man  
 the fulfilment of separate ideals and are not  
 species and therefore man as a species a  
 purely conventional sign like the equator in  
 the hunting of the shark according to the bellman.  
 I can only say that there is a growing  
 feeling among naturalists that there are  
 other forces at work in the production of  
 the existing forms of animals & plants  
~~besides~~ besides adaptation of circumstance and  
 that each species may be said to always  
 to approach an ideal type around which  
 is perhaps never attained to but which is  
 as it were the mean of all the variations  
 of that species.



This idea fits in remarkably with Sir  
Joshua Reynolds' idea of beauty as the thing  
which is not ugly that is to say that  
form from which all individuality which  
consists in the deviation from the central  
type ~~exists~~ is ~~deflected~~ removed. Nature makes  
ugliness more often than beauty but beauty  
more often than any particular form of  
ugliness. He compares it to a pendulum  
which in swinging backwards & forwards  
never returns on the same line as it went  
before but all the lines have a common  
point of intersection which is the ideal beauty.  
According to this view Fr. Galton's composite  
photographs if ~~that~~ should be more  
beautiful than a Greek Greek statue  
which they ~~are not~~. A fact which has not  
yet been recognized.  
The ideal beauty is then

St. James's Westminster Sq. W. 1A  
King's College  
Cambridge.



*c.c.*  
Fashion.  
~~Etter~~

What I wish to suggest is that beauty is  
~~the only~~ <sup>only the</sup> way in which we ~~can~~ must arrange  
 sensations for them to stimulate satisfactorily  
 our sense organs just as ~~truth~~ the order  
 which we perceive in the universe may be  
 regarded as an order in our 'perceptions',  
 phenomena & not in ~~their~~ perception  
 themselves. I quote Mr. Pearson partly because  
 he says what I want partly to make  
 quite sure that our brother M.E.T. will  
 contradict me.

2/2  
c