

Dear Harold,

Consider the case where the 'if' clause expresses or simulates a universal proposition: e.g. if the soul is mortal, god is unjust. You say this means: the soul's being mortal implies god's being unjust. But will this do? For 'the soul's being mortal' is exactly what is in doubt. Those words are not known to stand for a universal which really is (just as 'if' was in the garden's doesn't stand for an individual sort of things which really exists): if they were known to stand for a real universal, we could say Because & not If. It is precisely because we don't know whether the universal 'human soulness' has the property of ^{communicating} "communicating" with 'mortality' that we say 'if'. In other words the prop. 'The human soul is mortal' is a universal proposition: even if there were no individual souls, it would be true (as you might prefer) if it were true at all: but the matter ^{is} is. ^{is} it true at all? Your remarks about the indifference of universals to the existence or non-existence of their instances don't apply here: the difficulty is really within the world of universals itself. So also 'if' unprovokedly is vicious, no man is free from vice: ~~the argument that, as you say, is not valid~~ ~~but the argument for the difference~~ Here also is the 'if' cases where we suppose that a certain universal proposition

R. F. Harrod by.

Christ Church.

is true, or (if you prefer) that a certain general fact, or
general proposition, is real. Here again we are not
talking a bit about individual instances.

Did you in your theory on the word 'imply'? If so,
let this say. $A \text{ implies } B \text{ only} = \text{if } A \text{ is, then } B \text{ is.}$
So 'imply' can't be used to explain 'if'.

But since has just arrived: so I must stop.

G. Lodge Logic Vol. 2. on the 'World of Ideas':

Yours.

~~stop~~.

R. F. Harrod Esq.

Christ Church.

~~stop~~.