

THE  
MECHANISM OF MAN.

AN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION

WHAT AM I?

A POPULAR INTRODUCTION TO

MENTAL PHYSIOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY.

BY

EDWARD W. COX,

SERJEANT-AT-LAW, PRESIDENT OF THE PSYCHOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF  
GREAT BRITAIN,

VOL. I.

THE MECHANISM.

---

---

THIRD EDITION.

---

---

LONDON:  
LONGMAN AND CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.

1879.

## PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

---

Two large Editions have been exhausted with a still increasing demand.

The Second Edition, enlarging the entire scheme of the work, was re-arranged and almost entirely re-written.

It has not been found necessary to make many changes in this Third Edition. The opportunity has been taken to revise the composition, but the substance of the treatise remains unaltered. The severe criticism to which it was subjected has been well considered and with due respect. But as the objections raised are for the most part argumentative only, they have induced but few alterations in the conclusions asserted by the Author as reasonably to be drawn from the *facts* adduced.

The Author is fully conscious that the great and unexpected success of his endeavour to combat the Materialism of Science by the weapons of Science, and the cordial welcome with which his little book has been received, not by his own countrymen only, but in every European country and in America, are due to the profound interest and importance of its subject and to no merit of his in the treatment of it beyond fearless maintenance of the unpopular and discredited doctrine of Soul in Man,



not holden as a vague faith merely, but as a conviction founded upon facts capable of proof by scientific evidence.

So long as Soul was recognised as but a faith based upon dogma, the Scientists were content to treat it with contempt, as a harmless superstition at which they could afford to smile, but which opposed no substantial weapon to the Materialism and Automatism they had honestly embraced as the apparently inevitable deductions from their researches.

But an attempt to challenge their conclusion upon their own premisses—a confident assertion that Soul can be *proved*, and Automatism and Materialism shattered, by the same process of scientific research as that upon which all their own Science is erected, required to be received in a very different fashion. Such a challenge—feeble as was the challenger—could not be met by silence. Facts and phenomena exhibited by the Mechanism of Man in its normal and abnormal conditions must be opposed by other weapons.

As in all the conflicts of Science, at all times and in all countries, the Scientists began by denial of the facts and phenomena, not by *disproof* of them; by argument *à priori* that they *cannot* be and therefore are not.

That failing, the next step was to discredit the witnesses. They were not honest; if honest, they were not competent; if competent by general intelligence and experience, in the particular instances they were the victims of *illusion* or *delusion*.

That is the present position of the controversy. The assertion is still repeated here, with entire confidence, that the Mechanism of Man is directed and determined by *some* intelligent force within itself; that the existence

of that force is proved by the facts and phenomena attendant upon the motions of that Mechanism in its normal and its abnormal conditions; that this force is by the same evidence proved to be the product of *something* other than the molecular mechanism of the body; that this *something* is an entity distinct from that molecular structure and capable of action beyond and apart from it; that this *Something* is what is called SOUL, and that this Soul lives after it has parted from the body.

EDWARD W. COX.

*Serjeants' Inn,*  
30th June, 1879.

---





## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

---

THE origin and design of this little book may be briefly stated.

It proposes to inquire if there be any and what *evidence* that, *as a fact in Science*, to be proved scientifically, there is in Man an intelligent and conscious *Something* other than his *material* (that is, his *molecular*) structure, by which that structure is intelligently controlled and directed—*Something* not a condition or product merely of that structure, but a *distinct entity*.

If such a *Something* be found, then come the questions:

*What* is it—what are its qualities, its powers, and its capacities?

Has it a distinct existence and individuality, and may it be reasonably presumed to survive the structure it possesses?

This is the special province of the Science of **PSYCHOLOGY**.

*Physiology* investigates the material structure and its functions.

*Psychology* investigates the *forces* that move, direct and control the structure.

**LIFE—MIND—SOUL.**

But it is impossible to treat of these without having before us an outline at least of the mechanism they move.

Consequently, a popular introduction to Psychology

would be imperfect and almost unintelligible without a brief preliminary sketch of the structure so moved and directed.

Hence the enlargement of the original design to the scheme indicated in the title of this book—*The Mechanism of Man*.

It may, perhaps, be permitted to me to state briefly how so presumptuous an enterprise came to be adventured.

Listening, with the respect that becomes a Student of Science, to the arguments of the great Scientists of our time, I found my faith shaken—my confidence that I had a Soul rudely disturbed and my hope of immortality shattered. I resolved to determine this doubt in one way or the other by a formal and careful investigation. As a thinking man, who must have sound *reasons*, based upon sufficient *evidence*, for any belief, I could not be content with the mere assertions of authority on a matter of such great moment. Science has appealed to Nature to prove that man is but an automaton. *Nature is God's truth*. I could not honestly meet the objections of Science save by Science, and therefore the task I proposed to myself was to inquire, laboriously and carefully, if there be any *facts* and *phenomena* from which Science might reasonably deduce the conclusion, denied by the Scientists, that there *is Something* in the Mechanism of Man other than his molecular structure—some *intelligent entity*, call it what we may, other than the body and capable of an existence apart from the body.

But what course should such an inquiry take? Metaphysicians and Mental Philosophers, as hitherto they have pursued it, have given an easy victory to the Physicists, because they sought that knowledge within themselves instead of noting the action of the intelligent motive forces in others, as exhibited in abnormal as in normal conditions, and because they preferred *à priori* argument as less laborious than investigation by observation, experiment and collection of *facts*. In a *scientific* inquiry if there be a Soul in Man another path must be



pursued. The inquiry must be conducted by the same methods as the Physicists have so successfully employed to ascertain the facts of their Sciences. *They* have learned the existence and qualities of the *Physical* forces, themselves imperceptible, by observing the action of those forces upon the molecular matter which alone our senses are constructed to perceive. In like manner we can scientifically learn *if* Soul is and *what* it is by one process only—examination of the *actions* of the Mechanism of Man in its various conditions of order and disorder, and inquiring if any of these raise the reasonable inference that there is in that mechanism an *Intelligent Something* other than the molecular body—call it *Soul*, or *Spirit*, or by whatever name we may prefer.

The pursuit of such an inquiry, even if it should prove to be of no utility to others, could not fail to be of incalculable advantage to myself. It would compel me to *think out* the whole subject—as so large and obscure a theme can only be sufficiently examined—by writing upon it. Mere thought too often cheats itself. It shirks difficulties or overleaps them. It accepts as definite much that is often indistinct. It is content not to probe too deeply the fallacies of an argument. But such self-imposition is impossible upon paper. The weak places are mercilessly betrayed. We are forced to measure the precise extent of our knowledge—the authenticity of our intelligence—the worth or worthlessness of the reasonings upon which we have relied. When that writing is addressed to a public not initiated into the mystery of technicalities and no opportunity is allowed for the concealment of cloudy thoughts under mystical words, the necessity for the employment of plain English enforces upon the writer the formation of definite ideas in his own mind. Clear speech can come only from clear thought.

More, then, for my own instruction than with any hope to inform others, an adventurous attempt was made to answer the question, “*What am I?*” It was commenced



with a firm resolve to throw aside all preconceptions, prejudices, and dominant ideas, admitting no other desire or design than to ascertain *the very truth*. The Mechanism of Man should be examined with honest purpose to learn what is *really* known about it, what is doubtful and what is unknown.

The work was pursued with diligence. As it proceeded, new views and new regions for thought opened at every step. The labour grew. The scheme extended. It was not complete without tracing Man backwards to the very beginning of life, and onwards through growth, maturity, decline and death. In the examination of the *forces* by which the Mechanism of Man is moved and the manner of their action, a world of new and curious facts presented themselves as being obviously associated with his psychic nature.

The circle of things *to be* known, but of which as yet we know little or nothing, extended as I advanced. Novel conceptions were suggested of the dual nature of Man and of the relationship of the non-molecular to the molecular structure. In the end, the great TRUTH came as a *conviction* of the Reason by positive *evidence*—as a FACT, and not merely as a *faith*—that *Man has a Soul*—or, as I should prefer to say—MAN IS A SOUL of which the material molecular body is but the mechanism through which that Soul, *which is himself*, maintains communication with the material world.

The *facts* upon which this conclusion is founded and the chain of argument by which it was deduced from the facts were fully and frankly stated in that little book.

Knowing the contempt of the scientific world for that which they call a pseudo-science, as having no real subject matter, and the indifference of the popular world to the questions of which it treated, the profound scepticism of the educated, the bigotry of the half-educated, and the incapacity of the uneducated to understand so unfamiliar a theme, success was not even hoped for. A very small circle of sympathetic readers

who, having shared my doubts, might possibly be curious to learn how I had resolved them, was the utmost I had anticipated. I dared not look for a more favourable reception from the Reviewers. The subject-matter of such a book would, I was well aware, be deemed to have no interest for their readers, and as, from the nature of its theme, it could not be reviewed without being read, the labour of reading would not unreasonably be looked upon as wasted. And so it proved. The work came forth, not only without a word of welcome, but without the slightest notice given to it by any of the principal London journals. Even the *Spectator*, which usually pays more attention to books of this class than of any other, put it aside without a word. Of all the daily papers, the *Morning Post* alone favoured it with a notice.

In these unfavourable conditions, the surprise was great to myself and greater to my Publishers to find the entire edition of 750 copies exhausted in less than twelve months. Little noticed by the press and advertised scarcely at all, the almost unprecedented fact occurred, that the sale, at first insignificant, grew week by week until thrice the number printed would not have sufficed for the demand. This was found to be due entirely to the recommendation of the work by one reader to another, in multiplying circles.

Nor was the interest it had so unexpectedly excited limited to this country. Communications crowded upon me from all parts of the civilized world, some disputing my conclusions, some commending, some asking explanations, some reporting phenomena and facts, but all exhibiting an eager interest in the subjects treated of, showing how entirely I had mistaken the apparent conversion of the general mind to Materialism and magnified the seeming indifference of the world to the existence of Soul. It was plain now that, as dogmatic faith had been rudely shaken by Science, the desire had grown to learn if Science could not substitute for that faith some *facts*, supported by *proofs*, that Man is *not* an



automaton—that he *is* something other than his perishing body and *may* hope to inherit a hereafter.

It would be affectation to deny that a success, so little anticipated, was very gratifying. But I was conscious also that it was due more to the transcendent importance and interest of the subject than to the treatment of it. The book had unconsciously struck an unsuspected vein in the public mind. It had partially supplied a new need produced by a new phase of opinion. Science having shattered faith in the destinies of humanity, an eager welcome was accorded to an honest, however inefficient, attempt to restore by Science the hope that Science had destroyed. This was the secret of the strange success, and nothing more than this. But it was the least reward for the labour bestowed upon the work. The advantage to my own mind of having in this manner *thought out* the subject and the clearness of the view of it so obtained has been to me of incalculable personal service.

A new edition being thus early called for, I resolved, after some consideration, to extend and recast the entire work. The subject had grown upon me as the task proceeded. One thought had suggested many new thoughts. A more systematic scheme of treatment had occurred to me. Some themes fitly belonging to the subject had been overlooked. Criticism had discovered defects to be removed and omissions to be supplied. Further reflection had changed some of the suggestions offered and modified others. Instead of merely a reprint, I resolved to recast and rewrite almost the entire of the work, to extend the scheme of it, and to give to it a more appropriate name. It is now in fact, as in title, a new book, increased in bulk by one-fourth, and having three-fourths of it entirely new.

I have only further to add that the establishment of a Psychological Society for the promotion of the Science to which this treatise is designed as an Introduction, then merely in contemplation, is now an accomplished fact. The *Psychological Society of Great Britain* has been formed with two objects; *first*, to collect from all



authentic sources *Facts* and *Phenomena* upon which alone Science can be securely based; and *secondly*, to elicit by discussion the Science that can only be securely erected upon a broad basis of facts. The Society is already flourishing, and it invites information and assistance from all quarters.

I venture to prefer the same request on my own behalf. The next and concluding volume will be devoted to an examination of the Mechanism of Man in action. *Physical Facts and Phenomena* are the exhibitions of the action of that Mechanism, and they alone will enable us to discover what is the structure of so much of the Mechanism of Man as from its site or formation cannot be examined while at work, and also so much of it as, not being of molecular structure, is imperceptible to the senses. It is by these facts and phenomena that I here propose to prove, in strict accordance with the methods and rules of Science, that Man is *not* an automaton—that he is something more than body—that in truth, *we are Souls*.

Let me add that every duly authenticated psychological fact and phenomenon that can be reported to me by any reader, in aid of the array of evidence already accumulated, will be gratefully welcomed.

Temple,  
28th Jan., 1876.

EDWARD W. COX.

---

authentic sources *Facts* and *Phenomena* upon which alone Science can be securely based; and *secondly*, to elicit by discussion the Science that can only be securely erected upon a broad basis of facts. The Society is already flourishing, and it invites information and assistance from all quarters.

I venture to prefer the same request on my own behalf. The next and concluding volume will be devoted to an examination of the Mechanism of Man in action. *Physical Facts and Phenomena* are the exhibitions of the action of that Mechanism, and they alone will enable us to discover what is the structure of so much of the Mechanism of Man as from its site or formation cannot be examined while at work, and also so much of it as, not being of molecular structure, is imperceptible to the senses. It is by these facts and phenomena that I here propose to prove, in strict accordance with the methods and rules of Science, that Man is *not* an automaton—that he is something more than body—that in truth, *we are Souls*.

Let me add that every duly authenticated psychological fact and phenomenon that can be reported to me by any reader, in aid of the array of evidence already accumulated, will be gratefully welcomed.

Temple,  
28th Jan., 1876.

EDWARD W. COX.

---





## PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITON.

*(This is reprinted as presenting fully the scheme of the treatise.)*

---

THE study of Psychology has not kept pace with the progress of the Physical Sciences. Its Professors can be counted upon the fingers; its disciples are few; its literature is scanty and unsatisfactory. To the multitude, even of the educated classes, it is an almost unknown Science.

But what study can rival it in real importance or in interest? What Science concerns us all so directly and so seriously? For what is Psychology but the Science of Ourselves? Physiology deals with the structure of our bodies and the functions of the various parts of that structure. The Forces that direct its actions are the greater subjects of Psychological Science. The province of Physiology is Body. The province of Psychology is Mind and Soul.

Opponents will say, perhaps, that, although it is universally admitted that we have Minds, it is denied by great authorities that we have Souls.

True. And a primary purpose of Psychology is to inquire if there be a Soul in Man, and if such there be, what are its dwelling, its functions, its capacities, and its immediate destiny, so far, at least, as Science can trace or reasonably conjecture them. Its *far future* is the province of Theology. My purpose here is to treat the *scientific* question only.

Of late we may perceive a slight rising of the tide in favour of Psychological inquiry. Phrenology gave to it the first great impulse, by reducing the study of Mind from metaphysics to physics; from inner consciousness to observation; from con-

jecture to fact; in brief, by applying to the Science of Mind the Baconian process of investigation, which has wrought such miracles in all the Physical Sciences.

The small progress made by Psychology and Mental Philosophy, when other Science has been advancing with such giant strides, appears to be the consequence of the obsolete method of investigation pursued by the few who have undertaken the study of them. The Chemist seizes the substance into whose composition and qualities he is desirous to inquire, and applies to it certain tests, by which he transforms it into other substances or reduces it to its elements. The Physiologist takes his organised material, scrutinises it with his microscope, marks its composition and its form, and, to find its functions, he severs a living fibre or a throbbing nerve, and notes what loss of power results from his vivisection. But the Psychologist cannot seize, and confine, and carve, and scrutinise, and torture the material of which Mind and Soul are made. He cannot even discern them by either of his senses, nor with the help of his most powerful instruments. What then remains for him? How is he to ascertain their existence at all, or to learn what are their structure, qualities, and functions? Obviously he can do this only by studying their *manifestations*. Their substance being imponderable and imperceptible, the Psychologist, having no tangible material wherewith to work, can investigate Mind and Soul only by observing the movements they impart to the material organs through which alone they can hold communication with the material world, and by carefully noting the action of the mechanism they direct.

But, instead of dealing thus with these subjects, Philosophers have been content with consulting only their own inner consciousness, and this being very limited, it has followed, as a necessary consequence, that the nineteenth century sees us but little better acquainted, *scientifically*, than we were in the ninth century, with Mind and Soul, their structure, functions, and capacities, and their relationship to the body, to each other, and to the world on which they exist.

Nor until this error of procedure be distinctly recognised, and Psychology treated in the same fashion as are the Physical Sciences—that is to say, by the gathering together of *facts*, attested by good and sufficient evidence, trying them by experiments carefully conducted, rejecting nothing on merely *à priori* argument, nor because of its apparent impossibility, or improba-



bility, or seeming inconsistency with some fact or law already assumed to be true,—can any hope be entertained of substantial progress in this the noblest of the Sciences. We must first observe with care and caution, test with skill, and note with accuracy. Not until facts are accumulated should we venture to assign causes. The golden rule of all true Science is, first, to collect your facts, and then, and not till then, to construct your theory.

Smatterers in Science and the outside world never recognise this rule. When a new fact is observed and asserted, they ask the observer how he explains that new fact, and if he cannot do so, they deny the fact itself.

A fact can only be proved or disproved by experiment. It cannot be answered by argument. Try it for yourself, if you doubt the authority. *If it is*, you will find it. *If it is not*, you will do Science a service by dissipating a delusion.

There is but one philosophical method of meeting the assertion of a fact in science, made by credible and competent witnesses,—by yourself making trial of it under the same conditions.

It was with an impression that there are now many persons who desire to obtain some knowledge of Psychology, but who are deterred from its study by the ponderous volumes of abstruse argument, clothed in a difficult and strange nomenclature, to which they are usually referred, and which are intelligible only to the far advanced Philosopher, that the thought occurred to me, if it might not be possible to make a book that should present to the beginner an Introductory outline of the Science of Psychology, written in plain language, such as the ordinary Mind might be enabled to comprehend without much difficulty.

As I reflected upon it, the design grew. I found that I could not well describe the mind without also giving some account of the Body. A description of the Anatomy and Physiology of the human structure was of course impracticable within the limits of such a work as I had contemplated. But a rude outline of the general scheme on which that structure is framed appeared to be necessary to the understanding of the construction and functions of those parts of the human organization which are the proper subjects of Psychology.

It then became an obvious suggestion that the design should be completed by making the object of the work to be, a description of A MAN, such as would supply to the popular intelligence an appropriate answer to the question, "WHAT AM I?"

The plan pursued has been to divide the entire subject into two parts.

The *first* part, which occupies this first volume, is devoted to a description of the Human Mechanism—Body—Mind—Soul—merely as it is constructed.

The *second* part will be devoted to a description of this *Machinery in action*, and it will embrace all the phenomena of *intellectual existence*, as distinguished from purely organic life, viewing it in its normal and abnormal conditions, in health and in disease—the *manifestations*, in fact, alluded to above, from which alone any knowledge can be obtained, or any satisfactory judgment formed, of the being, capacities, functions, and powers of the Forces, whatever they may be, by which the machine is moved to action and by which its actions are directed.

These will be found to be full of the most curious interest, not merely from the strange character of many of the facts that will be gathered together, but by reason of the overwhelming importance of some of the conclusions to which they appear to point.

Among the special conditions of the human organism that will thus pass under review in the second and concluding volume will be those of Sleep and Dream, Insanity, Hallucination, Unconscious Cerebration, Trance, Delirium, Psychic Force, and Natural and Artificial Somnambulism. The near relationship of these conditions to Health and Disease, and the light they cast on many of the seeming mysteries of Mind and Soul, will form a prominent part of the treatment of these themes, lying as they do entirely within the proper province of Psychology.

For it is with Psychology as with Medicine, function is best studied when it is disordered. When the Forces and the frame work together in harmony, it is difficult to discern their precise relationships; but when the machine is out of gear we are enabled to discover the hidden Mechanism by the jarring of the dislocated or broken wheels.

I am not a Scientist, but, if I may without affectation use the term as descriptive of one who recognises scientific rules and methods of research as the only permissible form of inquiry into *any* region of Nature, I am a Student of Science. And it is in the true spirit of such an one, with a single-minded endeavour to learn the very truth, without prejudice of any kind, that this work has been undertaken.

I have been asked, and shall be asked again, wherefore I do



not remit the question of the existence of Soul to the Theologians, and leave them to do battle with the Materialists.

I fear it is to this erroneous policy that the present prevalence of the doctrine of Materialism is mainly due. The question can never be fought out between the Divine and the Scientist, because they have no common ground upon which to combat. The Scientists unhappily for the most part dispute the Authority which is the basis of the Theologian's argument. It is consequently impossible that the Scientists can be convinced and converted by the Theologians. Materialism based on Science can be confronted only with its own weapons. *He who would do battle with it successfully must wield arguments scientifically deduced from facts scientifically ascertained.* The Divine cannot do this, for he may not abandon the high ground of Authority, whose part it is, not to prove but to *declare*. I hope, therefore, that I have not taken a useless path, however it may be deemed presumptuous, in thus endeavouring to support the contention for the existence of the Soul by arguments altogether apart from those which the Scientists reject, and based entirely upon that foundation of Fact alone which Science will consent to recognise.

It will be observed that, in the working out of this design, I have ventured to proffer some new suggestions that presented themselves to me as I wrote, the value of which I must leave to be estimated by others. But wherever this was done, I have been careful so to state, that the Reader may take them as suggestions merely, and not as asserted truths. Such are the speculations as to the manner in which the body is builded by the nerve system; and the proposition that the body is constructed of *two* germs, and not of one only, as Physiologists have hitherto supposed, with some others. The application of these principles of structure to the practice of medicine is also merely a suggestion of my own, whose worth it is for others to estimate. Throughout I have endeavoured distinctly to indicate what is doubtful and what may be deemed to be established. Doubtless it will surprise many to find how much the former predominates, proving the verity of the remark made above, that Psychology lamentably lags in the rear of the other Sciences.

But let us hope that this reproach will cleave to her no longer. Wherefore should not Psychology be made the especial subject for an Association similar to those which have so greatly promoted the progress of other Sciences of far less interest and

importance? The field of research is large enough to be the single business of a Psychological Society, and it needs but a little exertion to secure for it a numerous and influential body of Members.

In the course of the composition of this little book my attention has been often and forcibly directed to the extremely unsatisfactory character of scientific evidence. To a Lawyer, who has imbibed from his youth up the Principles of Evidence, and who has been trained, by experience in Court of Justice, to the almost instinctive recognition of what does or does not constitute *proof*, there is nothing so surprising, and at the same time so vexatious, as the almost entire disregard of the plainest principles of Evidence by the votaries of Science, who assert and deny facts, apparently without the slightest conception of the nature or degree of *proof* necessary to be produced before any asserted fact can be either accepted or rejected. One disputant appears to consider that the mere assertion of some stranger, of whose credibility or otherwise he is wholly ignorant, is of itself sufficient, without examination or cross-examination. Another will reject the testimony of twenty credible men because the fact they assert appears to him to be contrary to some assumed fact or theory which he has hitherto holden to be true. All produce *hearsay*, apparently without the most distant conception that it is wholly inadmissible as *proof*, and that it can be accepted only provisionally, for the purpose of directing investigation. Take almost any treatise on any Science and strike the pen through every fact asserted for which no sufficient proof is adduced—such proof as would suffice to convict an offender of the smallest offence before any legal tribunal—and what a skeleton would remain! This disregard of the most elementary rules of evidence is especially remarkable in works that treat of Physiology, Medicine, and Psychology. Cases are confidently narrated for which no proof whatever is or can be produced, and upon such flimsy materials whole theories will be found to be constructed or opposed. In the following pages I have endeavoured, with what success others must judge, to avoid this frequent error. I have sought to apply to Science the same rules of Evidence that are recognised in Law. The principle which I adopted, and have striven to adhere to, has been to assert nothing as *proved*, except upon such evidence as a Judge would submit to a jury, and upon which he would accept their verdict in a matter affecting life or liberty. Science should be content with nothing less than this,



either for proof or disproof. Hence the continual repetitions of the warning that "this is not proved," "that is only conjecture," and such like, with which I have found it necessary so often to intimate to the Reader the boundaries between the known and the unknown, the actual and the merely probable, as they appear in the following pages. It is tedious, but it was unavoidable.

And in this connection I may, perhaps, be permitted to throw out a suggestion, which has occurred to me when painfully reminded of the disregard of the rules of evidence that prevails in scientific debate. Would it not be possible to apply to scientific inquiries the same system of trial which is found to be so efficient a means of ascertaining truth in disputes referred to the Law? Would it be altogether visionary to propose the establishment of a Society, to be formed for the express purpose of trying, by a *Tribunal of Science*, disputed *scientific facts*, pursuing precisely the same procedure as is so successfully employed in determining other disputed facts. A Judge, a Jury, Advocates on both sides, Witnesses *pro* and *con*. examined and cross-examined, speeches to the Jury, a summing-up by the Judge, and a Verdict; the same rules of evidence to be observed as in a Law Court. The uses of such a tribunal would be manifest. It would not lack work. A new discovery in Science—a new and important *fact*—is asserted and contested. Either party to the controversy may challenge the other to investigation by this Tribunal of Science. If the subject should be deemed by the Council of the Society sufficiently important to deserve inquiry, a trial would be awarded. The hearing would be of itself an invaluable teaching to the whole scientific world; it would deeply interest the outside public, and the verdict would extinguish controversies upon which much thought, time, ink, and temper, might otherwise be wasted.

The scheme is not in itself impracticable. Its benefits, if it could be accomplished, are not doubtful. I submit it to the consideration of other Minds by whom, if this mere hint of it be approved, the scheme might possibly be matured hereafter.

Some novel suggestions, which will doubtless be denounced as heresies by the orthodox Professors of Physiology, will be found in the following pages. But I have been careful to note them as speculations merely, that the most careless Reader may not mistake for assertion, as being positive truth, of that which is intended to be advanced only as more or less probable conjecture of my own.



Indeed, I have been especially careful throughout to distinguish the unknown from the known, the doubtful from the positive, suggestions from assertion, and conjecture from knowledge. We have learned but half of any Science if we have not learned also the limits at which our knowledge of it ends and our ignorance of it begins.

Great will be the surprise of the Reader, as he turns these pages, to find how small a portion of them informs him of facts that are *proved*, and how much is merely conjectural. If all the ascertained *facts* in Mental Physiology and Psychology could be tabulated on one leaf, and all the assumptions and guesses noted on another, the latter catalogue would totally eclipse the former.

If any proof were wanting of the need there is for a Society to promote the study and progress of Psychology, by doing for it what association has done for the other Sciences, it will be found in pages that tell us, not only what *is* known of it, but what there *is to be* known, and of which the world is at present ignorant.

---

# CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
PREFACE . . . . .	iii
PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION . . . . .	vi
PREFACE TO "WHAT AM I?" . . . . .	xv

---

## PART I.

### INTRODUCTION.

#### CHAPTER

I. WHAT AM I? . . . . .	1
II. THE SCIENCE OF MAN . . . . .	8
III. THE PROVINCE OF PSYCHOLOGY . . . . .	14
IV. THE METHOD OF STUDY . . . . .	19
V. SCIENTIFIC PROOF . . . . .	27
VI. MATTER AND SPIRIT . . . . .	37
VII. OF FORCE . . . . .	50
VIII. OF SOLIDITY—SIZE—SPACE—TIME . . . . .	57
IX. THE NATURAL AND THE SUPERNATURAL . . . . .	62

---

## PART II.

### THE MECHANISM OF MAN.

I. INTRODUCTORY . . . . .	67
II. THE GERM . . . . .	73
III. OF HEREDITY . . . . .	108

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. HOW WE GROW. . . . .	112
V. HOW WE LIVE . . . . .	133
VI. HEALTH . . . . .	140
VII. HOW WE SICKEN . . . . .	149
VIII. HOW WE DIE . . . . .	166

## THE FORCES THAT MOVE THE MECHANISM.

INTRODUCTORY . . . . .	175
------------------------	-----

### BOOK I. LIFE.

I. WHAT LIFE IS . . . . .	179
II. THE BEGINNING OF LIFE . . . . .	195
III. THE CESSATION OF LIFE. . . . .	203

### BOOK II. MIND.

I. INTRODUCTORY . . . . .	208
II. THE MOLECULAR MECHANISM OF THE MIND	212
III. OF THE BRAIN . . . . .	219
IV. THE DUALITY OF THE MIND . . . . .	232
V. THE NERVE FORCE . . . . .	253
VI. THE SENSES. . . . .	259
VII. THE SENSE OF SIGHT . . . . .	267
VIII. THE SENSE OF HEARING. . . . .	275
IX. THE SENSES OF TASTE AND SMELL . . . . .	278
X. THE SENSE OF TOUCH . . . . .	281



# CONTENTS.

XXV

CHAPTER	PAGE
XI. THE EVIDENCE OF THE SENSES . . . . .	284
XII. THE MOLECULAR STRUCTURE OF MIND . . . . .	290
XIII. CLASSIFICATION OF THE MENTAL POWERS. . . . .	301
XIV. THE PROPENSITIES . . . . .	305
XV. THE SENTIMENTS COMMON TO MAN WITH THE LOWER ANIMALS . . . . .	319
XVI. THE SENTIMENTS PROPER TO MAN . . . . .	328
XVII. THE INTELLECTUAL FACULTIES . . . . .	350
XVIII. THE FACULTIES THAT PERCEIVE THE RELA- TIONS OF EXTERNAL OBJECTS . . . . .	355
XIX. THE REFLECTIVE FACULTIES . . . . .	364
XX. MEMORY AND RECOLLECTION . . . . .	371
XXI. HOW THE MENTAL MECHANISM WORKS . . . . .	381
XXII. THE WILL . . . . .	387
XXIII. THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL. . . . .	398
XXIV. INSTINCT . . . . .	403

## BOOK III. SOUL.

I. INTRODUCTORY . . . . .	409
II. SOUL—SPIRIT—PSYCHE—ANIMA. . . . .	417
III. IS SOUL POSSIBLE AND PROBABLE . . . . .	428
IV. CONSCIOUSNESS . . . . .	433
V. PRESUMPTIVE EVIDENCE OF SOUL . . . . .	438
VI. WHAT SOUL IS . . . . .	450
VII. THE DWELLING-PLACE OF SOUL . . . . .	454
VIII. THE FORM OF SOUL . . . . .	457
IX. SOUL AFTER DEATH . . . . .	463
X. THE OUTLOOK OF SOUL . . . . .	473

CHAPTER	PAGE
XI. PSYCHIC (OR SOUL) FORCE . . . . .	481
XII. THE PRE-EXISTENCE OF SOUL . . . . .	483
XIII. THE DWELLING-PLACE OF SOUL . . . . .	491
XIV. THE CONDITION OF THE DISEMBODIED SOUL . . . . .	494
XV. THE MYSTERY . . . . .	496
XVI. SPECULATIONS . . . . .	500
XVII. CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	504

---

INDEX . . . . .	507
-----------------	-----

THE  
MECHANISM OF MAN.

---

PART I.  
INTRODUCTION.

---

CHAPTER I.

WHAT AM I?

CONCEIVE, if you can, of a Man created perfect in structure of mind and body, with all capacities for thought and action, placed upon this earth and suddenly summoned to life. He would look above, below, around, and the first reflection of his wondering mind would be expressed in the question, *WHERE AM I?*

Then he would survey himself—his structure, so beautiful in shape, so graceful yet so powerful in action. Contemplating the Conscious Intelligence by which that structure is controlled, himself would be the subject of his own thought and he would exclaim in amazement, "*WHAT AM I?*"

When, wearied with surveying the glories about him



and the mysteries within him, he turned to ponder upon the purpose of his own existence, whence he had come and whither he will go, he would murmur doubtfully, "WHY AM I?"

WHERE AM I?

WHAT AM I?

WHY AM I?

A perfect answer to these three questions would comprise the entire circle of human knowledge, arranged in its natural order, conveniently alike for classification and for acquisition.

The answer to the question "WHERE AM I?" embraces the structure of creation outside of ourselves. The answer to "WHAT AM I?" comprises the structure, bodily, mental, and psychical, of Man. The answer to "WHY AM I?" includes all the objects of Man's existence—all religious, moral and social science.

*Where am I?*

Placed upon a globe made of materials the history and collocation of which are comprised in the science of Geology. Chemistry and Mineralogy deal with the composition of this globe. Geography with its surface. Its inhabitants are the subjects of Natural History, Animal and Vegetable. The structure of the things having life is the province of Physiology, Biology and Psychology. In relation to the highest of them, MAN, there is the record of History. This globe is wrapped in an atmosphere, the laws of whose motions and their relationship to the structure of Man comprise the sciences of Optics and Acoustics. The motions of the materials of which this earth world is constructed form the sciences of Mechanics, Hydraulics, Hydrostatics and Pneumatics.

This globe is permeated by forces of tremendous power and unceasing action, which may possibly and even probably be one force in various forms, but which are at present investigated under different names, Magnetism, Electricity, Galvanism, Heat, Light—and each is the subject of a science.

Lastly, this globe is one of many floating in space. It is part of a system of worlds, that system probably but part of another system, and so onward beyond the reach of the human mind even to conceive, all of which knowledge is comprised in the science of Astronomy.

I have here sketched merely a faint outline of the scheme, with purpose only to show how comprehensive it is. Its development would be the proper subject of a large volume.

The answer to the question, WHAT AM I? will relate exclusively to MAN. Not to the male or the female, the white or the black, the Teuton or the Celt, the civilised or the savage, the free or the slave, but to MAN, contemplated as a being of a peculiar form, endowed with *intelligence*, subjected to certain laws that specially govern his *organic* structure and to other laws that specially govern his *psychic* structure.

The answer to the question, WHY AM I? embraces the objects of existence: for what end Man is; what are his duties to his GOD, to himself, to his fellow men. These latter are included in Moral Philosophy and in Social and Political Science. His relationship and duties to GOD are comprised in the science of Theology.

The design of the present work is limited to one only of these three great natural divisions of the vast territory of knowledge, namely, that which presents itself as an answer to the question, "*What am I?*" To treat of all would be the labour of a lifetime. To treat fully of this alone would be a gigantic task.

For the proper answer is a description of the MECHANISM OF MAN. How it comes to be? What is its source? What its earliest condition? How it is constructed; how it grows; how it is moved and kept in motion; how its motions are governed; how it lives; how it dies? What becomes of it after death? Is there in the Mechanism anything our senses cannot perceive? If such there be, what is this thing? How is it linked with the body? How does it quit the body? What is the conscious entity we call "I" and "you"? Is Mind nothing more



than that part of the mechanism by which the individual Soul maintains communication with the external world? Does this *something* die with the body? If not, what becomes of it after the death of the body? What are its capacities and faculties? What is its relationship to the material world? If it has a future, had it a past? These and many other questions are involved in the inquiry into the Mechanism of Man and are necessary to complete the answer to the question, WHAT AM I?

In attempting such an answer I do not propose to treat of it so fully as the profound interest and importance of the theme would properly require. Neither knowledge nor leisure qualifies me for a *minute* scientific description of the structure of the human frame, the functions of its various parts, how it is builded, how maintained, how dissolved. To investigate these is the province of the sciences of *Anatomy* and *Physiology*. To the former reference will be made but rarely. To the latter frequently, because the purpose of this treatise is to describe, so far as research has yet proceeded, what are the laws of life, and what the relationship between *Body*, *Mind* and *Soul*—using the term Soul, not in its restricted sense as designing merely the collective intelligence, but as representing that entity which, in despite of the evidence and arguments of the Materialists, I cannot help regarding as something other than the visible bodily structure—an entity recognised by various names, —*Soul*, —*Mind*, —*Spirit*,—according to the speaker's conception of its nature. It must be understood that the term "*Soul*" is here used to indicate a *something forming part of the mechanism that is not body*, without expressing the slightest opinion as to its proper title and attributes. The term "*Mind*" is employed as the collective name of a great number of faculties of which the brain is the bodily mechanism through which the individual conscious self receive impressions from, and impresses itself upon the external molecular world.

WHAT AM I?

Viewed from without, a complex and highly organised



structure, admirably framed for adaptation to the conditions of the world on which it dwells; a mechanism set in motion and maintained by some *vital force* generated within itself and whose actions are directed by a self-contained *intelligence*.

Examined from within, this machine appears to be possessed by a *Conscious Self*, having an individuality recognized, even by the materialist proving its non-existence, as being distinct from the body, because it can contemplate the body as a something apart from itself. Moreover it is conscious of being controlled by laws other than those that control the body. It *may* be that such distinction does not really exist—that we are all body, and thought and feeling merely secretions of bodily structure. But it will not be denied that we have in us an instinctive conviction to the contrary, and that to the individual intelligence the Conscious Self is *not* the body. Of this universal conviction account must be taken in any treatise on Psychology. Therefore it will be recognized here; but with the distinct understanding that, until its characteristics come to be examined in their proper place, I do not design to express a dogmatic opinion as to the structure or qualities of that entity which we think of as “ourselves;” that which I design to describe when I say “*I*,” that which I intend to address when I say “*You*.”

The attention of the Reader will be more particularly directed in these pages to so much of the Mechanism of Man as relates to the *Forces* (whatever upon examination these may appear to be and by whatever name called—*Vital Force*—*Nerve Force*—*Soul Force*)—by which the organism thus marvellously constructed is moved to intelligent action and directed to intelligent deeds.

This subject has been claimed by two sciences, *Biology* and *Psychology*. The one professes research into the laws by which Life is regulated. The other by its title limits itself to the existence, structure, powers, and capacities of the Conscious Self—Soul—Spirit—Mind—Intelligence—or by whatever name we prefer to call that entity,

which, although invisible and intangible, we instinctively believe to be within us and contemplate as something distinct from the structure that is palpable to the senses. These sciences are so intermingled that it is difficult to separate them in practice, or even to conceive of them apart. Yet does neither term fully express that which it is the design of this treatise to attempt so to describe as to be understood by the popular intelligence. For this purpose I shall, wheresoever practicable, avoid the use of technical terms, not merely because they are too often only substitutes for knowledge, but also because they are apt to be associated inextricably with pre-judgments, always so carefully to be guarded against when we are in honest pursuit of *truth*.

Let it be avowed, once for all, that my purpose is to direct the attention of the Reader to what is *not* known as well as to what *is* known. Few are conscious of the extent of ignorance in relation to the subject of this treatise prevailing not in the popular mind alone, but in the world of Science itself and even among Physiologists and Philosophers. It seems scarcely credible, but it is literally true, that the most learned Physician cannot tell us by what process any one medicine he administers performs its cures! He can say only that experience has shown certain effects as often found to follow the exhibition of certain drugs. But he certainly does not know *how* those drugs produce those effects. It is strange and distressing to observe what irrational prejudices still prevail in all matters connected with the physiology of body and mind, and their mutual relationship and influences, even among persons otherwise well informed and who deem themselves well educated. It is still more strange that not the least prejudiced nor the least instructed in these subjects are to be found in the Profession whose business it is to keep the human machine in sound working condition. May not the cause of this ignorance of the laws of life, of Mental Physiology and of Psychology be, that they are not studied as we study the structure which that Life moves and that Intelli-



gence directs? Has it never occurred to the Physician and the Mental Philosopher that possibly in the laws of life, in the physiology of the mind, in the relationship of the Conscious Self and the body, more even than in the structure itself, are to be found the causes of many of the maladies to which that structure is subject. Therefore, that in the investigation of these laws the secret is to be sought of the operation of remedies, rather than in the molecular structure where for centuries the Doctors have been exclusively hunting for them with so little success?

---



## CHAPTER II.

## THE SCIENCE OF MAN.

WHAT is a MAN?

We see a substantial form, satirically described by Carlyle as "a forked radish with a head fantastically carved,"—a form admirably adapted to the conditions of existence upon a world that is itself regulated by certain laws of which our only knowledge is obtained by observing the manner in which they are obeyed and the consequences of disobedience. Man is manifestly adapted in all his structure to the planet upon which it is his lot to dwell. Nature imposes her conditions upon him; he can impose none upon Nature. Existing on a material world, he is subject to the conditions of that world, and therefore his external structure is of necessity material also. Matter is held together in its form as matter by a force of the nature and origin of which we are entirely ignorant and whose presence we know only by its manifestation. The province of this force appears to be to cause the "molecules" (which are the ultimate *perceptible* particles of what we call "matter") to exercise over each other a mutual attraction by which an infinite variety of agglomerations are produced—the quantity of attractive force being determined by the relative proportions of the molecules so agglomerated. This is the explanation of the fact, that the larger body attracts the smaller body in proportion to its relative weight (or gravity). The infinite variety of forms and substances into relationship with which Man is brought while dwelling upon this world is due to infinite variety in the combinations of molecules.

It may be suggested whether the repulsion which molecules are said to exercise (whence it comes that no two of them are ever in actual contact) instead of being, as commonly supposed, caused by the presence of a positive repelling force, may not be due to the varying powers of *attraction* possessed by various molecules or agglomerations of molecules, by reason of which the attractive force of some overcomes the attractive force of the others to a limited extent, so that they can approach only within limited distances. For instance, suppose molecule A to be four times as large as molecule B. A would attract B by a force equal to four. But B cannot come into actual contact with A because of its own attractive force, which acts as a repulsive or resisting force of one. B would therefore float at the distance of one from A, and by the joint action of the same forces the lesser molecule would revolve round the greater molecule. B would become in fact a satellite of molecule A. May it not be that the machinery of the Universe is kept in motion by the selfsame force and by the same law that sends the molecules of a grain of sand spinning about each other?

Gravity, then, is a condition of molecular matter. Wheresoever that is, gravitation operates—that is to say, there is the presence of a force by which molecules (the ultimate particles of that we call “matter,” which alone is perceptible by our senses) are drawn together, the amount of force exercised by each molecule or aggregation of molecules being proportioned to its bulk. We are as yet ignorant if the molecules of matter are of equal bulk. But as every molecule is itself an aggregation of smaller particles, which for convenience we call “atoms,” the probability is that molecules are of varying bulk and density, and that to this variation and the consequent differences in their powers of attraction and repulsion, the various forms and qualities of molecular structures are due. But the force of gravitation, whatever that may be, is manifestly the power that maintains molecular structure. Probably it is the force that creates molecules



by attracting atoms within a certain range and aggregating them into molecules. This is merely a suggestion; but there can be little doubt that all molecular structure is maintained, if not made, by the laws imposed by the force we call Gravitation.

Being so conditioned, all molecular structures are shaped in strict accordance with those conditions. Organic structure is not exempt from the influence of gravitation. Man is moulded in the shape he has, not because it is beautiful, or noble, or godlike, as the poets sing, but because it is the best adapted to motions that are controlled by the force of gravitation. He is pulled to the earth by a certain force which he must overcome if he is to move at all. That force suffices to keep him upon the surface of the earth. But another force is generated within his frame which enables him to raise half his body from the earth's plain. Therefore he has legs which by alternate action advance the whole body. Consequently legs are limbs only necessary to the human body when dwelling on a molecular world. Fishes, which float in a medium through which they can pass by an impulse from behind, have no need for legs, and consequently are constructed without them. If Man had been made to float in the ocean of atmosphere, as fishes are made to float in the ocean of water, Man would have been structured without legs and would have moved horizontally, as fishes do.

Surveying the molecular world we find that, with infinite subdivisions, all its substances resolve themselves into two great classes: 1. Organic matter; 2. Inorganic matter.

*Organic matter* is distinguished as being endowed with certain properties that attend the presence of *life*. It arranges itself in definite forms, according to some unexplored formative force that appears to be centred *within* the living being.

*Inorganic matter* is structured by some other force or forces than the vital force, and there is no reason to believe that the centre of that force is within the structure. On the contrary, the force appears to be



*external*, and this whether it be a chemical or a magnetic force.

The first important distinction between organic and inorganic matter is their subjection to different laws, or to some differing modifications of the same laws. The bodily structure is subject to the physical laws to a certain extent; but in life the organic laws supersede or suspend, more or less, the physical laws. When the force of the organic law declines, the physical law resumes its sway. The *chemical* force (by which I mean the force governed by the law that determines the combinations of molecules) yields to the *vital* force in the building and maintaining of the organism, so long as the vital force continues to flow. But when the vital force ceases or becomes languid, the chemical force regains its supremacy over the vital force and resolves the organic structure into its inorganic elements.

Not only do the organic and physical laws prevail alternately over the same structure, but organic and inorganic matter are continually changing places. Matter passes incessantly from one condition to the other. That which is inorganic to-day is to-morrow attracted and assimilated to organic structure. That which was organic structure yesterday to-day has become inorganic. Such is Nature's eternal round.

This, at least, is what our senses inform us. But the question has suggested itself, if it may not be that what we are accustomed to contemplate as organic matter—such, for instance, as flesh and bone—is really other than inorganic matter aggregated about the nerve system, and in fact clothing it—the nerve system being the sole *organic* material of the body? If so it be, vitality is not in the *substances* that build the substantial body, but only in the *nerves* of which the inorganic matter is the envelope. By the nerves the inorganic particles are attracted, used, and expelled. Neither in its collected form nor in its individual molecules has inorganic substance any vital force. It never becomes really organic, but only its particles are attracted by and incrust the

true organic structure. If the condition be thus, it will account for many facts in Physiology inexplicable on the accepted theory of the actual conversion of inorganic into organic matter; moreover, it would greatly influence the practice of medicine, by the light it must cast upon the causes of disease and the methods of cure.

But what the *Forces* are that sustain these eternal motions and direct them to definite ends we have as yet no accurate knowledge. Much that we deem to be knowledge is only unproved and often unfounded conjecture. Are there many forces, or is the same force exhibiting itself under different conditions, and therefore in different aspects? This is a question that still divides the scientific world, the most eminent of our Scientists holding that all the changes we see are the product of the same force acting under dissimilar conditions, and that what we call the operations of forces are merely modes of motion. What we really *see* in electrical, magnetic, or chemical experiments is not the force itself, nor the thing that sends forth that force, but only the *effect* of the invisible electric, magnetic, or chemical force, and the changes produced by that force in the molecular matter presented to it. All we *know* or can know is that a power is passing by which changes are made in the relative positions of molecules. We call that power "*a force.*" We really use the term as a substitute for a definite idea. Nobody knows what a "*force*" is, nor even how it operates. We term it "*magnetism*" or "*electricity*," as the case may be, but we have not the slightest conception what it is that attracts the metal nor by what medium the steel is pulled to the magnet.

So likewise we are ignorant of the forces that build and control organic structure. We know that they exist, because we note the results of their presence. We see the changes they produce in the substance we are enabled to perceive. We are as assured of their existence as we are of the existence of the magnetic force. But also we are equally ignorant whence the force proceeds, or in what manner it conducts its operations.



We observe that, besides the bodily structure palpable to our senses, which in itself would be a mere automatic machine going through a series of prescribed invariable motions, there is something that controls and directs the motions of the body intelligently—something that does not exist in any inorganic structure—something that has an independent *Will*, and can move the body at its own pleasure—something that has intelligence—something that has emotions—something that thinks, reasons, and creates ideas—something, indeed, that from the very nature of its work must be structured differently from the body with which, nevertheless, it is intimately allied. This is the *something*—call it SOUL, MIND, SPIRIT, as you please—which is the subject of *Psychology*, and to an outline of which, designed to be expressed in a form and in language intelligible to the understanding of the unlearned, this treatise is devoted.

Thus the SCIENCE OF MAN comprises *Anatomy*, which exhibits his *structure*; *Physiology*, which deals with the functions of the various parts of that structure; *Psychology*, which investigates the forces that move and direct the structure; *Anthropology*, which treats of the races of Men and their characteristics; *Moral Philosophy* and *Sociology*, that consider Man in his relationship to his fellow men; and *Theology*, that devotes itself to his relationship to his God.

This treatise will be mainly devoted to *Psychology*, that is, the forces by which the Mechanism of Man is moved, controlled, and intelligently directed to intelligent ends—LIFE—MIND—SOUL.

---



## CHAPTER III.

## THE PROVINCE OF PSYCHOLOGY.

By the term *Psychology*, then, I intend in this Treatise the Science appertaining to all of that portion of the structure of Man which is not that visible, tangible, perceptible part of him we call his *body*.

The work of this Science is to inquire

If there be in Man any such incorporeal existence?

If aye, what is the structure of that incorporeal existence?

What are its functions, powers, and properties?

What relationship does it bear to the body?

In what manner and to what extent does it influence the body?

What are the conditions of its being?

If and to what extent it affects or influences existence beyond and without the body?

Consequently, in the pursuit of Psychology the first question that presents itself for solution is—if there be in the Mechanism of Man something other than the molecular structure perceptible by our senses, but which is not perceptible by the senses because it is of some other than molecular structure.

*Physiology* is the science that concerns itself about the corporeal structure and the functions of its various parts. Its province is limited to that which it can see and feel and make the subject of examination by the microscope, with the help of scalpel, scales, and chemicals. It carves the dead form and ascertains its construction. It examines the living form, and seeing how it works in

health, when all moves smoothly, and in disease, when the parts are dislocated and the machinery is thrown out of gear. Learning thus the conditions under which the various parts of the mechanism act, it learns what are the *functions* of those parts.

But at this point the province of *Physiology* ends. It confesses itself powerless to look beyond the molecular form, because, as it says truly, it cannot, with its finest instruments, discover that which is non-molecular, even if it exists. Physiology deals rightly with that only which can be handled, sliced, weighed, measured, and analysed.

Function is not substance—it cannot be placed under the lens nor carved by the scalpel—yet does Physiology investigate *function*. Why? Because function is the end for which structure is designed. The office of the stomach is to digest; it is constructed to that end. Knowing the design we are enabled to understand the purposes of the parts, and observing the parts we are enabled to discover their functions. Thus the study of *function* is an appropriate branch of *Physiology*.

So it is with the study of a mechanism of human contrivance. We survey the whole machine and inquire its uses. We take it to pieces and learn what are the offices of its various parts and in what manner each assists the work of the whole. This is to perform to an inorganic mechanism the office that *Physiology* performs for the organic mechanism. But the inorganic machine is only an inert mass until it is set in motion by some force artificially generated within or applied from without. So the organic mechanism is only a curiously compounded clod until it is set in motion. But its motions are manifestly governed by some *intelligence*. The steam engine imparts force to the inorganic machine, and the human hand, directed by the human intelligence, directs and governs that force to the end designed. So the human mechanism is set in motion by the *vital force*; but its motions are directed by *intelligence*—differing from the inorganic machine in that the



*Vital Force* is self-generated and the directing Intelligence dwells *within itself*.

*Physiology* teaches us the structure and functions of the mechanism and *Psychology* investigates the powers and processes by which the mechanism is moved and directed.

The province of *Psychology* begins, therefore, precisely where the province of *Physiology* ends.

And they are necessarily pursued by different methods. *Physiology* proceeds by examination of substance, submitting it to all kinds of experimental tests and observing it in all its phases of growth, maturity, and decay, in health and in disease, noting the changes that occur in form or function.

*Psychology* does not deal primarily with substance. The subject of its investigations is invisible, impalpable, imponderable. It cannot be carved, sliced, placed under a microscope, subjected to analysis, reduced to its elements. But its methods of investigation are not, therefore, the less scientific, nor are the results less trustworthy. Its existence is not the less real because the *thing* we investigate is imperceptible to our senses. We can ascertain the presence of a force (or an imperceptible something that operates as a force) by observing its effect upon the matter we can perceive as perfectly as if we could see the operation itself. This is not conjecture, but *proof*. We know that magnetic force exists. How? We cannot see it—we are ignorant of its form, structure, and substance. But when it meets an obstructing body, it causes the obstructing body to move in an irregular manner that informs our senses of the perturbation. By multiplying these observations and noting the various conditions under which certain effects are produced, we are enabled to learn little by little the nature and character of the imperceptible and imponderable force and to become even more familiar with it than with many of the substances that are presented to our senses.

*Psychology* follows *Physiology* in noting the phenomena



presented by the abnormal equally with the normal conditions of the mechanism. Much more is to be learned of function when disordered, for then irregularity of action makes manifest hidden parts of the mechanism whose presence is not perceptible when the machine is working well.

In both the proper process of investigation is by observation and experiment. From both it is necessary to banish the once popular argument *à priori*. Both are questions of *fact* to be determined by investigation; not by argument. The progress of Science has been indefinitely delayed by the folly of Philosophers who have wasted time and thought in contention if a thing *can* be or *cannot* be, when the question to be determined is, *is it* or *is it not*?

The history of Science has been an almost continuous narrative of things pronounced by the Philosophers to be impossible and afterwards proved to be true. It is so yet, but with vastly diminished power for mischief. Still there are men calling themselves Scientists who determine without trial and dogmatically say "Impossible" to any fact that conflicts with their own preconceptions. *Psychology* has been the especial subject of this unphilosophical treatment. Even by those who professed to be its students it has been dealt with as a subject for metaphysical subtlety rather than for experimental observation. Formal treatises upon it, with a few very recent exceptions,<sup>(a)</sup> have been content with observing only the writer's inner consciousness. The necessary consequence has been that Psychology, as a substantial Science, has made little or no progress. All other Sciences have advanced by leaps and bounds, but Psychology is almost where it was a thousand years ago. The fault has been with the method of study, not with the materials. Facts for a foundation are abundant, if

---

(a) Mr. Herbert Spencer is the most conspicuous living Psychologist who has adopted the new method of basing his science upon facts. George Combe will ever be held in honour for having led the way.

only Psychologists will throw off the incubus of abstractions and descend from the cloudy region of metaphysics to the homely but solid ground of observation and experiment. Instead of contemplating their own minds, let them examine the minds of others, view with patience and carefully note the exhibition of mental and psychical phenomena in their various phases, and especially in the abnormal conditions of the mechanism of man, of which we talk so much but know so little. This is the province of *Psychology* which the Reader is here invited to enter as a student, with open eyes and ears, note-book in hand, to learn what *is*, without troubling himself first dogmatically to argue if, according to his own very limited knowledge of nature and nature's laws, it *can* or *cannot* be.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

## THE METHOD OF STUDY.

THE subject of *Psychology* being imponderable, immeasurable and imperceptible, how may the knowledge of it be procured?

Investigating the material body, the Physiologist, seeking to ascertain *structure*, calls to his aid instruments to assist his eyes and hands, and sees, feels, measures, weighs, carves, boils, burns and decomposes the subject of his investigation.

To ascertain *function*, he notes what occurs in one state of things and does not occur in another state of things. If, for instance, he desires to learn the function of the stomach, he subjects certain substances to its action and sees how they are mutually affected when in the condition of health and when there is the presence of disease.

But *Soul* and *Mind* cannot be so handled, weighed, measured, carved and analysed. Their existence cannot be proved to the senses, as is that of the body, for the simple reason that the body is made of molecules, which alone our senses are constructed to perceive, those other parts of the mechanism being probably composed of other agglomerations of atoms which our senses are *not* constructed to perceive.

Is the existence of these imperceptible entities, therefore, incapable of proof? Must they ever continue to be for us mere conjecture?

The answer to these questions, which lie at the foundation of Psychological Science, must be preceded by an answer to another question.

*Can* nothing be known to us but molecular structure?



That structure is but an infinitesimal part even of the little circle of Creation which the most powerful instruments can reveal to us. Is there any portion of all this vast *non-molecular* structure of which some knowledge may be attainable? *Have* we really attained to any knowledge of any portion of it, or of any of the forces that move it and of the laws that govern it?

Yes. Magnetism, Electricity, Galvanism—be they distinct forces, or be they three forms of one force exhibited under different conditions,—and whether what we so call are substances or merely motions produced by something unknown to us—are by our Scientists acknowledged, investigated and their qualities and conditions of being revealed, although they are imperceptible by any human sense.

How do the Physicists obtain their knowledge of these imperceptible existences, which, according to their own theory, should be altogether unknown and unknowable?

By observing the action of these imperceptible *non-molecular* things upon molecular substance that is perceptible. Our senses can perceive only the motion of the molecules. We do not and we cannot perceive that which moves the molecules, as we do not and cannot perceive the multitudinous combinations of atoms, other than the molecular combination, by which we are surrounded.

The Scientists will probably tell us that it is a *Force*, and that is all we know or can know about it.

But what is a *Force*? It is so necessary to have in the mind a clear and definite conception of what we intend by the term “a Force,” that it will be desirable for the student, at the very beginning of his inquiry, to make himself familiar with it.

“Force is that which causes motion.” True; but what is the *thing* you so call that produces the motion? Is a Force an actual *something*, or merely a condition or quality of something? Can there be *action at a distance*? If that cannot be, Force is not an abstraction but a substance, meaning by this term something that has shape, that is composed of some material and exists in a definite

portion of space. By "action at a distance" let us understand an influence exercised by one body over another body without actual contact or without an intermediate agent. Does the magnet act from afar by a species of moral influence existing within itself, and by the example and presence of which a sympathetic influence is set up in the steel, inducing it to leap to the magnet? This cannot be the explanation, although squaring in all respects with the phenomenon, for the sufficient reason that such an action implies *intelligence* in both magnet and steel. In such case, metals must have mind. But if not this, what is the influence that exercises a *force*, and what are the materials the force employs? Something must pass from one to the other by which the attracted body is seized and drawn as by a cord. We are ignorant what this intermediate something is. But it must be a very refined something, for it passes through the hand, or through glass, or through wood when interposed, and when it penetrates our own structure its passage is attended with no pain nor even with consciousness.

But if the pulling thing is an *agent* merely, it must proceed from, be connected with, and controlled by a *principal*, which must be something in the magnet. We give that something a name. We assume that it exercises a force upon the ether that is interposed between the magnet and the steel; that this force is conveyed from the magnet by the ether and there impinging on the steel sets up in its molecules a similar action. This would account for movement of the steel in the direction of the waves of the force applied to it. But it does not account for the steel moving *towards* the magnet in a direction opposite to the flow of the waves of the force. Scientists have put together all these facts and constructed out of them the science of *Magnetism*, meaning by that term to express the power, be it that of an influence or of a positive substantial agent, by which the phenomena exhibited by the magnet, and a multitude of other allied phenomena, are grouped together



and investigated as an important branch of Physical Science.

But the subject matter of their science being imperceptible and imponderable, not to be handled, weighed, and dissected, how do the Scientists proceed to ascertain the existences that are themselves imperceptible and imponderable and the nature and qualities of those existences—be they substances or be they only forces?

By careful observation of their manifestations under manifold conditions. The Scientists are unable to see, hear or feel them. But they note the fact that the molecular matter they can perceive and manipulate is, under certain conditions, subject to disturbance. They assume the presence of the something that causes the disturbance and they affirm the presence of that something as confidently as if it had been perceived by their senses.

Then they inquire what are the properties and powers of that imperceptible something. How do they this? By investigating the phenomena that attend the presence of that something. These they collect diligently and examine carefully, noting the various conditions under which the phenomena occur. Then they impose other conditions of their own devising—that is to say, they try experiments and apply tests—and thus they learn what are the circumstances under which the action upon molecular structure does or does not take place, and what is the manner of that action. So by degrees it is ascertained that this imperceptible something has certain *qualities*, from which it may reasonably be presumed that it is of such and such a character, and has certain functions in the scheme of being, and is regulated by certain natural laws. In this manner, although the Scientist can neither see, hear, nor feel the thing he is seeking, he arrives at as positive an assurance of its existence, and learns almost as much about it, as if it had been perceptible to his senses. Thus it is that we have obtained our acquaintance with Magnetism and Electricity, which we cannot perceive by any sense. Our



sole knowledge of them is derived from the varying manner of their action upon the molecular structure that is perceptible to us.

This is the pursuit of Science by exercise of the highest faculties of the mind, for from the known we thus arrive at knowledge of the unknown.

Our senses inform us of matter that is perceptible by them—that is to say, of one only of the infinite combinations of particles existing in the Universe. Our senses cannot inform us about that which is imperceptible to them. But we can and do arrive at very extensive and accurate knowledge of *imperceptible* existences, by observing the effects of their presence upon molecular matter which is perceptible.

As we have already obtained so large a knowledge of imperceptible and imponderable existences in *Physical* Science, I contend that, by the same method of investigation, we may hope to obtain an equal knowledge of the imperceptible existences which are within the proper province of *Psychological* Science. Organic matter is moved by some forces imperceptible to our senses. Are they merely *forces*, or *things*—entities, having form and substance? Say they are forces merely. Still the question comes back to us, what is the *thing* from which those forces flow? Again, if they be a force merely, there comes the further difficulty about “action at a distance.” *Can* that be? Can motion be produced by a body not in contact or communication with the body moved, without the aid of some medium to convey and communicate the moving power?

The Organic Forces (or the things that produce what to our senses appear to be the effects of a force), are of two kinds. There is the force that causes physiological action and change, such as growth, maintenance of structure, performance of function, and such like. This appears to be a blind force, like magnetism. There is also a force governing the structure that is *not* blind, that has *Intelligence* and a *Will*, is self-producing and self-sustained—a force the existence of which Science

has recognised equally with the instinctive consciousness of all mankind, some calling it Mind, some Soul, some Spirit, but which all have agreed to acknowledge as a *real something*. This is what I have presumed to call the *Psychic Force*. But this force, like the physical forces, must either be *something structured* or it must proceed from something structured. The Materialists contend that this force is purely a physiological product, proceeding from the brain structure, the result of a certain collocation of organic cells. The Psychologist contends that it is a force proceeding from something other than the molecular structure of the brain, and that either it is in itself a structured being, or proceeds from some imperceptible structured thing other than the perceptible molecular structure of the body. Precisely as the Physicists have attained to a positive practical knowledge of the existence of imperceptible Magnetism, by investigating its operations upon perceptible matter, so the Psychologist concludes the existence of an imperceptible entity (which he calls the *Self*, the *Mind*, or the *Soul*, from investigation of its operations upon the perceptible bodily structure and upon other molecular matter with which it comes in contact.

*Psychology* asserts that itself is capable of being so investigated, that experiments and tests of equal value can be applied, and that the existence and qualities of *Mind* and *Soul*, although themselves imperceptible and imponderable, may be learned by Psychologists as certainly and perfectly by observation of manifestations through the molecular structure, as the Physicists have learned the imperceptible Physical Forces by noting their manifestations through other molecular structures.

But by what method of study has *Psychology* been pursued until very recently?

Not as other Physical Sciences have been explored, by observation, experiment and test, but by introvision, self-inspection and metaphysical abstraction. The Mind has been made, as it were, to retire into itself and survey itself. The self-consciousness of the explorer has been



consulted and accepted, not merely as a witness whose evidence is to be received in common with other evidence, but as the sole witness. The necessary consequence of this has been that Psychology is the most backward of all the sciences. We know little more of it now than was known to Greece and Rome. While all other Science has been advancing, this has stood still. Mind has been treated metaphysically instead of physically. It has been viewed as an abstraction, to be dreamed about and argued about, not as a substantial reality, a definite *thing*, to be discovered by experimental investigation, and whose powers and faculties are to be ascertained precisely as we ascertain the powers and qualities of Magnetism, Heat, and Electricity. Instead of self-inspection and *à priori* argument, and ingenious conjecture, and metaphysical abstractions and a jargon that serves only to conceal ignorance, Mental and Psychological Science should be pursued by observation of others than ourselves; by noting how Mind and Soul are manifested in them by influence over the actions of the body—by control of the material structure in health and disease, and, above all, by studying the *abnormal* conditions of the mechanism. As the functions of the body are best learned in the sick room, when those functions are disorganised, so *Mind* and *Soul* may be revealed to us most clearly when the organism is disordered, or, to be more accurate (for the Soul itself is not disordered), when there is disease of those material organs through which the non-molecular Conscious Self maintains its communication with the molecular world.

And the study of Psychology embraces that of some other sciences with which it is intimately associated. Especially is knowledge of the elements of Physiology necessary to the Psychologist, for he must know something of the structure and functions of the bodily organs, and especially of the brain and nerve system, before he can clearly comprehend the relationship of Soul, Mind, and Body, and distinctly understand the functions of the entire organism, the manner in which



it receives impressions and communicates them to the *Intelligence* within, and of the mechanism by which the Intelligent Entity communicates its Will to the molecular world without. PSYCHOLOGY will thus be seen to be a science as liberal as it is large. There is none so calculated to expand and elevate the mind, for its contemplations are of the past, the present, and the future of MAN. Its issues are annihilation or immortality.

---

## CHAPTER V.

## SCIENTIFIC PROOF.

TRUE Science can be founded upon *facts* alone. Facts can be ascertained only by a process of *proof*. We learn from the principles of *Evidence* what constitute *Scientific Proof*.

Facts, and facts only, can be accepted for the foundation of all truly scientific argument, upon which to base practical conclusions.

An argumentative theory may be constructed upon the assumption of supposed or unproved facts, but only for the purpose of giving direction to inquiry. It will not justify assertion as of a *truth*. Only presumptive conclusions can be drawn from presumptive facts.

At the beginning of an examination of the Mechanism of Man it will be desirable to clear the mind of some fallacies and distinctly to declare, once for all, what is intended throughout this treatise when something is called

A FACT.

What is a *fact*?

In the Scientific sense, equally as in legal contemplation and in common sense, a *fact* is anything, or any state or condition of anything, the existence of which is proved by *evidence*. A fact cannot properly be accepted as such without *proof*, that is to say, without *evidence of its being*. There are, and ever will be, differences of opinion as to what kind and degree of evidence is sufficient to prove a fact. But no proof is admissible for the purposes of Science which is not also sufficient for the common uses of life.

For scientific purposes, equally as for those of our

daily existence, we must be content with *relative truth*—that is, with *what appears to be true according to our mental structure*. *Absolute truth*, or unconditioned knowledge, is by man wholly unattainable. We can only know according to the conditions of our being, and we must be content to assume that things are as they appear to be to our cultivated senses and intelligence. For instance, it *may* be, as some philosophers have contended, that the world is all within us and that there is no objective existence. It is *possible* that there is no correspondence between our mental conceptions of the external world and things we think that we perceive. But it suffices us for all purposes of present existence to accept as real what our perceptive senses present to us as realities, especially if we find the senses of our fellow men conveying to them the like impressions. *Absolute truth* being unattainable, we must be content with *relative truth*, and it is a mere waste of time and toil to look beyond the relative for the absolute. If this were to be frankly recognised by Philosophy, as it is by common sense, a world of worthless controversy would be extinguished. For every purpose of existence here, scientific and social, it suffices to accept the external world as *a fact*, and its qualities and characteristics as being such as they appear to be. "*I*" *may* be merely an illusion of your mind. "*You*" *may* be but a self-deception of my mind. But, so long as "*you*" and "*I*" agree in recognising the existence of each other, we may scientifically think of one another as objective realities, and treat of ourselves, and of things in their relation to us, as being *facts* upon which the sciences of Physiology and Psychology may be confidently constructed. *They are facts to us*, and that is all we can know, or need to know, in this world.

But how are we to know what *is* a fact according to this limited definition of it?

By *proof* of the existence of the thing asserted to be a *fact*.

Observe that the existence of a fact is wholly inde-



pendent of our recognition of it. No amount of assertion will make it *to be*. No amount of denial will make it *not* to be. Mere argument can neither establish nor extinguish a *fact*. It can be *proved* only by observation. But argument, experiment and test may, and ought to be, employed to direct observation to right results. So by the process of reasoning the existence of a fact, not proved by positive observation, may be presumably, though not positively, deduced from facts already proved. But all such presumed facts must be accepted with the reservation that they depend upon the reality of the facts from which they are argued. The degree of proof demanded for the establishment of a *fact* is a subject for discussion, as it must vary with the character of the fact to be proved. Probability is a material element in resolving this. A fact of frequent recurrence may be accepted upon a lesser degree of proof than rare and strange facts. There are some facts so far outside of ordinary experience that they can be admitted only upon the highest degree of proof. Slight proof would have sufficed for a statement that Dr. FRANKLIN had flown a kite. But by the scientists of his time, to whom the characteristics of electricity were almost unknown, cogent proof was properly demanded of his asserted fact that he had drawn lightning from a cloud by his kite. In the then almost unexplored Science of Psychology, the highest degree of proof of the phenomena of Artificial Somnambulism was rightly required by Scientists from the asserters of those apparently marvellous *facts*. Now that the condition itself has been accepted as an established truth, and most of its phenomena are admitted to be realities, comparatively slight proof of any new fact is required, while the highest degree of proof is properly demanded for the phenomena of *Psychism*, which are *at present* as new and strange and seemingly as marvellous as were those of Somnambulism thirty years ago or those of electricity a hundred years ago. Twenty years hence that which in *Psychism* is now new and strange, and therefore startling and wonderful, will have become as

familiar, and doubtless be explained as perfectly as the phenomena of Electricity now are. Then alleged phenomena of *Psychism* also will be admissible upon proof of lesser degree than is now rightly required for them.

A fallacy widely prevails, even among Scientists themselves, against which the inquirer must keep careful guard, for more, perhaps, than any other cause it has stayed the progress of Science. It is the prevalent habit of not separating the *fact* from some real or supposed cause of it, from some consequences imagined to flow from it, from some bearing it is assumed to have upon some other facts, from some presumed possibilities or probabilities in relation to it. This is the argument *à priori* which ever has been so fatal a foe to the progress of knowledge. The one question prompted by an asserted fact always should be, "*Is it?*" and not "*Can it be?*" or "*Can it not be?*" Almost every great fact in Science was at first declared *not* to be a fact, by virtue of the argument *à priori* that "*it cannot be, therefore it is not.*" This is the result of not separating the fact from its supposed cause, character, or consequences. If, for instance, before the discovery or investigation of Magnetism, fifty persons had said "We have seen a bar of steel rise in the air untouched." The Scientists of the time would have said, and doubtless did say, "*It cannot be true.*" It is contrary to the known laws of nature for a heavy body without life to rise and float in the air. It is opposed to all experience. You must have been dreaming, or you are insane, or some conjuror was deluding you. Obviously you are fools, madmen, or knaves." To this the fifty witnesses might have answered, "But all of us saw it at the same instant, and it occurred not once only, but many times; see it, try it, and judge for yourselves." The history of Science has been one unvaried tale of asserted new facts, met by this *à priori* argument, "*it cannot be,*" confronted by "*it is.*" So the Scientists would have replied: "We will not waste our precious time in viewing and trying what we know to be impossible. If we saw it we should not believe it.



We should rather conclude that our senses were deceiving us than that a known law of nature should be violated." Instead of investigating the asserted fact that steel can, under certain conditions, rise in the air in opposition to the law of gravitation, and then, if they found it to be a fact, forthwith inquiring into the cause, or by careful experiment and test trying if it was a delusion, or a fraud, or a phenomenon hitherto unobserved, they preferred to deny *the fact* of the motion of the untouched steel. And as it was so it is and so perhaps it ever will be. Still the error prevails of not separating the asserted fact from its supposed causes or consequences, asking only "*Is it a fact?*" and content to defer inquiry into its true causes, nature and characteristics, until its existence is ascertained.

In the honest pursuit of truth and persistent purpose to learn what the very fact is, without fear or favour, which should be the resolve of Students of all Science, but especially of Psychology, because of the many preconceptions and prejudices by which it is beset, another fallacy lurks unsuspected in the path, often misleading even the thoughtful. It prevails largely over the common mind. There is a popular confusion of *belief* with *fact*. The inquirer does not ask what the *fact* is, but what is the prevailing *belief* about it, and the fact is then affirmed or denied, not according to actual knowledge obtained by trial or experiment, but in deference to the prevailing public opinion. Although a *fact* is in no way affected by belief or disbelief, and cannot be in the least changed by any argument, nor affected by any opinion, and whether the acceptance of it be popular or unpopular, the vast majority of persons look to *belief* and not to facts. They affirm or deny the fact itself, not after actual investigation, but in accordance with the popular view of it. This is very irrational and utterly unscientific; but it is the common practice, and it must be confessed that Science has not yet shaken itself wholly free from the fallacy. The Reader, remembering the danger, will avoid it by resolving always to ask what is the fact itself,



and not what is the prevailing belief about the fact. Belief changes continually. A fact never changes.

These frequent fallacies are due mainly to the general neglect to learn the elementary principles of evidence. To set these fully forth would demand an entire volume. We can here state but a few of those principles which it is most important for the student of Man to remember.

The *best evidence* that the nature of the case will admit is always to be required. Secondary evidence is inadmissible if better evidence can be had.

*Hearsay* is as a general rule to be rejected. Hearsay is the repetition of a statement received by the witness from another person. Even the law relaxes this rule in certain cases where its observance would defeat justice and make proof impossible. So Science may resort to it when nothing better is to be had. But it is a wholesome rule to insist upon, that where the evidence of the principal is to be obtained, it shall be required in all cases. When hearsay is admitted, it should be watched with the strictest scrutiny and tested by close cross-examination. All experience proves the tendency of reporters of what others say to misunderstand or exaggerate, and doubt must rest upon any statements that have not been subjected to strict cross-examination.

Evidence varies in value, not only according to the capacity and trustworthiness of the witness, but also according to his means of knowledge. A man may be perfectly honest, but deceived by his senses or his imagination. Hence the value of cross-examination to ascertain the circumstances under which his knowledge was obtained. The worth of the testimony is a question for fair discussion, without imputing wilful falsehood or misrepresentation. The evidence of one witness only to an uncommon fact is of small value. But the weight of evidence of many witnesses increases in a far greater ratio than their number, because of the improbability of the same cause operating to deceive all at the same moment. The testimony of two honest witnesses to the same fact is worth fourfold that of a single witness ; of

three witnesses, tenfold; the simultaneous observation of half a dozen trustworthy witnesses is almost conclusive. The fallacy into which even the educated and intelligent fall when weighing the value of testimony, lies in confusion of the attested fact with preformed conclusions by which they seek to try the truth of the fact. It may well be that twenty persons truly assert that they witnessed a certain occurrence without their conclusion being correct as to the cause of that occurrence. To take the familiar instance of the alleged phenomenon of a table rising in the air untouched. Twenty persons assert that they witnessed the seeming miracle, and declare their belief to be that it was done by spiritual agency. It may well be that they have truly attested *the fact*, which was palpable to their senses, and yet be quite wrong as to its cause. But unreflecting persons reject the evidence of *the fact* because they question the *cause* assigned for it. Thus investigation into important problems is summarily suppressed, to the great loss of Science, which profits by every discovery of a new *fact*, however trivial it may appear at first.

All truth-seekers must start with a stern resolve to pursue the very truth honestly and fearlessly, without questioning what relationship it bears to other facts and without pausing to inquire what may possibly come of it. A fact will always take care of itself and on better acquaintance will be found to harmonise with all other facts. If in the end the new fact should prove to be inconsistent with some supposed truth, it merely compels a re-examination of that accepted truth with the help of the new light supplied by the new fact. Should they still be found in conflict, we consign the older creed to the limbo of fallacies, well pleased that we have not only learned a new truth but banished an old error. *Unlearning* is even a more profitable work than learning.

Nothing is more rare than this honest truth-seeking. I think it was PASCAL who said so wisely, "*Men do not believe what is true, but what they wish to be true.*" This



state of mind is almost universal. Where inquiry is professed to be made after what they call the "truth," ninety-nine persons in every hundred go to it looking for evidence, not to discover *what the truth is*, but to endeavour to find something that will support their preconceived beliefs or wishes. Where this is the mental condition of the investigator, truth is impossible of attainment. His preconceptions, desires, prejudices or interests colour the entire of the evidence submitted to his judgment. Whatever supports his previous preference is eagerly accepted, without the slightest care to try its credibility or its value. Whatever opposes that preference is tried by impossible tests, answered by absurd explanations and rejected for ridiculous reasons.

The history of Science is indeed one long record of the conflict between *fact* and *prejudice*. Every new fact that conflicted, or appeared to conflict, with some supposed established fact or accepted theory has been subjected to this method of attack from men who would not ask "Is this true?" but who asserted that it *must* be false because it was inconsistent with something they had previously believed to be true. But for the irrepressible vitality of a *fact*, Science would have been still in its infancy, for every successive discovery has been subjected to a systematic process of argumentative repression, conducted in almost invariable series after this fashion:

It *cannot* be true, for it is opposed to such and such a law of Nature.

It is contrary to our experience.

It is inconsistent with this or that theory.

It is an imposture of the discoverer.

It is a delusion of the witnesses.

You cannot explain its causes, therefore it is untrue.

Your *theory* of its causes is untenable, therefore *the fact* is not to be accredited.

It must be tried on our own conditions.

We will not waste our valuable time in investigation.

If the phenomena can be produced in this manner,  
why not in that manner?

If you can do *this*, why can't you do *that*?

Of what *use* is it, if true?

Even should you prove it to be true, no credit  
attaches to its discovery, for it was known long  
ago.

With some or all of these weapons war has been waged  
against new truths always and everywhere—interest and  
vanity being the prompters—the interest of those who  
are associated with current theories—the vanity of those  
who, having achieved fame by one set of theories, want  
the moral courage to confess error by recognising another  
theory. It is not surprising, therefore, though sad, that  
Scientists should too often adopt the attitude of the  
ignorant outside crowd towards new truths that are in  
conflict with old beliefs. It is only more lamentable in  
their case, because Scientists claim to be especially exempt  
from prejudices and to be in the pursuit of the very truth,  
with the one honest desire and design to find it and a  
brave resolve to proclaim it when found, whatever the  
prejudices or power arrayed against it and how unpopular  
soever it may be.

Therefore it behoves the Inquirer after Scientific Truth  
to keep watch and ward against *scepticism* and *credulity*  
alike. It is as foolish to believe nothing as to believe  
everything. There are persons, not a few, whom no  
amount of evidence will satisfy when not accordant with  
their interests, their prejudices, or their desires. There  
are almost as many who will believe on no evidence at all.  
Self-conceit that will not own error—obstinacy that  
prides itself on never changing an opinion once formed  
—vanity that flatters itself by thinking “How much  
more clever am I, who will not be imposed upon, than  
my neighbour who, with thrice my learning, believes  
this novelty”—interest, real or supposed, in the estab-  
lished falsehood,—personal inconvenience in the recog-  
nition of unpopular truth—these are the familiar sources  
of scientific *scepticism*. Impulsiveness that will not pause



to reflect—laziness that will not labour to examine—these are the sources of irrational *credulity*.

But there is a credulity of scepticism as irrational as credulity of belief. The explanations of scientific facts and phenomena, especially of those that are presented in the investigation of Psychology, so often put forth by Scientists with purpose to destroy the weight of evidence that threatens the overthrow of some cherished theories, almost invariably present the curious characteristic, that the explanation offered is more impossible or improbable than the fact itself.

The true safeguard against scientific scepticism and credulity alike must be found in a stern resolve to seek the very truth, regardless of all prejudgments and prepossessions, without asking what consequences may come of it, and with firm purpose to pursue it by the only process through which scientific truth can be attained—evidence collected with care, examined with caution, and accumulated with diligence until it amounts to *proof*.

*Proof* based upon *evidence* is the only foundation upon which reason can properly proceed to erect a superstructure of *Science*.

This is the method designed and attempted to be observed in the following sketch of the MECHANISM OF MAN.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

## MATTER AND SPIRIT.

To know the Mechanism of Man we must have a definite and distinct conception of that which is designed by the term "*matter*." It is a term presenting itself very frequently in all the physical sciences, and it is scarcely less recurrent in Mental and Psychological Science, even when pursued metaphysically. But as the present design is to investigate these Sciences by the method of observation and experiment, in preference to the ancient method by consulting only the inner consciousness and by argument, they cannot be prosecuted a step without reference to the term *matter*. The foremost question to be decided is, if there be in the Mechanism of Man anything that is *not matter*—that can be distinguished from matter in quality and manifestation—that is a cognizable entity distinct from matter, although intimately associated with matter.

A word so often recurring and upon the proper understanding of which so much hinges requires, therefore, to be distinctly understood by those who use it and should carry a definite meaning to those to whom it is addressed.

I deem it to be neither necessary nor desirable, in a treatise designed for popular information, to refer to the controversies that have raged among metaphysicians and philosophers upon the existence of matter, its properties, the conception we have or can have of it, the *noumena* and *phenomena*, the being and the not being, if matter be all that is or if there be no matter at all,—if what we so term is only a mental conception and not an external



objective reality. Such contentions certainly appear to me to be of little worth—rather darkening knowledge than adding to it,—wasting time and brains that might have been more usefully expended. That this is not an unfair judgment of the Metaphysicians is proved by the fact that they have done scarcely anything for the advancement of our knowledge of the psychological structure of man, insomuch that, until the beginning of the present century, when phrenology first pointed out the true path for investigation and taught that the only means by which discovery could be made in a science not purely abstract was by observation and experiment, no progress whatever was made in psychological science. As the consequence, we know little more of *Life*, *Mind*, and *Soul* than was known a thousand years ago.

I do not propose to trouble the reader with the insoluble question as to the existence or non-existence of anything out of ourselves. For all purposes of human life we must accept the world as we find it and the conditions of our being as they are. We are constructed to take cognizance of external existences and to believe the senses that tell us of their presence.

Whatever may have been our past abode, or where-soever we may dwell in the future, our present life is limited to a world—one of a multitude of worlds visible to us (but which occupy only a little circle in an illimitable space), and of countless other worlds beyond the range of vision. These visible worlds are suspended far apart from each other, in a vast ocean we are accustomed to call *a void*, but which Science must recognise as space filled with something that is not perceptible to our senses. A positive void is not in accordance with the scheme of Creation, so far as it can be perceived by us. To this imperceptible material that occupies all space within the range of our vision when aided by optical instruments, the convenient name has been given of "*The Ether*." That term I shall use throughout this treatise; but as a name only, and with no intention to imply by it the recognition of more than the *something imperceptible*,

whatever it may be, which occupies all of space that is not occupied by *perceptible matter*; but without designing to affirm, or even to imagine, what that *something* is.

Our senses are constructed to perceive certain external existences. We could not maintain life in a *material* world (that is, a world constructed of molecules) unless endowed with senses to take cognisance of the molecular structure by which we are surrounded. We could neither procure pleasure nor avoid danger. Our senses are accurately adjusted to our needs. With the aid of Science, we are enabled to extend the range of those senses beyond the limits required for the common purposes of life. We can thus see things far beyond the range of unassisted vision, as also things so minute that to the unaided eye they are invisible. But the most powerful instruments can help us to penetrate but a very brief distance into the infinitely great and the infinitely little. The telescope shows us tens of thousands of worlds; but these occupy only a speck in space. The microscope reveals to us perfectly organised forms of marvellous minuteness; yet the matter it makes visible is as a mole-hill to a mountain compared with the still lesser matter it cannot show us, but which nevertheless is as real as are the worlds, as much surpassing in littleness the smallest thing shown by the microscope as the unseen Universe exceeds the tiny portion of creation presented to us by the telescope.

"*Matter*," then, is the name we give to that portion of the external Universe which our senses, aided or unaided, are constructed to perceive. Whatever our senses can take cognisance of is what we call "*matter*." All the far greater portion of Creation that is imperceptible to our senses, is not "*matter*." But nevertheless it exists. Let us call it *non-matter*.

Thus defined, the Universe is composed of *matter* and *non-matter*.

But it must be clearly understood that this is entirely a human distinction. It results from the structure of the human senses. Possibly it is not a distinction



actually existing in Nature. There is no definite boundary between non-matter and matter. Possibly, nay probably, the one is continually passing into the other, very slight change of conditions sufficing for the purpose. Moreover, matter must vary according to the characteristics of the Intelligences that contemplate it. To a being with *one sense more* than Man, much would be perceptible that is imperceptible to us, and therefore much that to us is *non-matter* would to him be matter. To a being having *one sense less* than ourselves much that to us is matter would be *non-matter*.

But we are inquiring now into the structure of Man and *his* perceptions, and therefore we can recognise here as "*matter*" that only which is perceptible by the human senses.

What, then, is "*matter*?"

It is whatever is perceptible to the human senses, which are constructed to perceive a certain small segment of the vast circle of actual existence, *and that only*. All of creation that is not structured of "*matter*" our senses are unable to perceive, and we can discover its existence only by its manifestations.

"Matter" is structured of *molecules*, which are not really the ultimate particles of matter, but those agglomerations only that are perceptible by the human senses. Molecules are but groups of lesser particles, that are imperceptible by our senses until thus united into the masses we call molecular. To these lesser particles the convenient name of "*atoms*" has been given. But we are ignorant in what proportion or manner they are brought into combination for the formation of molecules. It may well be that molecules are formed by the attraction of certain definite combinations of atomic structure, thus by countless divisions and endless agglomerations producing infinitely various forms of being. Even conjecture falls back confounded at a contemplation so vast, and yet so probable, because in strict accordance with all of creation Man is constructed to perceive.

"Matter," then, is structured of *molecules*, which are

structured of *atoms*. When "matter" is apparently destroyed, it is only resolved into the molecules of which it was formed. Molecules themselves are probably resolved into their original atoms. Recombinations of both are continually proceeding. Thus the great cycle of renovation by change is maintained.

Our senses, which can perceive molecular structure, cannot perceive atomic or any other structure. Imagine a being constructed of atoms combined in some other proportion than is required for the structure of molecular matter. Such a being would be absolutely imperceptible to us. He might stand before us and we should not see him—touch us and we should not feel him. His presence could only be made known to us by some force applied to the molecular substances about us by the motions of which substances alone our senses could be impressed.

Moreover, there is doubtless an infinite variety of combinations of atoms, besides the molecular combination that alone is cognizable by us. These structures would be perceptible to beings constructed with senses differing from our own. The space occupied by molecular structure is but the minutest fragment of the space occupied, or at least capable of being occupied, by *non-molecular* structure. If not only the whole of our atmosphere, but all the interspaces between the visible worlds, be crowded with beings of atomic, or of some other than molecular, structure, we could see nothing and know nothing of them,—because our human senses are incapable of being impressed by them.

And not only is it certain that such a thronged Universe *may* encompass us on every side, but the most probable conjecture, based upon a survey of the whole scheme of creation, is that we are so encompassed.

Beings having life and intelligence might be about us everywhere—might walk the earth, dwell in the air, occupy the mighty spaces between the visible worlds around us, and if only they are constructed of atoms combined in some proportion or manner other than that in which atoms combine to form molecules, they would



be absolutely imperceptible to us. Nor is this the most curious consequence. If those beings are structured, as we are, to perceive only one of the many non-molecular combinations of atoms, we and all that we can see of creation must be as imperceptible to them as they are to us. A non-molecular world altogether different from ours, or like our own, might be about us without any consciousness of it by ourselves, and in each case we and our world would be equally non-existing to the inhabitants of that non-molecular neighbour world.

Atoms combine to form molecules, and if we knew the laws by which atomic structure is governed, as we know the laws that govern molecular structure, we might produce the necessary conditions for causing the combinations that convert atomic structure into molecular structure and so make it perceptible to our senses. An Intelligence superior to our own might readily do so. Has it ever been effected? Does it ever occur under any conditions? When we cease to exist as molecular structure and become atomic or other non-molecular structure, are conditions possible under which the non-molecular may be changed into molecular structure and so become again perceptible to human senses? Is this power possessed by any of the multitudinous creations of atomic or other non-molecular structure with which the Universe is doubtless thronged? These are problems of Psychology that may not be so insoluble as they seem.

The molecules of which "matter" is constructed are not in actual contact. If we could invent a microscope of sufficient power, we should see them distinctly separated one from another, and that which to the unassisted eye appears as a solid mass would present itself as merely a group of distinctly separated bodies, held in near neighbourhood by some imperceptible force, but which would fly apart and disperse if that force were to be for forces, these molecules that make all "matter" are in an instant withdrawn. Under the ever active physical perpetual motion within their several spheres. In

organised bodies they certainly must be so, for only thus could the work of growth, repair and removal be performed. In every process of *life* there must be the incessant passage of matter through matter, by permeation of molecules through a crowd of other molecules. This could not be unless the molecules of which we are constructed were not only distinct but separated.

If we could, with such a microscope, survey this molecular Mechanism of Man, what should we see?

A structure which to our sense of sight would appear almost as a fluid. There would be nothing *solid*, in our sense of the term. A mass of ever moving particles, separated, but held within a certain mutual range by some imperceptible rein. This would admit of endless motions among themselves and ample space for the permeation of the whole structure by other molecules or by structures made of smaller particles than molecules. The entire of non-molecular structure (by which I intend anything composed of other particles than molecules) might thus be readily admitted into a body builded of molecules and occupy the spaces between them without any change in the form, or size, or external aspect of the body so possessed. I ask the serious consideration of the Student to this necessary condition of molecular structure and his endeavour clearly so to comprehend it, for it will be found hereafter to have important consequences in Psychological Science.

I repeat that, in the pursuit of science, and especially of Physiology and Psychology, it is necessary to dismiss from the mind the notion of *solidity*. No progress is possible while that conception clings to us. It is still, as ever it has been, the most formidable obstacle to knowledge. The true principles of these allied Sciences are unintelligible so long as we look upon structure of any kind as a solid mass of materials in actual contact. Banish this fallacy of the senses and view all material things with the mind's eye, and they will then appear to the mental vision as being, what in fact they are, agglomerations of separated particles with interspaces. Once



attain to a clear apprehension of this and instantly the mechanism, not of Man only, but of the entire material —(that is, *molecular*-structured)—portion of Creation will appear under another aspect. A new and bright light will be thrown upon that which before was shrouded in utter darkness. Operations previously unintelligible will become plain and manifest, and phenomena, before wrapped in mystery and marvel, will be found readily explicable, in strict accordance with the known laws and forces of Nature.

*Matter*, then, is not something having definite qualities, an existence and an individuality altogether distinct from the rest of creation, which, for lack of a better name, we here call *non-matter*. Matter is, in fact, *non-matter* itself aggregated into the definite form we call *molecular*. Molecules are themselves attracted into masses and constitute the material substances of which alone our senses are enabled to take cognizance. The forces that compel these aggregations of atoms into molecules and molecules into material substances are very imperfectly understood, and we are equally ignorant of the laws by which the forces operate upon the elements of matter, not merely to bring them into shape, but to produce all the countless variety of shapes that matter assumes. But we know that when those forces cease to act the *substance* is separated into its original molecules. It is probable, though not yet proved, that *molecules* resolve themselves into their original *atoms*, that which was *matter* to-day becoming *non-matter* to-morrow, and the next day, perhaps, turning to *matter* again. But of this eternal change, although proceeding about us every moment, we are wholly unconscious, because our senses are so constructed that they receive no impressions from *atoms* or non-molecular structure until they are combined into the form of *molecules*.

We have some notion of *matter*. We know little or nothing of *non-matter*. But it exists, and its proportion to matter is as Mont Blanc to a grain of sand. *Non-matter* is not a *nothing*—an idea merely. It is as real as matter.

It must be structured of something, and occupy a part of space, and have forms and qualities, and exist under conditions and in obedience to laws, precisely as matter does. We must remember that "*matter*" is only *non-matter taking the shape in which alone it becomes perceptible to our senses.*

Whatever name be given to *non-matter*, according to the conceptions entertained of it by different persons, they who use the term should always design to express the same thing, and they should carefully avoid any name that would be likely to convey to the mind of reader or listener a notion that *non-matter* is something to which a definite conception is already attached. Hence, in this chapter I have adhered steadfastly to the indefinite name that best expresses our almost entire ignorance of its nature and characteristics.

So likewise if a Being of atomic or other non-molecular structure desired to make itself perceptible to us, it could do so by converting non-molecular structure into molecules, and thus making "*matter*" which then would instantly become perceptible to our senses. We could both see it and feel it. If there be any conditions under which this process of conversion of atoms into molecular structure can occur, is a question for important inquiry by Psychology.

If such a Being desired again to reduce matter to non-matter, the process of conversion would be by resolving the molecules into atoms. Then that which the moment before had been seen, or felt, or otherwise had become perceptible to our senses, would instantly become imperceptible to them. The thing so changed would still exist. It might stand on the same spot, occupying precisely the same portion of space, identically the same in shape; but we should have no knowledge of its presence. It would have *vanished*—as we should call it—that is to say, it would no longer be *perceptible* to us. It would for all purposes to us have ceased to be. But there it is, nevertheless, in substance and shape precisely as before, but by reason of the resolution of the molecules into their



constituent atoms it would have ceased to exist to our perceptions. It would in fact have become what mankind calls "*spirit*."

For, if we forget *phrases* and consider *things*—if we firmly resolve to attach to the term "*spirit*" some definite and distinct conception, instead of a vague, colourless and formless notion, such as is too commonly indulged by those who mistake words for ideas, we shall discover that in fact whatever our senses can perceive is *matter*, and whatever our senses cannot perceive is *spirit*. All of the Universe that is imperceptible to our senses is not a void—a nothing. It must be *something*, formed of *something*, and be *somewhere* and occupy *some space*. The material of which it is constructed may be of any degree of rarity, but nevertheless it is an existing *thing*, as real and solid to senses constructed to perceive that special structure as is molecular substance to our senses. Hence "*spirit*" (if any be pleased to give this name to *non-matter*) being of *atomic*, or some other non-molecular structure, is continually passing into the form of *matter* and as continually passing again out of the form of matter into the non-molecular structure we call "*spirit*." "*Matter*," thus viewed, is but the crust or outward shell of "*spirit*." We are ignorant as yet what are the forces that produce these changes. We know not the power by which atoms are aggregated into molecules, or molecules resolved into atoms, more than we know the force by which molecules are aggregated in such fashion as to form the infinite variety of substances that compose that portion of Creation perceptible to our senses, which, therefore, we call "*material*."

But the lesson I am desirous to impress upon the Reader is, that at the beginning of his study he should conceive of "*matter*" and "*non-matter*" (or "*spirit*") with so definite an idea of each, that it may not be necessary for me hereafter to repeat the sense in which those terms are here used.

"*Matter*" is all of creation that is of molecular structure, and which alone is perceptible to our senses.

“*Non-matter*” or “*spirit*” is all of creation that is not of molecular structure, and which therefore is imperceptible to our senses that are constructed to perceive only molecular structure.

“*Matter*” becomes “*Spirit*” by the resolution of its molecules into the atoms of which they are constructed.

“*Spirit*” becomes “*Matter*” when its atoms are agglomerated into molecules.

If the molecules of which Mont Blanc is made were to be suddenly resolved into their atoms, the mountain, without the slightest change in shape or bulk, would as instantly vanish from our perceptions. We should cease to see it or to feel it. We might walk through it without the slightest consciousness of its presence. But there it still would be, as it was, in the same place, the same in size and shape—in every particle identical with the Mont Blanc that just before had confronted us. Because it is now *atomic* and no longer *molecular* it is absolutely imperceptible by our senses. It has no existence for us. It is that we term “immaterial” and imponderable. It is what the Materialists call “unknowable.” If a prophet were to declare its presence, we might have faith in his assertion, but there would be no *evidence* of its actual existence. It would be to us a *spirit mountain*.

If the wave of a wand could then recombine those atoms into their disintegrated molecules—in an instant Mont Blanc would stand before us again, visible to sight,—palpable to touch—impassible—a material mountain knowable and known—“*spirit*” one moment, “*matter*” the next.

Probably few readers have ever realised to their conceptions the fact, shown by this illustration, how intimately *spirit* and *matter* are allied, how easily and speedily either might pass into the other.

From the different conditions of these forms of being—one *molecular*, therefore perceptible by the senses (which we call “*matter*”), the other *non-molecular*, and therefore *imperceptible* by the senses (which we call



“atomic”)—we might reasonably look for a difference in the natural laws to which they are severally subjected, as also in the forces, or in the operations of the forces, by which they are directed. Molecular structure, for instance, is subject to the force of *gravitation*. Non-molecular or atomic structure is probably exempt from the influence of that force. I say *probably*, because, being unable to perceive the structure of non-molecular being, we can only conjecture, from changes in the conditions of its action, the influence of the known physical forces, or the presence of unknown forces. The exemption of non-molecular structure from the force of gravitation is a conclusion consistent with what we know of the action of the physical forces upon matter. We shall see hereafter what facts and phenomena there are that point to such a condition, if they do not prove it.

But when I divide creation into *matter* and *non-matter* (by which I mean molecular and non-molecular structure, the former being that which our senses are structured to perceive, the latter that infinitely larger part of creation our senses are not structured to perceive)—I must not be understood as asserting that there is a determinate difference between these two forms of being. It may well be that matter and non-matter are, in fact, identical, for there is strong evidence that they can pass readily from one condition into the other. Our perceptions are conditioned upon certain laws of our own structure, and the seeming differences may be in *our* capacity for, or mode of, perception, and not in the object. Thus, all that we call “matter” may be in substance precisely the same as that we call “non-matter,” but rendered perceptible to us by reason of some special manner of its presentation to our senses. On the other hand, what we call *non-matter* (simply because we cannot perceive it), may be identical with the matter we perceive, only that, not being presented to us under the conditions that would make it perceptible, it is to us what we term *immaterial*.

So likewise *non-matter* may be infinitely various in structure and quality. There may be, and doubtless

there are, countless intelligent existences which, because structured differently from ourselves, have perceptions of much that we are unable to perceive, to whom there is a world, or even a Universe of worlds, palpable and perceptible as is ours to us, and to whose senses we, and our earth, and our Universe, are as imperceptible as is their existence to us, and who have no more knowledge of us than we have of them. Thousands of such non-molecular structures may be even within the range of our vision and we should know nothing of them. It is conceivable, it is possible, it is not even improbable, that within the little circle of space which our tiny world encompasses in its journey round the sun there may be worlds we cannot see, peopled by races of intelligent beings we cannot know, and who in their turn know nothing of our world nor of us who people it. Nay, the region of the very atmosphere in which we live may be thronged with forms, animate and inanimate, intelligent and unintelligent, whom we cannot perceive *because they are not structured of molecules as we are*, and who cannot perceive us or our dwelling place, because our molecular structure is imperceptible to their senses.

It will be seen hereafter what a flood of light these considerations throw upon many phenomena that perplex us by their seeming mystery and startle us by their strangeness.

---



## CHAPTER VII.

## OF FORCE.

THERE will be such repeated occasion to employ the term FORCE in the following chapters, that it will be desirable for the reader to understand clearly the sense in which it is here used. Half the controversies of the learned world would be avoided if the disputants would begin by distinctly defining their terms and consenting to use them in the same sense. In the first edition of this treatise the term *Force*, always in its pages employed in a certain scientific sense, was misrepresented by some hostile critics and perhaps misunderstood by some readers.

All *change* involves *motion*. We cannot conceive of any change in the condition of anything, or of any particle of anything, without the conception of *motion*.

Nor can we conceive of *motion* without associating with it the conception of *cause* and *effect*. The motion of any particle of matter must be produced by something without itself, or within itself, and that something is what we call the *cause* of the effect. True, that cause and effect, philosophically considered, are only *invariable sequence* so far as human observation has extended. But it is impossible to sever, in our human conceptions, the idea of the antecedent from that of an influence or power exercised by such antecedent and by which the change is produced. It is to this that the name of "*cause and effect*" has been given. For all practical purposes we must recognise cause and consequence *as a truth to us*, whatever it may be in reality. As motion is a change of place, more or less, it cannot occur without changing the place of something else. There is no void in creation. Every

part of it is occupied by *something*, however imperceptible to our senses that *something* may be. There is no *solid* in so much of the Universe as is apparent to us. The visible worlds are only aggregations of molecules that do not touch each other and that are in perpetual motion and change.

Nor can we conceive of one thing producing motion in another thing without communicating to it an *impulse*. This impulse it is that we term a *Force*.

*Force*, then, in the scientific sense of the term (in which alone it is here employed), means merely *that* (whatever it may be), *which communicates to molecular matter the impulse that causes motion*.

By the *Forces of Nature* are here intended those impulses, whatever they be, that are communicated to the molecules that make "matter," producing in them certain definite motions by which a change in certain definite directions occurs in the relationship of the molecules. These *Forces* are known to Science by many names, according to the apparent spheres of their operations. Thus, a force is found to separate the molecules of certain substances and to recombine them so as to form other substances, and to this the name of the *Chemical Force* has been given. A force is found to proceed from certain substances and to make the particles of the air luminous in its passage through them and to deflect the molecules of which metals and other things are made. This is called the *Electric Force*. A force is found to pervade the entire of the world on which we dwell and to cause molecular changes in its substance. We call it the *Magnetic Force*. A force is found to control the motions of the visible worlds, and to govern every movement of ourselves. This is called the *Force of Gravity*. A force is seen to move the molecules of which *organic* matter is constructed. It affects them in a very different manner from the operation of the *forces* that control *inorganic* matter. It produces infinitely complex structure and sustains that structure even in opposition to the Physical Forces. This force results in *Life*, if it be not Life. We



give to it different names, according to the particular mode of its manifestation, and sometimes to hide from ourselves our ignorance of its nature. We call it the *Vital Force* or the *Nerve Force*.

There is yet another form in which force exhibits itself. *Vital Force* preserves the life of the organised being, failing which it ceases to live. *Nerve Force* sets in action all the functions of the organism and *moves* the muscles and limbs. There is another force that *directs* the movement of the material mechanism of the body, an *intelligent* force, produced within the body, to which I have ventured to give the name of the *Psychic* (or *Soul*) *Force*.

The Reader, then, must understand distinctly that, throughout this treatise, by the term *Force* nothing more is intended to be designated than *the thing* (whatever it be, and upon which no opinion is proposed to be pronounced) *that is the immediate cause of motion in the thing then under contemplation*.

Whether there be in fact as many forces as names given to them, or whether, as is the later doctrine, they be one force in different manifestations, is not a question for discussion here. Be they one or many in no manner affects any fact or argument hereafter advanced. The proofs in favour of the identity of all the forces by which *molecular matter* is moved are certainly very cogent and their actual conversion, each into each, in the brilliant experiments of PROFESSOR TYNDALL almost amounts to demonstration. Science, equally with the common language of books and of society, still continues to distinguish between them, preserving the particular name by which each of the Physical Forces has hitherto been known. That course will be observed in the following pages, with the express understanding that thereby nothing is to be assumed as to the source or the nature of those forces.

To prevent needless repetition, let it be stated, once for all, in what sense the name given to each manifestation of force is here used.

1. By the *Force of Gravity* is intended the force that *attracts* molecule to molecule, matter to matter—a force that appears to pervade the entire material universe and to be limited to *molecular matter*.

2. By the *Magnetic Force* is intended the force that, seen in slight action in the magnet, certainly pervades all the world in which we dwell, and probably the Universe, and which is reasonably supposed to be the active agent in all molecular change, alike in decomposition and recomposition.

3. The *Electric Force* is doubtless only another name for the Magnetic Force, exhibiting itself under different conditions, but which manifests its presence more frequently and plainly than the Magnetic Force when, meeting with obstructions in its passage through various molecular structures, it marks its presence by light, heat, noise, and shattering of the obstructive body.

4. By the *Vital Force* is intended the force that we recognise as *Life*. It is found only in organic structure. It can to a limited extent control the operations of the *Physical Forces*, whose sway is resumed immediately on the cessation of the *Vital Force*.

5. By the *Nerve Force* is intended the force that, emanating from the nerve centres, is radiated throughout the organic structure by the nerve cords, enabling them to build, sustain, and repair the body, causing it to perform the functions necessary to its own nutriment. It is probably identical with the *Vital Force*.

6. By the *Psychic Force* is intended the *Intelligent Force* that proceeds from the Conscious Self, and sets in motion and directs the motions of the mechanism of the body, in obedience to the commands of that Conscious Self.

Such being the forces hereafter often referred to, it may be convenient also to state briefly in what manner their existence is ascertained and presence proved.

*Themselves* are not visible, nor tangible, nor perceptible to any human sense. Until recently, some of them were



contemplated even by Science as things having shape and substance. Scientists talked of the Electric and Magnetic *Fluids* as if they were definite bodies that passed through certain substances, and showed themselves in sparks, and made themselves felt in shocks inflicted by blows delivered by the supposed fluid. This notion is now abandoned and these Forces are recognised as being only modes of motion. They are not *things*, but only certain conditions of things. Nevertheless, if not themselves things, they must emanate from things.

According to the doctrine preached by Professor TYNDALL and the Materialists, *all* of these Forces *ought to be* alike excluded from the range of their studies, for they say that Science can deal only with that which is *material*, which it can throw into the crucible, subject to the microscope, or decompose in the retort, and that all beyond this are subjects only for imagination and therefore unworthy of attention.

But the *Magnetic* Force is as imperceptible to our senses as is the *Psychic* Force or the *Vital* Force. By what right do they receive the one into the circle of Science and reject the other?

Being imperceptible to our senses, even if they be material entities, all of the *Physical Forces* are equally as incapable of demonstrative proof, according to Scientific requirements, as are the *Psychic*, the *Vital*, and the *Nerve Forces*. But we are not the less certain of their existence because we are unable to perceive them, nor the less competent to learn their characteristics. We know of them by their *manifestations*, that is to say, by the effects of their presence upon the molecular matter our senses are constructed to perceive. It is probable that, although they are at all times passing about us, and through us, and through all the masses of the worlds, with enormous power, we should never have discovered their existence but for obstacles that impede their free flow. When the molecules yield, and glide, and transmit the motion to their neighbours, there is no consciousness in ourselves of the action of any of these forces and no

presentation of its presence to any of our senses. But when its equable flow is disturbed, the power of the force is shown in manifestations that are often tremendously destructive—always more or less the sources of pain or of alarm. Thus we learn their presence by the results. We find it in the abnormal condition of the molecules subjected to the force, and alike with the *Psychic* and *Organic* as with the *Physical* Forces. Hence the importance of investigating abnormal conditions of organised being as affording infinitely deeper insight into the secrets of Science than can be given in their normal conditions, when, there being no disturbance there is no manifestation.

Force, then, being motion merely, one molecule transmitting it to another molecule, and, according to what is called the *Conservation of Energy*, not ceasing to be, but merely changing the former mode of motion, the mind of the Reader will be at once directed to the question, whence it comes? Where and by what power was the Force *first* set in motion that now moves certain molecules of the pen with which I write? Who or what gave the *first* impulse? Seeing in matter “the promise and the potency of every form of life” does not explain the presence of the *Forces* that are keeping every molecule of which the universe is constructed in perpetual motion. Does not this point directly to the existence of *something other than the matter that is moved*—something outside of it by which those forces are set in motion? If there be such a *something*, it is that which I intend by the term *Spirit*, in the sense stated in the previous chapter, viz., a power proceeding from that infinitely vaster non-molecular region of creation in which the molecular Universe is but a speck floating, as in an ocean, whose non-molecular structure presses close upon us everywhere and permeates all molecular being.

If speculation may be permitted, with the understanding that it is speculation merely, may it not be that the *material* (that is the *molecular*) world is merely the surface of the *non-molecular* (or *atomic*) creation



agglomerated into molecules, and so made perceptible to our senses, but which molecules are continually dissolving again into atoms. What would be the conclusion from such a probable condition? That the molecular world is a representation of the atomic world—is, in fact, the atomic world itself made perceptible on the face of it—but that below this molecular surface lies the non-molecular world, which is the true substantial world? Would not this solve many problems and make plain much that now appears to be involved in unfathomable mystery? It is not an impossible conjecture. It is not even improbable.

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

## OF SOLIDITY—SIZE—SPACE—TIME.

THIS introduction to the Mechanism of Man would not be complete without warning the Reader against some other popular fallacies he will stumble upon in his studies, which, unless removed, will certainly prevent his clear comprehension alike of the physical and the psychical laws to which he will be introduced. Some have been already disposed of in the previous chapters. Others remain to be noted. The popular notions of *Solidity*, *Size*, *Space* and *Time* are altogether fallacious.

A Reader not accustomed to reflection will be startled to learn that nothing is *solid*, in the popular sense of the term. He conceives a solid body to be, as it appears to his senses,—an uniform and continuous substance—a whole without definite parts; or, if composed of particles, that those particles touch one another and are agglomerated into what we term a *solid* mass. But the fact is otherwise. *Nothing* in nature is *solid*. Everything is composed of particles, perhaps of varying sizes, *but no two of which are ever in actual contact*. There is a space around each particle within which it can move freely. Take steel or granite, for instance. A good microscope exhibits them as made of small particles crowded together. A better microscope will show us each of these particles composed of yet smaller particles, and so forth beyond the ken of the most powerful instrument. We know that these smaller particles are made of particles still more minute. We know also that they do not actually touch, for heat expands and cold contracts the mass; the



one, by further separating the particles ; the other, by drawing them nearer together.

*Solidity*, therefore, is only our notion of nature, not a fact. A *solid* is merely an agglomeration of particles opposing resistance to our muscles. A *fluid* is an agglomeration of particles moving so easily among each other that they readily yield to the impact of our muscles.

To beings of non-molecular structure a solid might be as fluid as is the air to us. On the contrary, to beings of some other structure that which to us is fluid may be solid. Constructed as we are, we pass readily through the particles of the air ; with more difficulty through the particles of water ; we are unable to pass through the particles of a rock. But there are gases that can penetrate the particles of granite, and it is not improbable that there are beings structured so that a rock would be no impediment to them. If molecules be but aggregates of atoms, it is certain that anything structured of non-molecular atoms, which are so much smaller than molecules, could permeate and pass through anything of molecular structure as easily as the particles of salt can permeate the particles of a glass of water. To a thing, animate or inanimate, structured of atoms not aggregated into molecules, or aggregated in some other than molecular form, the most solid wall would be no obstruction whatever.

So it is with our own bodies. They are not *solid*. They are made of particles that are not in actual contact and every one of which may be—in fact, *is*—necessarily permeated by other bodies still smaller. This is the manner in which the processes of nutrition and elimination are conducted. Thus it is that the body contracts with cold and expands with heat. Its particles are drawn closer together or moved further apart ; but they never *touch*. Diseases and their remedies, and, indeed, the entire laws of health, can only be understood by a firm and clear understanding of *the fact*, that nothing of our structure is really solid, and that the thing we term *solid* is only so to our sensations.

*Size* is another fertile subject of popular fallacy, which the student of Psychology must resolve to banish. "*Great*" and "*small*" are terms we employ as if they had a definite meaning. We forget that, in fact, we use them only relatively to ourselves. We measure everything by our own sensations. We call "*great*" whatever is bigger, "*little*" whatever is smaller, than ourselves. We forget that we are not the centre of Creation. To a Being viewing this world from another standpoint things would appear, in respect of size, altogether different from that they appear to us. We term the animalcule *small* because it is imperceptible to *our* vision and *we* can with difficulty conceive of anything smaller. But there is no reason to doubt that size is comparative only. To a Being constructed with powers of perception equal to that we obtain by help of our best microscopes, what we call *little* would appear big, and a whole world would be visible, whose existence is unknown to us because it is imperceptible to our senses. So it would be with a Being whose senses possessed the power the telescope gives to us. *He* would see a vast Universe of worlds of which we are ignorant. Nevertheless, it is necessary that we should recognise the existence of the *infinitely little*, for only thus can many of the problems be explained which Psychology will present to us. How inconceivably minute some things actually are will be shown by a simple illustration.

Present the object glass of a camera before a vast landscape. Every object in that landscape will, at the focus of that glass, be concentrated instantly into a picture inconceivably small, as is proved by this, that on the table on the other side of the glass is exhibited the entire of the landscape, with every object perfectly depicted. In that mere pin-point at the focus of the glass all this picture, with its millions of objects, was compressed, and yet each of them—hills, rivers, fields, trees, leaves, and blades of grass, the whole landscape in fact—was compressed and distinctly drawn and painted! The particles of musk will be diffused through the atmosphere of a



room for months with no perceptible diminution in the weight of the mass and yet must millions of those particles be pouring from it hourly.

So with the *infinitely great*. Our earth is but as a grain of dust to an eye that could compass even the Universe immediately about us. Our sun, with its attendant worlds, is but one of the multitudinous suns that are grouped in that part of the heavens we call the "Milky Way," and our limited power of vision can penetrate but the merest fringe of creation.

*Space* itself is but a human notion. It may be something very different from our conception of it. The axioms of the Mathematicians are supposed to be absolutely true. They are not so necessarily, nor even probably. Man is constructed to perceive, and to contemplate his perceptions, only according to certain conditions of his own organisation. The axioms of Euclid are but axioms to the human brain, according to its limited capacity for conceiving of *space*. To a mind having other perceptions of space these axioms, that appear to us to be absolutely and universally true, might be altogether false. As it is, our confidence in the absolute truth of mathematics has been rudely shaken. The mathematicians of Germany assert a fourth dimension of space (beyond length, breadth, and thickness, which are all the dimensions conceivable by our very limited intelligence), and which, if it exist, overthrows our present notions of matter, mind, space, time, and being.

So it is with *Time*. That also is a human conception. It may and probably does differ, not only with other animals, but among ourselves. We may see this in the rapidity with which the same minutes seem to fly, when we are trying to catch a train, compared with their seeming slowness when we are waiting for a train. It may well be that to the gnat who lives but for a day life may appear to be as long as our lives appear to us. Our notion of time results from the structure of our mechanism, compelling *successive* reception by the Conscious Self of the ideas and impressions conveyed to it

by the brain, which cannot present to the consciousness two distinct impressions at the same instant. This is a purely material condition, consequent upon the Conscious Self being compelled to communicate with a material world through a material organ. When the Conscious Self is released from that obligation, free to take its perceptions directly, and no longer compelled to receive them in succession, its conception of Time must of necessity be altogether different, and past, present and future will have quite another meaning for it.

---



## CHAPTER IX.

## THE NATURAL AND THE SUPERNATURAL.

It is impossible to enter upon the study of the great Science of Psychology with any chance of progress or profit without first clearing the Mind of some prejudices, deeply rooted and difficult to be eradicated, which, implanted in early youth, have been supported by the language of literature and confirmed by general acceptance. Such a prejudice is the popular notion of *solidity*, showing a confident belief in that which does not exist in fact. Another fallacy is, the reality of *colour* and *music* as things existing in the external world and not as being, what in truth they are, merely sensations of our own Minds.

But the prejudice to which it is desired more particularly to invite the consideration of the Reader, with an entreaty that he will make an effort to banish it entirely from his Mind in his studies of the question WHAT AM I? is that term so often used and abused—the source of so many fallacies in argument and of so much confusion of thought—the *Supernatural*—a phrase which has about it the convenient vagueness that enables the loose or shallow thinker to impose an empty word for substantial wisdom. How large it looks and sounds, and how admirably it is opposed to the term “*natural*!” How glibly they pass together from the lips! But tried by the Intelligence, what do they import? “What is the *Natural*?” “Whatever is.” “What is the *Supernatural*?” “Whatever is not the natural.” By these

unmeaning definitions the unreflecting Mind believes that it has solved the whole problem.

But the Psychologist must banish the term altogether, as being too indefinite for any purpose of Science. Phrases such as these are the *ignes fatui* of knowledge. They mislead thought. They impose names for things and substitute shadows for substances. What do you intend when you say that this is *natural*? What do you intend when you call that *supernatural*? Do you answer that the supernatural means something above the natural—beyond its range—out of its sphere? Granted. But to determine this you must first define *the natural*. What then is the *natural*? Surely it is not restricted to the range of your own knowledge. All is not *supernatural* that chances to be beyond the limited survey of your own intelligence or even beyond the limit of the knowledge Man has yet attained. See what is involved in the use of the term *the supernatural*. We believe we have learned certain regular sequences of actions as occurring within the very petty circle of the boundless creation to which our small intelligence can penetrate, and seeing certain conditions of things attending or following on certain other conditions, we assume these sequences and conditions to be governed by a compelling force, which we formulate and call a *Law of Nature*. The Scientists assume, not only that they have accurately learned the particular law, but that there can be no other as yet unknown law by which that law may be modified or superseded, and then they dogmatically declare that whatever is within the range of their asserted law is *Natural* and that whatever is beyond its range is *Supernatural*.

But, in very truth, of the multitudinous laws of Nature, and of the many forces that exist even within the circle of our intelligence, Science has learned but the merest fraction. We are as yet but upon the threshold of our knowledge of Nature and of Nature's laws. It is only supreme vanity or purblind ignorance that can venture to say what is or is not natural. *Whatever is is natural.*



Nothing that *is* can be *supernatural*. *The fact of existence is conclusive proof of naturalness.*

Most of the now familiar facts of Science were once deemed *supernatural*. Being strange and inexplicable by the then known laws of nature they were relegated to the convenient region of the non-natural. But investigation of their sources speedily showed them to be in strict accord with nature. The larger portion of the phenomena of Psychology are still looked upon as *supernatural*. The Student will soon discover that, like all the physical phenomena, they are wholly natural and obey fixed laws of Nature.

Banish, then, the conception of *the supernatural* from your thoughts and the word from your vocabulary. It will only lead you astray. Do not assume that you know all about Nature, and all the laws that govern her, and all the forces that move her, and all the forms and conditions of being, so that you are entitled to say of this or of that "it is not *natural*," or of other things that "they are *supernatural*." In the Science of Psychology you will come continually upon phenomena which, because they differ from physical phenomena, and are not obedient to physical laws, nor cognisable under physical conditions, have been branded by Scientists as *supernatural*, and the Truthseeker has been deterred from the investigation of them by shouting to him "Superstition! Beware!" Your course as an honest searcher for truth is clear. You must look to *things* and not to *words*. There is but one question for the honest student of Science; "Is it a *fact*?" Of this be assured, that no fact, however seemingly trifling, is worthless to Science. The frequent question, "What is the use of it?" must be answered by pointing to the apple of NEWTON, the kite of FRANKLIN, the teakettle of WATTS, and the dancing doll of WHEATSTONE. What a universe of new knowledge may not be opened by the finding of the smallest *fact*. When the knowledge of ourselves, of our mental and spiritual structure, of our capacities here and hereafter, shall have been deemed, as soon it

must be, a necessary part of education, the *Supernatural* will cease to be a word of fear even among old women. Then we may hope that it will at length be banished from the vocabulary of the Scientist and even from the cant of Materialism.

---

In a recent essay contributed to the *Nineteenth Century* by Professor HUXLEY, entitled "*Sensation and the Sensiferous Organs*," appears the following significant reference to the insufficiency of Materialism to account for that which forms the subject of investigation in this book:—"The Idealist, not content with declaring the truth that our knowledge is limited to facts of consciousness, affirms the wholly unprovable proposition that nothing exists beyond these and the substance of mind. And, on the other hand, the Materialist, holding by the truth that, for anything that appears to the contrary, material phenomena are the causes of mental phenomena, asserts his unprovable dogma, that material phenomena and the substance of matter are the sole primary existences."

---



## PART II.

# THE MECHANISM OF MAN.

---

### CHAPTER I.

#### INTRODUCTORY.

I MUST pray the Reader for the moment to think of A MAN, neither as living nor dead, neither as white nor black, neither as good nor bad, but merely as an inert machine, complete in all its parts, but to which the motive force has not yet been applied. Contemplate him as perfect in form and faculties, wanting only the presence of the power that is to set the machinery in motion.

What do we see?

A head, a torso and four limbs. Two of the limbs are constructed to carry him to objects external to himself and two to bring external objects to him. The head is obviously contrived and created for the direction and control of the action of the four limbs. The business of the torso, or trunk, is to supply to the machine the material needful for its subsistence and to carry off the material which has been used up.

This structure is inclosed in a smooth and fair fabric—the skin.

If we look below the outward covering of the skin, what do we find?

A framework of bones, supporting a mass of fibrous muscles, which are attached to the bones by tendons.

By the opposing contractions and expansions of these muscular fibres, the bones are set in motion and the equilibrium of the mechanism is maintained. In a cavity protected by the bony structure we find a complicated apparatus for grinding, receiving, and digesting food, for eliminating from it the nourishing particles, and for expelling the useless residue and the used-up material. Another apparatus receives and expels the air, in the great ocean of which Man lives. It separates the particles of the gases that compose the atmosphere; takes up one gas and casts off the other; mingles the gas with the blood, as it passes on its journey through the whole structure, and to which work it is impelled by that never resting force-pump—the heart.

And this structure of bone and muscle, fed by the blood sent to every part of it by the combined action of the heart and the arteries, is permeated by a network of threads running from certain centres. These delicate threads are constructed to receive impressions made upon their extremities, to carry those impressions to the centres whence they radiate, and to convey to the whole structure the orders which the Conscious Self *wills* and the brain transmits.

Set upon this structure of trunks and limbs is *the head*, a ball almost wholly filled with a greyish mass of a peculiar fabric, fibrous, formed of two distinct hemispheres and showing also some other marked divisions. From this double brain radiate two sets of nerve cords, which cross, and each passes to the side of the body opposite to that whence it issued. Divided and subdivided into infinite ramifications, the nerve cords penetrate every part of the structure, bringing the remotest regions of it directly under the cognizance and control of the nerve centres.

The head incloses the brain and the brain is the organ of *the Intelligence*. The head thus rules the structure above which it is set. The Self *wills*, the brain receives the command and conveys it to the nerve, and the limbs obey the prompting of the nerve. But the brain does not



control the apparatus for nourishment and reparation that is contained in the trunk. A portion of the machinery works independently of the control of the *Will*, by a nerve force sent from other centres, so that the operations necessary to Life, or which would not endure suspension, shall be independent of the caprices of the Intelligence. But these functions are not altogether exempt from the influences of the brain, as will be seen hereafter.

Thus the *molecular* mechanism of a Man may be rudely contemplated as a brain centre, communicating with the external world by means of a complicated structure, composed mainly of bone and muscle, set in motion by a multitude of cords connected with that nerve centre and maintained by a feeding apparatus placed within the body of the machine, which apparatus prepares the food for the various work it has to do, conveys that food where growth is proceeding or repair is required and carries off whatever is useless or used up.

The action of this mechanism is controlled and directed by a *Conscious Self*. This rude sketch of what a Man is has been purposely presented, because it is necessary to a clear understanding of the subject of this treatise that the Reader should enter upon it, having in his mind a distinct and definite conception of A MAN, viewed merely as a machine maintained and moved, through the agency of a visible and tangible apparatus, which, for lack of some better name, will be termed throughout this book "The Nerve System," meaning by that name to designate the entire of the structure—brain, ganglion, spinal cord, and nerve threads,—by which life is sustained, the body moved and the functions of its various organs performed.

The next conception which I must ask the Reader to form clearly and keep firmly in his mind, so that he may never think of the human frame without having this condition of its structure as an essential portion of his thought, is that the body is not a *solid* mass, but constructed of an infinite multitude of molecules, each one of which has an

individual existence, distinct and separate from the others. Aggregated, but not in contact, these molecules in various combinations present themselves to the eye and the touch in various forms, to which we give various names, as flesh, bone, tendon, hair, and so forth. But all these diverse shapes are only changes in the *combinations* of the molecules, which continue still unchanged. They separate from one combination and enter into another combination, and then they appear to our senses as a substance of another shape and quality. But the ultimate particles of every portion of the structure are identical.

It is also necessary, in addition to this clear conception that we are constructed of molecules, to comprehend as clearly the fact, that these molecules do not touch one another even in the most compacted parts of the body. The enamel of the teeth is, perhaps, the most solid substance in the structure. But when this compact material is viewed through a very powerful microscope it is seen to be a porous mass, and if we possessed an instrument of sufficient magnifying power, every particle which composes the enamel would be seen to be lying apart from its neighbours, with ample space about them for the reception and the passage of still smaller particles. That this is not merely a speculative suggestion is proved by the elasticity of that substance, due to the particles being pressed more closely together by the force applied to the mass from without, and which particles rebound to their relative positions when that pressure is removed.

It will be seen hereafter how vastly important to the understanding of many physiological and psychological conditions is this molecular structure of the body. It is, indeed, the foundation of all physical science. There can be no accurate conception of the world, or of anything appertaining to it, unless the mind possesses the clearest comprehension that there is no such condition as *solidity*, according to our common notion of it, and that what we are accustomed to call "*a solid*" is only an agglomera-



tion of minute particles held in near neighbourhood by some controlling force, but still so far apart that between and around each one of them other smaller particles can freely move, permeating the entire substance.

Having thus attained to a clear and firm conception of your body as a structure built of molecules inconceivably small, no two of which touch each other, and having emancipated your thoughts from the popular notion of a *solid*, you must endeavour to keep this conception steadily in view while pursuing the subject here to be treated of.

For, indeed, this conception of the human structure, as of "the great globe itself, and all that it inherits," is the only secure foundation for science. If it be true of any part it is true of the whole—true of the universe, so far, at least, as it is within the reach of human perception. Right comprehension of it removes countless difficulties from the paths of science and philosophy, and solves a multitude of problems utterly baffling to the most sagacious of us so long as we hold to the notion of solidity as a fact in nature, or as being anything other than a name we give to that which affects in a peculiar manner our very limited perceptions. The notion that there is nothing solid—that the hardest substance is a fluid mass of atoms—is hard to grasp at first, because it runs counter to appearances and is in seeming opposition to the teachings of two at least of our senses. But once clearly conceived and accepted as a fundamental truth, not only will thought readily run in accord with it, but we shall hereafter find it difficult to examine any fact or phenomenon, with a view to learn its character, its uses, the laws it obeys, and the conditions under which it exists, without instant reference to this, the greatest fact of all, *that there is nothing absolutely solid—nothing whose molecules are so closely packed that smaller particles than its own may not penetrate and permeate it.*

Remember, also, that in the most solid body all the atoms of which it is composed are capable of motion among themselves, even if they are not (as is probable,

though not proved) always in actual motion. When the magnetic force passes through steel, we know that every atom in the mass is moved from the position it had in relationship to the rest, and rebounds when the force has passed. These truths will not only help you to a more accurate conception of the operations of magnetism, light, heat, and other natural forces (or modes of one force, if such they be), but they will vastly aid your inquiries into the *Vital* and *Psychic Forces* and their operations in relation to the human structure, which it is the purpose of this work to describe in as popular a form as the obscurity and intricacy of the subject will permit.

---



## CHAPTER II.

## THE GERM.

ALL *organised* being has its first perceptible existence in the form of a *germ*.

We are wholly ignorant what a germ is. We know of it, and we intend by it, nothing more than this—*the thing that an organised being is when it begins to be*. It is the conception we have of the first form of existence. All of us have been germs, and the question "*What* was I then?" so important to Psychology, is in itself very curious and interesting. To all reflecting minds it must have presented itself many times.

A germ, in its first stage of being, is probably imperceptible to the eye, even with microscopic help. When first perceptible its growth is already advanced.

Small as it is, it contains *a life* certainly, and, as will be shown presently, the nucleus of the being it is to become. Probably the entire nerve structure of that being is compacted into that tiny point.

The accepted theory is, that the germ is single, produced by one parent only and either vivified or cradled by the other parent. And this alike with Man, animals, and vegetables.

The hazel-nut is a familiar illustration. The male flower is distinct from the female flower, separated from it always, even on the same bush, and often growing on different bushes. The catkin, or male flower, produces millions of particles of pollen, so minute and multitudinous that if, when it is mature, a light breeze passes over the nut grove, the pollen shaken from the catkin appears

as a cloud of smoke, filling the air far above the bushes. Countless millions of pollen grains are here produced to fertilize a few hundred tiny crimson flowers. Either is each one of these the living germ of a hazel-nut, or it possesses in itself a vital force that stimulates into expansion and growth the germ that is in the ovary of the female flower. If one of these millions of germs descends upon the point of a tube in the little crimson flower that peeps out at the summit of an unopened bud, it is driven or drawn by some unknown Force into the cradle that lies at the base of that little flower. There it expands, starts into growth, and in due time becomes a hazel-nut, in its turn to be the parent of future hazel bushes.

We know that this is the process by which in plants the pollen is conveyed to the pistil. But there our knowledge ends. How the tiny particle makes its way into the cradle we do not know, nor what occurs when it arrives there. We know only that one or more of the germs begins to grow; that when it first becomes visible to us it is composed, of two distinct parts, instead of being one whole. The germ remains inclosed in the seed packed in a bed of materials for its nourishment, answering precisely to the yolk in the egg of a bird. Should not the conditions favourable to the development of the germ occur before its edible cradle perishes, the germ itself disappears; but what becomes of it or of the life in it we know not. If the conditions requisite for its expansion are presented, it starts into activity, it makes its first meals upon its own cradle, and presently, escaping from that pent up prison, it sends its roots into the earth and its branches into the air and becomes a plant, the potential parent of myriads of other plants like itself. From that single germ millions of new germs come. But *where* were these before they are found in the flower? Were they contained within the one germ that has grown to be the parent plant, or were they extracted by the plant from the earth, air and water which it absorbed and assimilated in its progress from germhood to



planthood? There is no alternative to this. The first solution is confronted by overwhelming difficulties. The other is sufficiently intelligible, but then it involves the further consideration—that if the plant extracts its germs from its food, the elements that “clip us round about” must be full of germs, for many plants feed upon the air; and, inasmuch as it is impossible to conceive of a sufficient number of germs of its own kind to be accessible to each plant that produces many millions of germs, the necessary conclusion is that the germs of life are without individual character, that their development as vegetable or animal, or as a particular vegetable or a particular animal, depends upon the conditions under which that development occurs; that is to say, that the same germ becomes a cabbage, a caterpillar, a chaffinch, or an ox, accordingly as it is exposed to the conditions necessary to the development of the one or of the other. To this alternative the advocates of Materialism are compelled. Psychology suggests another solution.

The Materialists avoid some of the difficulties that encompass the inquiry into the origin of organic life by denying that life is other than a function of a certain collocation of “matter,” and not a thing distinct from it, imported into it, and going out of it as a separate entity. The protoplasm, they say, when the conditions are favourable to action, goes to work and cells are produced which increase by division and finally form the various organic substances. What we call *Life* results from this process and does not cause it, as the popular belief is. Precisely as certain molecules, combining under certain influences, form *inorganic* matter—such as gold,—when those molecules combine under certain other conditions they form *organic* matter, the characteristic of which is *life*.

This is, I believe, a brief but fair statement of the theory of Materialism.

The answer to be given to it is, that *Life* is associated with a complicated structure adapted to automatic action. While life lingers it acts in many ways in direct opposi-

sition to other natural forces. Where *life* is, the laws of chemistry are suspended, resuming their power instantly upon the cessation of that life. The departure of life is not coincident with a change in the collocation of the atoms, which would be the result if life were the product of that collocation. When the nerve centre dies the whole body dies. But if, as asserted by Materialists, life proceeds from a certain arrangement of the particles of organised matter,—as in the finger, for instance,—the finger, if uninjured, might live though the nerve centre be dead. Many more arguments and illustrations might be suggested to support the contention that there are germs of life and that the mature organised being is an *expanded germ*.

But, although ignorant of the structure and qualities of the ultimate germ, we have certain knowledge of *two* important facts that attend its development into an organised being.

*First*, that *two* parents are required for the development, if not for the production, of the germ.

*Second*, that the organised structure is duplex—that is to say, it is formed, not as one whole but of two parts united. Wherefore this requirement of *two* parents? Why this strange structure? Is there any relationship between those two facts? Is the peculiar structure the result of this remarkable law of parentage?

I venture to offer, but as suggestion merely, answers to these questions. If they should prove to be solutions of the problem, their importance to Physiology and Psychology alike will not be disputed. May I hope that they will at least be deemed worthy of discussion.

Wherefore are *two* parents required for the production of organised structure having that self-contained and self-directing power we call *Life*?

Recognising the great truth that Nature (*a*) always

---

(*a*) Desirous to avoid theological controversy, I use this term as a perfectly neutral name by which to designate the *force*, which may be, that moulds matter. I intend by it the creative



employs the most direct and simple means for the attainment of her ends, the scientific equally with the popular, mind would certainly have pre-supposed that the reproduction of a living organism by another organism similar to itself would be a power possessed by that organism alone and that the product would be a perfect likeness of the parent. This would be the most simple and obvious method of propagation. The undeveloped *germ* might be a *fac-simile* of the parent, but innumerable circumstances during the years of growth would certainly modify the resemblance and bring about extensive variations.

There is, undoubtedly, what appears to be a waste of power in the requirement of *two* parents for the production of that which might have been more readily produced by *one*. But as Nature never wastes power nor works imperfectly, it may be reasonably concluded that some design of vast importance is involved in this universal requirement of *two* to accomplish what might so well have been the work of one.

Instead of the simplicity of plan and directness of action observed in all the other operations of Nature, we find that in this supreme exercise of creative power two parents are required for the reproduction of organised life. The law is almost, if not entirely, universal. There are some apparent, but few, if any, actual exceptions. The process of fertilization may be hidden from the eye of the observer, or it may, as in some of the lower forms of life, extend to two or more generations, or it may be performed by a species of hermaphroditism. But it is a natural law *that two parents shall contribute to the structure of an organised being having life, whether animal or vegetable*. Man is not exempt from this law. If there be exceptions, they have not been discovered,

---

power, the potency which, according to Dr. TYNDALL, there is *in* matter for every form of life—the potency of *something other* than matter, as it appears to me; the *unintelligent* force which alone the Professor can find—the *intelligent* Providence I cannot choose but see.

or, at least, their existence has not been decisively proved.

The universality and inexorableness of this law of organic life appears to indicate the presence of some overpowering though unrecognised cause, peculiar to organised structure, for it is found to govern that structure only. The *living* organic form alone demands two parents for its production. Apparently there has been a departure from the most simple and direct scheme for the most indirect and imperfect. Is such a cause anywhere to be found? Is any peculiarity of structure to be discerned that will explain this resort to a process seemingly so clumsy and needless? That is the question to be considered.

How the germ is either produced in or compressed into or eliminated from the organism, we are, as yet, wholly ignorant, because we have neglected to inquire. Its presence there is certain. In such case, conjecture may be permitted, if accepted as conjecture only. I venture, therefore, to suggest for consideration by Science—if the germ may not be thrown off from the nerve structure (which is the animal, in fact) by a process nearly resembling that of gemmation, as actually seen in the lower organisations and notably in vegetable life. I suggest further, that the germ so extruded from the nerve structure is taken up by the blood, eliminated from the blood by the special gland, and there awaits the occurrence of the conditions necessary to *development* into the complete organism?

There is another suggestion which, in the present imperfect state of our knowledge, may be entitled to consideration, inasmuch as it certainly reconciles many grave difficulties attendant upon the former one. I offer it for what it may be worth, *as a suggestion merely*. To make it clearly intelligible to the Reader, I must ask him to carry his thoughts still further backward into the beginnings of things.

Whence the germ of the future being? Trace an organised structure, whether of man, or of animal, or of



vegetable, from its first perceptible existence, through its expansion and growth, to its maturity. Even conjecture fails to suggest at what time and under what conditions the germs of the future offspring are first lodged in the structure of the parent. Unless this be effected by some direct act of Divine creation (an hypothesis not to be entertained when it is remembered that the like agency would be required for the production of the germs, not of man only, but of every mouse, bug, gnat, and cabbage), the conclusion is inevitable, that if the germ comes into the parent *from without* it can come only through the medium of the air breathed or of the food eaten. But the whole body of the parent is constructed of the particles that composed the beef and bread and other materials of its food. Even in the womb the offspring is fed by the food eaten by its mother, as afterwards it is when in the cradle. If the germs of the future progeny come into the parent from without, they *must* be contained in his or her food. But the ox borrowed his flesh from the grass. If, for instance, the germ of the man came to him from the ox, that germ must have existed in the vegetable that supplied the material for the flesh of the ox. The grass, in its turn, obtained all, or the greater part, of its own *substance* from the mineral stores of the earth and the gases that are in the air. If, therefore, the germ was in the grass, it must have come from the earth. Thus, by a direct and not distant link it is distinctly proved that, *if the future germ is not a product of the parent germ, but is introduced into the organism of the parent after its growth has begun, it must have come from some other source—animal, vegetable, or mineral*;—unless, indeed, we accept another suggestion, more familiar to poets than to philosophers, that every germ contains within it all future germs, as was said of the acorn :

And countless forests slumber in a shell ;

—a pretty fancy that will not bear the disenchanting touch of the wand of science.

If it be that the germs of the future progeny are taken into the organism of the parent with the food, the question at once presents itself, how it comes that the germs of *men* are latent in the earth, so as to pass from the mineral into the vegetable, thence into the animal, and thence into the Man? But such an hypothesis involves yet a greater difficulty; for, if this be the true history of a germ, it follows that the germs of all organised beings are identical, and that it depends upon the conditions under which they are developed what they shall become when brought within the nerve influence of a living organism; if of a human being, that germ taking the shape of a man; if of a sheep, becoming a lamb; if of a cabbage, growing into a kale. This is sufficiently improbable.

But there is a practical objection to the popular theory in the fact that, alike with a man, a sheep or a cabbage, the developed germ bears an *individual* as well as a generic likeness to the parent by whom it was assimilated.

Thus, then, by a process of exhaustion, we find ourselves reduced to *two* alternatives of origin for the germs of organised beings. Either,

1st. There is a homogeneous germ of life, common to all organised beings, which is scattered profusely everywhere, brought to us in our food, and thence absorbed into the organism, eliminated by it, and when finding the necessary conditions for growth taking form and character from the nerve organisation with which it chances to be associated; or,

2nd. The germ is *not* a distinct individual, nor a new creation, nor in its vivification a new being. It is an offshoot from the nerve organisation of the parent (probably thrown off by a process somewhat resembling that of *gemination* in vegetable life, and which is often visible to us as the manner of reproduction by some lowest forms of animal life). It is a *mere continuation of the same individual life*, a part severed from it and thenceforth maintaining its own separate existence,



itself again dividing and reproducing *fac-similes* of itself, and so forth, indefinitely, until disease or accident destroys the organism or renders it unproductive.

If this be so, there is no apparent necessity for the co-operation of *two* parents in the production of an organised being. For aught that Science can discover, reproduction might have been accomplished by the ostensible parent alone. If the germ be the product of but one of the two parents, and the other parent supplies only an *aura* to vivify, or a cradle to nurse it (which are the only two alternatives as yet suggested by Science), there is no conceivable cause why the real producer of the germ should not have brought it to perfection without such elaborate contrivances as are actually resorted to. Noting the simplicity which prevails in every other work of Nature, and which becomes the more apparent the more perfect our acquaintance with her, it is impossible not to suspect some lurking fallacy in a theory that attributes everything to the one parent who conceives, nourishes, and brings forth and almost nothing to the other parent. Is it not probable that more may really be contributed by that other parent than hitherto has been assumed?

Nevertheless, although the *primâ facie* probabilities point to the conclusion that the father is at least equally potent with the mother in the process of production (and there is a mass of facts, otherwise altogether inexplicable, that tend to confirm this conclusion), the scientific dogma seconded the popular notion. For ages it was asserted, as an unquestioned truth, that the mother was at once the producer and the nourisher of the germ, and that the father contributed nothing more than a conjectural, undefined, imperceptible *aura*, or vitalising influence,—(of whose existence there was no proof)—by which it was that the germ supplied by the mother was first stimulated into life, afterwards to be moulded, mind as well as body, by the mother, and by her to be brought into the world constructed wholly of the material she alone had supplied to it! No less

strange, and altogether inconsistent with the assumption, was the fact that this production of the mother alone was often found to partake as much and often more of the shape and character, bodily and mental, of the parent who provided merely the supposed *aura*, as of the parent by which that new individual being was produced, fed, nursed and structured.

The absurdity of a theory which had held almost unquestioned sway for centuries was first seen when Physiology began to trouble Pharmacy and to put to flight the many fallacies in which the Doctors had indulged. No attempt had been made to prove the existence of the asserted *aura*, nor to define what it was, nor how it operated, nor in what manner it could possibly *mould* the bodily structure of the embryo or impart to it *mental* characteristics. The more rational and probable hypothesis began to make its way slowly to adoption, that the father supplied the germ and that the mother was merely its nurse. This explained some of the difficulties attendant upon the *aura* theory. But it left many more unexplained.

We have now arrived at this point. *All organised structure* above the very lowest (and probably that also) requires for its production the *co-operation of two distinct organised beings*. In whatever manner this is brought about, the result is the same. *Two* parents are needed. Doubtless the same law prevails with the lowest also, if only we could trace the process with our microscopes. One organised living thing cannot reproduce its like without something being contributed to the structure by another organised living thing having a certain degree of affinity with it.

On the accepted assumption that the offspring of organised being is but a single germ produced by another organised being, it has been for ages a disputed question by which of the two parents that germ is produced;—if by the parent in which it is apparently lodged and by which it is borne, nourished and brought forth, or if by the parent who apparently does nothing



but impart to it *a force*, whatever it be, without which the germ cannot be developed.

For centuries the universal opinion of the few Scientists who cared to think upon the question was, that the germ was in the mother, who found for it a cradle and food.

But how the germ was *vivified*, or why Nature should have resorted to such a needless complication to produce a result which might so much more readily and certainly be produced by giving the power of vivification of the germ to the parent who produced and nourished it, is a question that appears never to have occurred to the few who troubled themselves—if any did—to think about it.

In recent times, however, opinion upon this point has changed, mainly through investigation into the manner of propagation by plants. It is accepted now, almost universally, as being more probable, if not positively proved, that the germ is from the father, the mother providing for his germ merely a cradle and food.

This theory removes some of the most formidable of the objections that presented themselves in overwhelming array against the theory of a maternal germ vivified by an *aura*. It does not leave altogether unaccounted for the fact that the offspring as often resembles the father as the mother. That a mere *aura* could stamp upon a mere germ such characteristics as the shape of a finger-nail, or a talent for music, was so monstrous a conclusion that the marvel now is how it ever came to be accepted for a moment by any rational being. But every day reveals the profound ignorance of Physiology that prevailed even among the Scientists of a century since, and which is still but slowly being dispelled. It is at least conceivable that, the germ being from the father, it may be stamped with some of the characteristics of the nursing mother. But this assumption is negatived by the fact that the chicken nursed in the shell and brought to life by warm water resembles the mother as often as does the child whom the mother nurses personally. The theory accounts for but few of those characteristics. Many remain for which no sufficient

cause can be thus suggested. Something more is wanting to complete the explanation and to cover all the facts.

Such were the steps by which, while giving to the subject the thought required for the description of "a MAN," as designed in this little book, the conclusion was compelled that something further yet remained to be investigated before we could understand clearly how the Man, as we see him, could come from the single germ, as Science supposed (for it did not *prove*) that germ to be.

Then it was that the *second* great fact occurred to me *that man is a duplex structure*—that is to say, that he is not formed as one whole, but of *two distinct halves* joined together—that he has *two* sets of bones, muscles and nerves, and *two* brains. True, there is but one liver, stomach, and intestine. This at first sight seemed a conflicting fact. But further examination showed the internal structure to be substantially the same as the external frame, the only difference being that the position is reversed, and instead of the point of junction being side by side, as with the framework of bone and its appendant muscles, it is, from the necessity of its position within the body and the requirement of but one heart, one liver, &c., only a junction of two halves before and behind. Tracing these internal parts from their point of union with the external frame at the neck, it will be seen at once that one-half of the whole springs from one side of the body and the other half from the other side, and that they unite at a central line throughout, precisely as the two halves of the external frame are united. That which was at first advanced by some dissentients as being opposed to the suggestion of a *Double Germ* has proved upon further investigation to be really a confirmation of it.

But even if the fact were not so, unity of the intestinal apparatus would in no way affect the conclusion indicated by the manifest duplicity of all the rest of the structure. It might well be that the duplex nerves, uniting for the formation of the internal parts (the heart,



stomach, lungs, &c.), should produce a homogeneous structure, instead of two distinct and differing parts put together. An argument against duplex structure based upon these assumed facts would be of little or no weight even if the assumption were true.

Looking beyond the human body, it will be seen that all organised being is built after the same fashion. It will be found on close inspection, that all other animals are so made. So likewise are all vegetables. Every leaf is duplex; so is every part of a flower. All organised being is, in truth, formed of two halves joined together at a central line. Nothing organised is structured as *one whole*, as is the scheme of all *inorganic Nature*.

Observing these facts, the question occurred to me—wherefore this remarkable method of constructing an organised being? Why is it always and everywhere, from the highest to the lowest, from the most complex forms to the most simple, *duplex*, and not as any sculptor, or scientist, or human artificer would have made it, one whole instead of two halves joined together? There must be some substantial reason for this. There must be some powerful and universal cause to produce this universal effect, for which there is no apparent motive and by which no perceptible purpose is served.

Then I bethought me—is there any *other* universal fact which might have some bearing upon *this* universal fact?

Reflecting, I found that there is such a fact—a fact also inexplicable by any useful purpose that can be discerned—namely, this—that *two parents are required for the production of every organised being*.

Is there, then, a connection between these two great facts in the architecture of organised being—the *requirement of two parents and the duplex structure of the beings they produce*?

The conclusion flashed upon me that these two great facts in animal and vegetable physiology stand in the relationship of *cause and consequence*. They explain and supplement each other. The double structure is the effect of the twofold parentage. The twofold parentage

produces the double structure. It is admitted that each parent contributes *something* to the formation of the offspring. Even conjecture has never succeeded in assigning the part contributed to the organism by each parent, so as to afford a rational suggestion of the manner in which the indisputable result is brought about. *A double structure by the junction of two germs, one contributed by each parent*, clearly explains all that has been wholly inexplicable hitherto by the ancient theory of mere vivification by one parent and nursing by the other.

Thus came the first idea of organic structure by *the junction of two germs*, instead of the mere development of a single germ, which I have ventured to offer to the judgment of other minds.

But *two germs*: how are they to be united so as to form *one* being—how combined in *one* structure?

Examination of the structure itself supplies the answer. There we find a clear explanation of the cause of the duplex formation of all organised being, Man, animal, vegetable. Obviously these are, as we should in such case expect to find them, compounded of *two* germs, and if so structured, there can be no question that one germ is supplied by each parent. Hence the scheme of the structure is not by the carving or moulding of one homogeneous shape, as would be the manner of making a form the product of *one* being, but by the putting together of *two distinct halves*, which would be precisely the plan to be pursued if the structure were made by the junction of the distinct products of *two* beings. Hence arises that otherwise inexplicable fact, the necessity for the combination of *two* parents for the production of *one* organised being. We shall see presently in what manner this contrivance secures many most important objects attainable only thus.

Let us now inquire to what extent the *facts* confirm this antecedent probability.

The manner in which the junction is effected is plainly to be seen by the least curious eye. Each half of the frame is joined to the other half at an obvious line.



But how are their general uniformity, their common growth in due relationship one to the other, the union, not of form only but of vitality and of mental function, brought about so as to constitute of the two distinct halves one distinct individuality in appearance, in consciousness and in mental action?

By a simple contrivance of whose objects and uses Physiologists have hitherto confessed their entire ignorance. This result has been attained by causing the nerve system of each half of the body to cross to, permeate, and so give its own vitality to, the other half of the body. If, as here contended, the body be structured of two germs, the sending the nerve force from the nerve centres of one germ through the entire organism of the other germ admirably produces the desired result. By this contrivance the nerve force of the nerve system of the one germ is made to vivify and direct the expansion and growth of the other germ. The consequence of this interchange of forces between the *two* allied germs is that the characteristics of germ B. are impressed upon germ C. and those of germ C. upon germ B. A near approximation, although not an actual identity, of form and character, bodily and mental, is the consequence of such an intermingling of the two nerve forces. By this admirably simple but effectual scheme the important design is accomplished of general resemblance combined with specific differences.

A sculptor modelling a man would not construct two separate halves and then join them together; or, if he did so, he would exercise all his skill to make the two halves so like that the keenest eye should detect no difference between them. Nature works more perfectly than the most skilful sculptor. If she had produced statues as she produces Man, we may be sure that she would have made them as faultless as the sculptor desires and designs them to be, but, is unable, from the imperfection of the human senses, so to mould them. If the popular notion be true, Nature, in this solitary instance departing from her habitual perfection, has made Man so

clumsily that the two halves of the body of the most perfect man ever made by her were *unlike*! Whence this exceptional imperfection of her work, if, as hitherto assumed, she constructs man as one whole, as a sculptor constructs him? But this seeming clumsiness is accounted for if, instead of making him as one whole, she makes him of two parts, each part being supplied by a distinct and separate producer.

If we trace the consequence of such a structural scheme, it will be seen at once how completely it explains much that is otherwise inexplicable; how it suggests the rationale of inherited characteristics, mental and bodily; the transmission, not of form only, but of diseases, tempers, talents, idiosyncrasies, of all kinds, the strange mingling of the characteristics, not only of both parents but of their ancestors also; the predominance in the offspring of the traits, sometimes of one parent, sometimes of the other; the cropping out of family peculiarities after intervals of one or more generations. It supplies an obvious solution of the hitherto perplexing and insoluble problems of *Hybridism*, clearly showing the laws by which it is governed and the reasons for them; how and why varieties are permissible to a certain limit and then cease, and what is the cause of that tendency to return to the original stock which is observed continually in vegetable life, but which has been less noted in animal life because of its slower and for the most part hidden development.

Moreover, the suggestion of a double germ, if it be the fact, extends to *all* organic structure having life, to vegetable as to animal existence, and in this offers a still more vast and varied field for observation and experiment. It is in the vegetable kingdom, indeed, that investigation may be most effectively pursued. Whatever is true of the one is true of the other. We have the vegetable world under our almost absolute control and can experiment upon it with ease and rapidity. With the animal world experiment is more difficult. With Man we can do little more than observe; we are



unable to control. But if all are subject to the same law of generation, if all are produced by the same process of two parents, a germ being contributed by either parent, and then the junction of the two germs, the results of experiments tried with the vegetable world, over which we have extensive control, will be applicable to the animal world, over which we have imperfect control, and to Man, over whom we have no control at all.

Let us now proceed to trace some of the practical applications of the suggestion that the *duplex structure* is caused by the junction of *two germs*.

It perfectly explains the otherwise wholly inexplicable mingling in the offspring of the mental as well as of the bodily characteristics of both the parents. In such case those of the father or of the mother predominate according to the amount of vital energy possessed by either germ. The necessary effect of two nerve forces working together would be seen in the formation of the structure. If the *nerve* or *vital force* of the two germs were equal, the product would be intermediate in its resemblance to both. If either were more powerful than the other, the germ that possessed the most vigorous nerve force would direct the action of the united force to the extent of its superiority. If such a condition could ever be, that the germs of both parents possessed precisely equal nerve power, the result would be an offspring in which all the actions of the combined forces would be equal within, modified only by external circumstances. Where the nerve energy of either excels, the result would be regulated by internal tendency as well as by external conditions, and there would be that decided resemblance of the child to the predominant parent which must be the subject of daily observation by all who use their eyes. Could any conceivable *aura* applied to an invisible germ accomplish such an end? Impossible. But if not thus, how is the fact of inherited qualities to be accounted for? All the explanations hitherto attempted have utterly failed to offer the slightest solution of the problem. Some have attri-

buted likeness to the father to mental impressions of the mother conveyed sympathetically to the offspring. But this is at once answered by the fact, that the children of a blind woman as often resemble the form and features of the father as the children of women who have sight, and a child will thus inherit the features of a father which were unknown to the mother. It is negatived by another fact, that the chicken constructed in the egg resembles its parent. But if it be, as the contention here is, that the maternal germ is supplied with vital force and formative nerve energy by the paternal germ, and the paternal germ by the maternal germ, it is evident at a glance how it comes that, by the union of the forces, each modifying each, the product is stamped with the characteristics of *both* parents, the qualities predominating of the parent by whose germ the greater vital force or nerve energy chanced to be possessed.

Thus it is that Nature accomplishes the design of infinite variation within certain prescribed limits. By no other means could it be so simply yet so perfectly effected. On no other hypothesis can the results we see be so reasonably and clearly explained. An *aura could not* do it. No conceivable nursing by one parent of a germ supplied by the other parent will explain the unquestioned facts of resemblances to and differences from *both* parents.

If the germ be in the male, the female finding for it a cradle and food, as is the only theory yet broached (save the *aura* theory), how comes it that one parent alone possesses germs? Whence do these come? Unless they are new creations, they must come from somewhere. Think for a moment what a *germ* is. It is the embryo being, and so far a *structured* being that it actually possesses more or less the bodily and mental characteristics of both parents! After it has been deposited in its first cradle (the shell of the egg or the womb of the mother), the father can impart to it no further character, mental or bodily. All, therefore, that the ultimate living being



exhibits of the mental or bodily shape of its father must have been imparted to it *before* it was taken to be nursed in the egg or by the body of the mother. Consequently a *germ* is not, and cannot be, as some unreflecting persons have imagined, a mere protoplasm or cell; it must necessarily be a thing having life, and shape, and qualities. If such it be—as who that considers the facts can for a moment doubt?—then we are at once supplied with an obvious clue to the manner of germ growth and how it becomes a human being. There is, in fact, but one probable solution of this problem, namely, that the process is not by *construction* but by *development*. The germ itself is an infinitely minute creature which, on finding its appropriate cradle and food, *grows by expansion*. One of the conditions of its expansion and growth into a complete and organised being is its union with another germ capable of junction by reason of a general similarity of shape and perhaps other characteristics. The germs of beings of the same genus, even if to some extent, unlike, are so far like as to permit of this junction. The germ of an animal of another genus is too unlike to permit of such an union, and therefore the junction of such dissimilar germs produces no offspring. This is the simple explanation of the hitherto insoluble problem of *Hybridism*.

By what impulse the germs of the male and of the female unite in the very earliest stage of their separated existence we are wholly ignorant. This only we *know*, that of thousands of germs brought into contact but one fulfils the conditions requisite for junction, perfects the junction, and grows with its companion into one being. In other animals the number is subject to extensive variation and in the lower classes of animals and in the vegetable world it is sometimes enormous. But this is plain; that as the complication of the *nerve structure* increases and the power of the brain is extended, so is the capacity limited for junction of the germs and the ability of the mother to maintain them.

And here I will venture to offer, as a *suggestion*

merely but not as part of the argument, a hint which may possibly be deemed by some readers worthy of further examination, inasmuch, if there be truth in it, a blaze of light would thus be thrown upon this very obscure subject.

May it not be that the germ, if eliminated by gemmation or otherwise from the nerve organization, is a *fac-simile* of the parent producing it—not, however, as he (or she) may at the moment be affected by accidental circumstances, but as the nerve structure of that parent was originally developed, and in due course would have normally expanded? Development is the work of the nerve structure until it attains to maturity. When that matured nerve structure throws off germs structured like itself, the process is doubtless identical with that of gemmation in the lower forms of organised being. But it will be answered, perhaps, that if the germ be a *fac-simile* of the parent, there should be exact uniformity of production—that is to say, all human beings should precisely resemble each other—and so also should all tribes of animals and plants. True. And here we find the clue to the hitherto unexplained need for *two* parents in the production of *one* being. Is not this the contrivance by which that uniformity is effectually prevented, without introducing the disorderly multiplicity of shapes that would result if *no* resemblance were preserved between the germ and the parent? The manner in which this admirable design of diversity with general resemblance is brought about is now manifest. The individual germ resembles its parent, but the union of two germs produces a double structure in which, by exchange of nerves, each germ gives vital formative force to the other. The necessary result is an intermediate structure, having some of the characteristics of both germs. Infinite diversity within a certain definite but undefined limit is thus admirably brought about by means of modifications made in the normal structure of either germ through the influence of the nerve force of its allied germ.



But the suggestion of structure by two germs is in no manner affected by the question whether the germ is or is not a *fac-simile* of the *nerve structure* of the parent, although, if a fact, it would fully explain the *modus operandi*, otherwise wholly inexplicable. It is, however, in strict accord with the Darwinian theory, which maintains that development and progression are caused by repeated exercise of some bodily or mental faculty so affecting structure that slight modifications thus made in the parent artificially are transmitted naturally to the offspring. That such modifications are not perfectly reproduced in all cases is obviously due to the influence of the associated germ contributed by the other parent.

It has been objected to this suggestion that, if the method of structure be by the junction of the germs, the offspring should be in form and character precisely intermediate between the parents. So it would be if the germs were always equal in nerve force. But, in fact, they are never alike. One germ always possesses more nerve force, in the whole or in part, than the other germ, and the characteristics of the germ having the greatest power will consequently predominate in the organism constructed of the united germs. This is the *rationale* of the familiar expressions: "That boy is like his father;" "this is like his mother;" "he has his father's face, but his mother's temper;" and so forth. The scientific explanation is, that the characteristics of the paternal germ were more vigorous in the one, those of the maternal germ in the other, and in the third, the paternal germ was the more vigorous generally, but the maternal germ inherited a strong development of the passionate temperament of the mother.

These likenesses and unlikenesses to both parents are even more remarkable in the mental than in the bodily characteristics of the offspring, thus confirming the suggestion that it is the character of the *nerve system* of the parent that is transmitted to the germ. In the structure of the body an intermediate product between the two parents appears to be the rule—as seen in what

are called half-breeds. Cross-breeds of different coloured races exhibit the influence of both parents. The rationale is obvious. The nerves that make the colouring matter of the thing are acted upon by two influences, that of the paternal germ, which would produce a white skin, and that of the maternal germ, which would produce a black skin. The result of the combined or opposing influences is a skin neither black nor white, but of an intermediate tint. No mere *aura* will account for *this*. Thus is explained the remarkable cropping out of certain family features of body or mind, or of both, even after their disappearance for two or three or more generations. The process is somewhat after this fashion. An ancestor possessed some marked characteristics of mind or of body. The germ resembled him. If that germ could exist and develop alone, it would be a *replica* of the father. But nature has required the junction of *two* germs for the formation of a Man, and the extent of modification so caused depends upon the predominance of the nerve force possessed by either germ. If that of the father prevails, the offspring will resemble the father in form and character. If that of the mother prevails, the offspring will more resemble the mother. Strongly marked characteristics of the father may be modified or even subdued, by greater nerve or vital energy in the maternal germ.

Now, suppose a child to be "the mother's child," (as the popular phrase is), and by reason of the predominance of her nerve energy some of the characteristics of the father are repressed. If that child grows to maturity, marries a wife having less of nerve energy, his offspring will be the product of a germ stamped with the characteristics of the family from which he has descended. The now greater energy of the paternal germ repressing the characteristics of the maternal germ, and the features, mental and bodily, of the parental ancestry, or some of them, will reappear. And this might occur, not once only, but often in the course of generations, exhibiting that "cropping out" of ancestral



character, so often noted, but of which no rational solution has been suggested hitherto.

HYBRIDISM thus receives a practical explanation. A limit is indisputably assigned to it alike in animal and vegetable being, but the causes of that limitation have never been discovered or even conjectured. The proposition of a double germ perfectly solves the problem. The limit of Hybridism is the relationship of the two germs. They must be so like that, when united, they can grow into a form having a certain amount of symmetry in the two halves of the structure—sufficient, at least, to permit the functions of life to be carried on. The heart must be enabled to pump regularly. The nerve system on one side of the body must bear so near a resemblance to the nerve system on the other side of the body as to permit of perfect community of action. If these conditions of union necessary for development do not present themselves, the germs cannot join, or if they join, there can be no growth and the imperfectly constructed being perishes in embryo. Hence it is obvious that all the stories of monstrous births are myths. Such productions are simply impossible, because there can be no junction of germs so dissimilar as to preclude common action.

It is true that anatomy does not reveal to us the actual presence of germs, either in process of gemmation or otherwise; but we are not therefore the less assured that there is a germ and that the germ is contained in the body of the parent and consequently must have come into it by *some* means. The truth is, the *actual* germ is too minute to be perceptible by our very limited senses. With the aid of powerful instruments we can perceive its envelope, perhaps, but not the ultimate entity—the *mere point* that constitutes what may be termed the *concentrated* organised being—the *monad* of the Man, the beast, or the plant.

A former chapter (*ante*, p. 59) has shown by the illustration of the landscape condensed into the focus of a lens how rude and insufficient are our notions of the

small as of the great—notions, indeed, that are conceived only in their relation to ourselves. Thus it will be seen how possible it is for the absolutely perfect to be found in the infinitely little.

*Misshapen* births are inexplicable on the single germ theory; but they are readily explained by the suggestion of a double germ. Children with two heads, four legs, three arms, or two distinct beings united, cannot be accounted for by any influence of an *aura*, nor by imperfection in the formative force, whatever that may be.

But we talk of deformities, forgetting that all of us are more or less deformed. The most perfectly shaped man or woman is *unsymmetrical*—that is to say, there is a marked *unlikeness* between the two sides of the body. The two sides of the face (which is the part most seen and therefore permitting of the most accurate study) will be found *always* to exhibit considerable differences. Probably no two sides of any human face are precisely similar. It is the same with every limb. One hand is almost always larger than the other; so with the foot; so with the leg and arm. One side of the body is usually stronger than the other. It has been answered to this, that most persons fall into a habit of using one side of the body more than the other and hence its greater strength. But the obvious reply is, that we use the strong side most because it *is* the strongest. This is especially to be noticed in left-handed persons, who are usually left-footed also, but do not therefore use the left foot more than the right, save for the purpose of springing from it. But these dissimilarities of strength, and size, and shape, are as plainly to be seen in the infant as in the adult, proving them to be the result of congenital causes and not of habit.

It would be a curious subject for inquiry, by persons who have leisure and opportunity, how far, in respect of strength and similarity of shape, each of the two sides of the body resembles the father or the mother. The collection of a large number of such observations would



go far to determine the important question here raised as to the parentage of the embryo, whether it consists of *one germ vitalised* or *two germs united* and, further, if it be *one germ only, from which parent it comes?* Assuming general resemblance to one parent to be consequent upon the greater nerve energy of the germ of that parent, it might reasonably be anticipated that the portion of the structure to which that parent most contributed would bear the greatest resemblance to him or her. If it be so in fact only an extensive series of observations can determine. But in pursuing such an inquiry it must be remembered that the germ in neither parent is a perfected form, like the completed human body, but probably nothing more than a nerve plexus compacted into an almost imperceptible point. When the two germs of the two parents meet, unite, form an embryo and grow together, it is not (as the suggestion has been misrepresented by some of its critics), that the two germs link themselves together side by side by an act of *volition*. My proposition is, that the two germs, while yet undeveloped nerve centres, adhere by some attractive force, according to some law not known to us. Then the plexus gradually unfolds. The nerve threads as they expand stream each one to the opposite side of the dual embryo, and then build the body about themselves, each nerve attracting from the blood of the mother the various materials requisite for the construction of that portion of the frame to which it belongs, decomposing the molecules of those materials and recomposing them into the material needed for its own work. The nerve force possessed by the nerve threads flows from the nerve centre and that nerve centre combines in unequal proportions the nerve forces of the two germs now conjoined. The formative force possessed by the various nerve threads is thus the sum of, and therefore proportioned to, the natural force of the germ from which it radiates, modified by the force of the germ with which it is associated. Consequently the product is a structure having the characteristics of *both the parent germs*, in

relative proportion to the nerve forces of those two germs, subject of course to modification by accidental external circumstances and by internal conditions impossible to be traced.

Nor is this all the extent of likeness and variation. These are to be seen, not merely in the general structure, but in its parts. Not only may the germ of one parent possess more *general* nerve force than the germ of the other parent, but particular parts of the nerve system of one may be more powerful than the like parts of the other. In such case the characteristics of those more energetic parts of the nerve organism predominate, with the consequence we see (but have not been able to account for), that although the general resemblance may be to one parent, one or more features or characteristics, bodily or mental, are found precisely to resemble the like characteristic in the other parent,—as in the frequent instance of the form of the hand, of the fingers, of the finger nails, and even more often in a special mental faculty or in some peculiarities of temper or of constitution.

Nor are these curious combinations of resemblances and differences limited to bodily characteristics. They are at least as frequent and remarkable in the *mental* qualities. The reason is obvious. The brain is the instrument by means of which the Conscious Self—that is, the Man—communicates with the external material world and his fellow beings. It is through the mechanism of the brain that we see, hear, feel, think, imagine, reason, and so forth, through the whole catalogue of the mental faculties. In strict accordance with the double structure of the body there is a double structure of the brain. In fact, we have two brains, as we have two arms and two eyes. If the suggestion be true that the cause of this double structure of the body is the double germ (accounting for the requirement of two parents), the duplex brain is due to the same cause.

Precisely as the comparative vital force of the two parental germs determines the development of the form of the framework of the body, in the whole and in its



parts, so does it determine the form of the brain and of the two halves of the brain, and in this manner it is that there is produced in the offspring more or less of the *mental* as well as bodily characteristics of both parents. In mental character, indeed, this union of the qualities of the two parents may be better studied than in the shape of the body, for they are more obvious to the casual observer. The fact, indeed, is undisputed, that these resemblances and differences, and combinations of differences and resemblances, in the characteristics of both parents, or of the ancestors of both, are actually found in the vast majority of mankind. It is within the personal observation of all who use their eyes and ears.

The only problem for Science to solve is—*how this inheritance of mind* is brought about. No physiological explanation hitherto offered has approached to a solution of it. Always nine-tenths of the facts were left *uncovered* by the theory. The suggestion here thrown out for consideration has at least the recommendation *that it supplies a rational and probable explanation of every fact in Heredity and Hybridism.*

If the suggestion be true of Man, it is true of the animal world also. If *we* are constructed by the junction of two germs, so are all animals. It has been answered to me that some low forms of life are not seen to have two parents. But wherever we have been enabled to trace the process, something more than mere self-production has been discovered. Where no junction of sexes is apparent, in many cases impregnation is found to have taken place at some early stage of being, and sometimes by a species of hermaphroditism. In other cases, if such there be, it is more probable that similar contrivances prevail than that they should be exceptions to what is an undoubted law of Nature wheresoever we are enabled to trace her handiwork.

Perhaps some Readers will say, "You have made out a good case as regards Man and beasts, but how do you apply your suggestion to birds and fishes and the other creatures which are produced from *eggs*?" The egg is

extruded by the mother and it contains but a single germ, which becomes the chicken, or the cod, or the tadpole?"

It is only a difference of words, not of *facts*. The offspring of all organised being is cradled in an egg. *We are all, in truth, hatched.* The only difference between one living being and another is, that in Man and the higher animals the embryo is hatched within the body of the mother at a very early stage of its development and completes its development in the womb, being fed directly by the blood of the mother; whereas in birds, fishes, and most of the lower animals and in vegetables a store of nutriment is contained in the egg produced by the mother, from which the material is extracted wherewith the developing nerve system builds the body about itself. Strange as the assertion may appear on the first statement of it, it is a fact that every seed is an egg and the tree or plant whose embryo it contains is produced by precisely the same process within its shell as is the chicken or the salmon. There is an embryo, visible to the eye, which is the germ of the future organised being. When the conditions occur that favour its development, this embryo expands and filaments (the vegetable nerves) shoot from it in definite forms, pervade the substance of the egg and extract from it the material required by each for the formation of that part of the structure to which that nerve or filament belongs. Thus we learn that the contents of all eggs that are extruded from the parent before the germ is developed, animal and vegetable alike, possess all the materials required for the construction of the body of the being there to be produced. The chicken comes from the shell a perfected form.

But what is there in this tending to confirm the suggestion of a *double germ*? Do not structure and growth in an egg produced by one parent alone rather suggest the development of a single germ?

The answer is obvious. The hen bird can produce fatherless eggs. These eggs are, to all appearance, as complete as perfected eggs. They are filled with precisely



the same materials for constructing the chicken. There is certainly a germ in each of those eggs. The microscope can discover no difference in its earliest stages between the barren egg and the impregnated egg. But when its growth has advanced and the impregnated egg is extruded from the body of the hen, the germ in it is found to be duplex, having *two* layers instead of one. In fact, the process of development has already commenced. It began when the ovum was impregnated and while yet it was merely a minute point.

What is absent in that fatherless egg, the lack of which deprives it of the power to produce a chicken, but which is possessed by the egg lying by its side, the product of the same mother? The eye seeks in vain for a structural difference without or within. What is the vivifying influence that is wanting to its fertility? It is surely a monstrous exercise of fancy to assume that merely the influence of an *aura* could suffice to change the egg from barrenness to chicken-bearing. Something has entered that fertile egg, not when it was incrustured with a shell and had grown to maturity, but when it was only a nucleus. What is it that so enters and causes such a miraculous change in the destiny of an egg? If not a mere *aura*, it must be a part of the future chicken. We may throw the *aura* theory aside as ridiculous. Then, if not that, it is a *germ* that is deposited there by the second parent. But there is already a germ in that egg. We cannot see it in this early stage of extreme littleness, but we know that it must be there in the beginning, because we find it when the egg is produced by the mother alone, without alliance with another parent. If there be already a germ in the egg of the hen, and a germ is also conveyed into that egg from another parent, that egg contains *two* germs. We find there a germ formed of *two* layers and considerably larger than before impregnation. Of what use are *two* germs in the same egg, if they do not in some manner influence each other? We can discern but one germ *in two parts*. Has the other germ perished? If not, what has become of it? The

answer is obvious. The paternal germ has joined the maternal germ. The two apparent layers of the impregnated germ are, in fact, the two parental germs. These presently join, unite, and *grow together*, and the duplex structure of the chicken is the consequence of this junction.

Thus tracing the process of production in the egg of a fowl and finding in it almost demonstrative proof of the existence there of *two germs*, one contributed by each parent, we have the strongest presumptive evidence of the union of germs here suggested.

And inasmuch as Man, Animals and Vegetables, as well as Birds and Fishes, are produced in *eggs*, the conclusion is inevitable that the same law prevails with all organic being, and that the process of reproduction with all is as it is *seen to be* in the eggs of the bird and the fish. The egg of the Man and of the animal, which is provided by the mother, contains a germ that is eliminated from the mother, which mother germ is joined by a germ transmitted from the father, and the new organised being thus derives its parentage from both, partaking of the qualities and forms of both, the two parts of the obviously duplex structure being unequally developed according to the relative strength of the nerve forces of the two parents.

And the same process is manifestly performed in the production of *vegetable* life. There are male and female plants and flowers and parts of flowers. No known plant is really self-produced. *Two* organisms are required to produce *one* new one. There must be *two* parents for every vegetable, as for every animal and every Man. In all, the process is substantially the same. A germ proceeding from one parent is received, nursed and brought forth by the other parent. The ovarium and its apparatus is the maternal womb in which the pollen (or paternal germ) is received and nursed. What is that germ? Precisely what the germ of the Man and the animal is—an embryo plant—a plant in miniature—a plant compacted together—the nerve skeleton of a plant



compressed into an invisible point, embedded in food, which its mother has supplied, sufficient in quantity to provide material for its growing and expanding structure until it is competent to maintain itself. What is this *growth* but *development*? The plant is not made by some formative force from *without*, playing the sculptor's part and modelling it. The bud grows by an expansive force from *within*. The oak is but the *development* of the tiny speck in the acorn which has been produced by the addition of a pollen germ to the germ that was cradled in the ovarium.

In vegetables, as in animals, the question has always been, *whose was the germ*? Formerly, the ready answer was the same—the mother plant bears the seed, the pollen does but *vivify* it. Nobody seems to have questioned what *vivifying* means, nor by what process it is effected. Others contended that the pollen was the true germ and the ovarium merely its cradle. But the difficulty remained, how it could be that a mere *vivifying influence* should *change the shape* of the plant or impart to it the shape of the parent, or how, if the mother plant merely received the paternal germ and embedded it in food, there could be communicated to it the *shape* and *qualities* of the mother. This difficulty is entirely removed by the suggestion of a *double germ*. The suggestion is further confirmed by the fact, so inexplicable otherwise, that vegetables, like animals, are of duplex structure, not only every leaf, but every part of every flower, being made of two parts united, and almost invariably the point of junction being marked by an obvious medial line.

Looking, then, at the process of reproduction in plants, what do we see? Germs of plants, resembling their parent, are extruded from the parent by a process called *gemination*. Each of these buds is a distinct being, for it lives when severed from the parent. Has it not carried with it a portion of the parent's life, of which is it not, in fact, a continuation?

It is said, with some probability, that the bud, even

though severed and itself reproducing buds, can live no longer than the natural term of the life of the parent from which it was severed. This is, however, as yet unproved, although many facts in vegetable physiology point to such a conclusion. Be that as it may, these leaf buds, in obedience to some unknown law, often become flower buds, and then, instead of a life that *by severance* might be continued for a limited time only, they change at once their form and their character and that life is devoted, not to self-sustainment, but to the formation of the apparatus necessary for the reproduction of a *new and independent being*.

But for the production of this new and independent being a new condition is imposed. *One* parent produces the *bud*; but *two* parents are required for the production of the *seed* which cradles the germ of the *new* plant. These two parents may be distinct plants, or both may be found on one plant, or both may exist in the same flower. But wheresoever located *two* parents are required, even although they may be on the same stem, in the same calyx, in the same cavity. One germ must be "fertilised" by another or there can be no *new* plant.

What, therefore, does *fertilising* mean? When Scientists use the term *what* do they intend by it? I do not ask a definition of it in words which are only synonyms for the term itself, nor in words that are mere words, carrying no definite notion of any definite act or thing; but what *process* do they thus name? What is actually *done*? What change is made? *How* is the result brought about? By what specific *contrivance* is it that the germ produced by one of the vegetable parents, which would perish if left alone, is converted into a living organised being by the mere contact of something proceeding from the other parent? *What* is that something, and *how* does it operate to bring about so marvellous a change?

Is it not, as here suggested—that the requirement of *two* parents for the production of the seed, which is to be a new plant, is not demanded for the production of the



bud (which also is part of the parent plant), because the new organised being is contained in the seed and constructed of *two germs*; the object of this being to produce *infinite variation of individuals with a limit to divergence from species*? And is not this probability confirmed by the undoubted fact, that the organised being so produced is structured, not as one whole, but of two dissimilar halves joined together? Does not the argument that has been advanced against this suggestion—that in some plants both the parents are part of the same structure—go far to support it: for how overwhelming must be the necessity for *two* parents, when a fertile seed cannot otherwise be produced by the plant, even when both parents are existing together in that plant? Can any mere *vivifying aura* account for this? If not, can any other rational explanation of it be offered?

How the plant is developed we do not know. With animals the nerve system expands, and grows, and builds the body about itself. The nerve system of plants is not like that of animals, but it performs the same office. What with them is the *formative* force? It is not more likely to be applied from without in vegetable than in animal structure. It must, therefore, proceed from within. Whence does it come? How is it generated? How is it directed? These are mysteries that invite the examination of Science. The infant plant is stamped with the characteristics of *both* its parents. Although almost invisible, we know that the embryo is impressed with the shape, the qualities, and the idiosyncracies of both, for, if the parents are unlike, the offspring is a hybrid. Variations are so produced almost at will. If the seed (which is only a germ embedded in food required for its own maintenance) be the product of parents produced on the same plant, it will be developed into a plant similar to that from which it sprung. Why? Because both the germs of which it is constructed are the same in character. But if impregnation be made with the germ of another plant, of the same kind but varying in shape and hue, the result will be an offspring

intermediate between the forms or hues of the *two* parents; thus repeating precisely the process which produces varieties in animals and in Man.

These facts, moreover, strongly confirm the suggestion already made, that the germ of each parent is a *fac-simile* of that parent, and that all the infinite varieties of form and character in Man, in Animals and in Plants, *is due to the junction of the germs of two parents*, necessarily producing modifications, all the combinations of which are beyond human calculation.

The suggestion that the duplex structure of all organised being is the result of two germs, and hence the requirement of two parents for its production was received, when first I ventured to propose it, with almost universal contempt and even with ridicule. Subsequent researches of the most eminent Physiologists at home and abroad have, however, gone far towards confirmation of that suggestion. Dr. MASTERS has frankly stated in the *Gardener's Chronicle* that it might be accepted as solving many of the problems of vegetable structure. Listening at the Royal Institution to the admirable lectures of Professor SCHÄFER on "Animal Development," they seemed to point directly to the same conclusion. Having directed his attention to my suggestion, the Professor wrote to me: "Your suggestion has certainly received a large amount of confirmation from the recent observations on fertilization which I had occasion to narrate in my lecture of the 21st inst." More recently, the highest European authority, Professor HAECKEL, seems to have accepted the same views, for I find in a notice of his great work on "*The Evolution of Man*," contributed to the *Academy* by MR. A. WALLACE, the following:

We have, then, a long discussion of the nature of reproduction, which is shown to be really a continuation of the growth of the individual; but we cannot see that any attempt is made to show how or why the sexes came to be differentiated as soon as the organisation became complex. This part of the subject is rather slurred over, and the whole process of fertilisation is said to be "extremely simple, and entirely without any special mystery. Essentially it consists merely in the fact that the male sperm-cell



coalesces with the female egg-cell." The very mobile thread-shaped sperm-cells (spermatozoa) "find their way to the female egg-cells, penetrate the membrane of the latter by a perforating motion, and coalesce with the cell material. We hardly think that Prof. HAECKELL'S readers among the educated public will find this such a very simple matter. Considering that in the case of many marine animals these sperm-cells are discharged into the water, and have actually to seek the egg-cells and then penetrate their outer covering, it will be impossible to avoid the assumption that these apparently simple "cells" are not only living but intelligent organisms, endowed with a wonderful impulse to seek out and penetrate into eggs, thus destroying themselves in order to give birth to a new and higher being. However, when the two cells have coalesced, an important change takes place in the egg. Its nucleus disappears, and a new nucleus takes its place, which possesses the wonderful power of growing into the form of the parent organisms, however complex they may be. The egg-cell is now, therefore, a new formation, possessing in itself the vital activities of both parents combined.

---

## CHAPTER III.

## OF HEREDITY.

It is an undisputed, indeed indisputable, fact that the offspring of all organised beings resemble their parents. Children have more or less of likeness to father, or to mother, or to both; and this extends to the faculties of the *mind* as well as to the form and features of the *body*.

Shape, complexion, temperament, tendency to certain diseases, even vital power,—termed by Sir BENJAMIN BRODIE, “a faculty for living,”—come by inheritance from ancestors.

The Mental Faculties are derived in like manner from *both* the parents.

There are features of mind and body common to nations, as there are characteristics of form, disposition and intellect common to *families*.

*Nationality* and *relationship* are, therefore, not merely sentimental fancies. The recognition of them is in strict obedience to one universal law. There is *scientific* truth in the proverb, “Blood is thicker than water.”

HEREDITY is the contrivance by which general uniformity is preserved, while individual variety is maintained. It provides for infinite variation of animal and vegetable life, combined with perfect preservation of the species.

*Heredity* results from the operation of a law, which may be briefly expressed in these words, “*Like produces like.*” The germ of the offspring is a *replica* of the parent. The life of the child is, in fact, but a continuation of the life of the parent. If subject to no modifications in its birth or development, the offspring will bear a very



close resemblance to the parent. But practically it is subject to more or less of modification in all stages of its being. These modifications are, however, strictly limited by the law that they shall not be inconsistent with the healthy action of the organism so modified. When the modification passes this point the germ perishes. *Hybridism* is the most striking illustration of this law. The limit to Hybridism is the limit of the capacity of the two germs to unite, consistently with the healthy modification of the joint structure.

If the offspring were produced by but one parent, it would resemble that parent alone and but few types of being would be found. Individual variation would be confined within very narrow limits. All the members of the same family would be alike in mind and body, subject only to the comparatively slight variations produced by accidental circumstances in the course of development and growth.

Providence has avoided this inconvenience. By what provision?

Obviously by that described in the last chapter. *Two* parents are required for the production of an individual organic being.

And the manner of its accomplishment is obviously as there suggested.

Thus it is that the offspring come to have resemblances in mind and body to both parents.

Thus it is that, while preserving *races* and *species* of animals and plants, infinite *individual* diversity is produced.

*Heredity*, then, is the great law of Life, and its operation may be described in three words "*Variety with uniformity.*" Man continues to be Man because his father was a Man. Every Man has his *family resemblances* because he inherits with the life the *being* of his parents. Every Man differs from every other Man and possesses his own *individuality* because he mingles by inheritance the characteristics of *two* parents, modified as are both of these by their parental antecedents.

Thus does each one of us represent in himself not only his immediate parents, but also the ancestors of both. It would baffle the profoundest calculator to determine the results of such a commingling of shapes of body and qualities of mind as must be inherited by but a few generations. Who could trace how opposing features of mind and body must neutralise each other? How an accidental combination of the same feature in two or more generations, or even in the two immediate parents, must exaggerate the development of that feature into positive deformity? Patient investigation might trace the introduction of some special excellence or defect that has thus become hereditary. We learn from this *how it is* that family features, virtues, and vices crop out again long after the ancestor who introduced them has passed away.

Nor does this natural inheritance of ancestral character, caused by union of the two parental germs, in any wise conflict with the law of *evolution*. Rather it confirms that law by revealing to us the manner of its operation. The offspring being a continuation of the parent's life, and *at the time of its gemmation* similar to the parent, partakes of the changes wrought in the brain of the parent by education and exercise, as also it shares any degradation of the parental brain caused by disease, or accident, or neglect. Thus it is that the sins of the father are visited upon the children, even to the third and fourth generation; but thus it is that ability and virtue are transmitted also. If Heredity has made Man what he is, lifted him by slow degrees from a mere animal existence to the possession of reason, the knowledge of right and wrong, the recognition of a Creator to whom he owes allegiance, and to the hope and prospect of a blessed immortality, may we not venture to anticipate that the continuance of the same law of *progression by evolution* may lift him higher still in the scale of being, and that he may become as much greater than he is now, as he now is greater than what he has been.



To trace the operations of the great law of *Heredity* would be a work too vast to be undertaken here. In this chapter nothing more was designed than to impress upon the mind of the Reader the important position which that law must occupy in any examination of the Mechanism of Man.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

## HOW WE GROW.

WHAT the germ is we know not. Whence it comes we know not. We know nothing more than that every living thing was first a germ not shaped, in any manner perceptible to the eye, even when aided by the most powerful instruments, like the creature it is to become.

What is the process of growth? Is it an *expansion* merely of a folded up form, or is it the construction of a new form? Is the germ a closely packed structure, growing by expansion and accretion, in obedience to a force from within, or is it a shapeless structure moulded in its growth by some formative force operating from *without*?

The problem has baffled the most sagacious physiologists. The argument for an *external* formative force is weak; the objections to it are strong. Animals, whether nursed in a womb or in an egg-shell, are *not* cast in a mould. There is no proof of the presence of any *external* force by which their growth is determined, nor can any reason be assigned for the existence of such a force, beyond the fact that animals are constructed in a definite shape according to a certain pattern. It is extremely difficult to conceive of any *unintelligent* force modelling a man or a mollusc, hour by hour, and even minute by minute, as it grows from a shapeless point into its perfect shape, replete with all the delicate organs necessary to its existence and reproduction. It is still more difficult to assign the act of construction as the immediate work of the Creator, who, if He is assumed to



model every man, must be assumed also to model every mouse, every flea, every aphid. Such a theory may be dismissed as infinitely improbable. If there be not the *direct* intervention of the Creator, the construction of the animal frame must be the work of some unexplored natural force acting in obedience to some natural law. Does that force operate from *without* or from *within*—that is to say, does the formative force that shapes the body exist in the germ, or proceed from the germ, taking its direction from *within*, or is it supplied and directed by some intelligent or other power acting from *without*? Here again we can only conjecture. We have no positive *knowledge*. Such observation of the process as Science has yet made points to the conclusion that the force is generated *within*; that the growth of the germ is by *expansion*; that the formation of the perfect structure is *not by shaping from the outside*, as a statue is moulded by the founder or wrought by the sculptor, but by *attraction* and *accretion*, in obedience to a definite law operating from *within*—substantially a process of *crystallisation*.

And here I must again hazard a conjecture and offer a suggestion, which I do with all deference to those who have professionally devoted their thoughts and studies to physiology. I do not even know if it be original; but as I can adduce no authority for it, the Reader must take it for what it is worth. Having meditated much upon it since it first came into my mind and made a partial application of the theory to facts as they presented themselves, I have found in it a solution of so many hitherto insoluble problems in physiology that I am induced to think there is at least some foundation of truth upon which others, who have more leisure for the work, may build a complete system of animal construction. If the suggestion does nothing more than provoke thought and discussion it will be of good service.

But, according to the rule I have adopted, I must here again give notice that much of the following is *merely conjecture*.

Whether the monad was at the beginning a shapeless cell, growing by germination or by division of cells, is yet a subject for controversy. But there is no dispute as to the result of this growth, howsoever caused. From being an almost imperceptible particle, the machine has grown to be what we see it.

Whence has this addition come and of what material is it composed?

The growth began in the womb of the mother. There the germ was fed; there it grew; there it assumed the shape of a Man.

Every molecule of which that growth was made was abstracted by the child from the blood of the mother.

Whence came the molecules that, being in the mother's blood, went to build up the structure of the child?

From that which the mother had taken into her blood; from the food she ate and the air she breathed.

If they came from flesh or fish eaten by her, those molecules must have been part of the structure of an ox, a salmon, or some other animal organisation. If from her vegetable food, they were part of the structure of a cabbage or of some other plant.

But whence came the molecules that formed the ox? From the grass he had devoured.

So we arrive at this. However numerous the intermediate travels from vegetable to animal or from animal to animal, all the molecules of which a child in its mother's womb is composed, save the mere germ, which is infinitely small, were, not long before, material forming part of some vegetable structure.

And the inquiry may be carried yet a step further. Whence came the molecules to the vegetable the ox had eaten on whom the mother fed and whose molecules were thus conveyed through the mother into the body of the unborn child?

From mineral constituents of the soil and air and from gases diffused in the air, the gases themselves being only expanded metals.

Thus the materials of which the body is built are, in



fact, more truly taken from the earth than we are wont practically to admit. "The dust of Alexander stopping a beer barrel" is not so wild a conjecture as Hamlet thought.

Hence, not fancifully, but as an actual and indisputable *fact*, by tracing backwards the construction of a newly-born child, we learn that it has attained its present bulk by attracting and assimilating the molecules supplied by the blood of its mother, who procured them from the ox, who obtained them from the grass, which stole them from the earth and the air.

And it is surprising how short a time is required for this process of conversion. The countless millions of molecules that form the new-born babe are carried to it in nine months. The precise periods have not been measured, but it is probable that mineral particles may on Monday be taken from the soil or air into a blade of grass, eaten by an ox on Wednesday, swallowed in the shape of beef by a mother on Saturday, and on Sunday form a part of the body of her unborn child.

When an independent existence begins, the same process of accretion by molecules goes on. The infant and the boy and the youth continue to *grow*, and that growth is partly supplied by the particles that constituted the flesh of an animal who procured them from a vegetable which drew them from a mineral or a gas. The entire of the bodily structure of the full-grown man, beyond the invisible germ of his beginning, is borrowed from animals, vegetables, the air and the earth. Thus, also, his whole life through, the material is supplied for the processes of waste and repair.

Inasmuch as the same molecule, in its transmigrations, from mineral to vegetable, from vegetable to animal, and from animal to man, by its combinations with other atoms changes merely its apparent form, but preserves its identity, there is good reason to suppose (for we are ignorant what *the fact* is) that the ultimate molecules of which this world and all its inhabitants are constructed are precisely alike, but by their infinite combinations produce the infinite

varieties of form and character that present themselves on every side.

If this be so, we can understand how it is that a structure composed of such various material as the body could be built from a supply so limited as is that apparently contained in the food of the poor. Physiology has not satisfactorily explained how muscle, fibre, bone, nerve, tendon, hair, and the many other substances that constitute the complete organisation, could be extracted from the boiled rice on which the Indian feeds, or the potatoes that were formerly the principal nourishment of the Irish labourer. But the problem is readily solved if it be indeed, as I venture to suggest, that the molecules which in certain combinations formed rice and potatoes are, by the *vital* or *nerve force*, released from that combination and reformed into other molecular combinations, in which they present themselves to our senses in the shape of flesh and bone.

As to this also we have as yet no positive *knowledge*. It is but a probable conjecture. To the disgrace of Science, we are at present wholly ignorant of the process by which the molecules that come to us in our beef and bread are dissevered and recombined into the form of bone and brain. This is a mystery which Physiologists have failed to penetrate and, indeed, have scarcely attempted to explore. *But it is something gained to know that we do not know.*

What, then, is the process of *growth*?

What is *the force* that attracts the particles that form the body to the precise site where they are wanted?

What is *the force* that changes those particles of beef and bread into human bone, tendon, flesh?

What is *the force* that moulds to the required shape the particles thus attracted?

That force must be supplied either from within or from without. It must be inherent in the germ, or it must be applied by some external power.

It is almost impossible to conceive the existence of an *external* formative force operating upon a germ in a



womb or in an egg. Neither womb nor egg partakes in the least the character of a mould, in which the body can be *cast* and so take shape by combined pressure and resistance. The only possible *external* power is that of the mother. The forces that have wrought upon her and which are still at their work with her are working also upon her embryo offspring. The structure is supplied with the material for its growth by her blood, and is constructed by the identical building force that is hourly repairing her own frame.

This we *know*. But we do *not* know, and as yet we have scarcely begun to question Nature, what this *Force* is, whence it comes, how it works. We have been so accustomed to think of it as a formative force operating from *without*, that the other question—if it may not be supplied from *within*—appears not to have presented itself to the Physiologists. Yet that view of it may be worth considering. Having given some thought to it, I think there is evidence, sufficient, at least, as we lawyers say, “to go to the jury,” *that the body is built up by the vital force within* and not by any plastic force from without. In other words, that we are *self-constructed*,

Again be it understood that I advance this solution as *conjectural* only. The arguments, I *suggest*, as strongly pointing to such a conclusion, do not attempt to go further than to show its probability and the claim it has upon the consideration of Psychologists and Physiologists. It must not be rejected merely because it is novel. We know so little of the laws of *Life* and *Being*, they have been so unaccountably neglected by exact Science, as if there was something in their very nature that excluded them from investigation in scientific method by patient collation of facts, by the application of tests, and the careful study of conditions, that our positive knowledge is removed by scarcely a step from positive ignorance. I advance this *suggestion* in the hope that, if there be anything in it, others having more leisure and capacity than I enjoy may be induced to pursue it to a conclusion. If it be a truth, its importance cannot be exaggerated.

The suggestion I venture to make, and which I submit with all deference to the scientific world, is *that the body is constructed by the nerve system*, the nerves attracting to themselves and decomposing the particles in the blood and reconstructing them into material fitted for that special formation; that this formative influence extends to a certain distance from the nerve by varying lines of force, and that thus all the various shapes are modelled. Analogous instances occur even in inanimate nature. A crystal grows by attraction of like molecular particles into a definite shape and always in that shape and in no other. This it does, not by virtue of a plastic force *from without* moulding it to that shape, but by *some unknown force within itself* radiating from a centre in definite directions to definite distances. If the crystal were permeated by nerve fibres, we should without hesitation attribute to *them* the process of crystallisation. If a force can thus operate from within the crystal to shape the crystal and cause it to assume a definite and invariable form, may we not reasonably look for a like force operating through the nerve system to produce the shapes of organised bodies? May it not be that the flesh, bones and other parts of the bodily structure are moulded by a process *resembling that of crystallisation*, the material being attracted by the nerve force to the nerves as the centres and by the operation of that force decomposed from the particular molecular combination in which it existed when absorbed into the blood; then by the same force reformed into the new molecular combinations that constitute bone, muscle, and the many other constituents of the body? Having been so attracted, decomposed and recomposed by the nerve force, by the same force the same matter in its new form is deposited and maintained in its proper sites in the organism.

We are ignorant what is the form of the germ and of the process of its growth; but we know that it must be either a mere shapeless point, to which head, legs, arms, nerves and arteries are added by an unknown constructive force, or it is an embryo (by which I mean an



unexpanded type of an animal, like the butterfly in the grub), and grows *by expansion*. May it not be that the germ is a miniature nerve system, so infinitely small as to be beyond the penetration of our most powerful microscopes; that in the conditions favourable to its expansion it *unfolds*, and that, when unfolded, it proceeds to build up about itself the visible and palpable structure we call "the body," each separate nerve fibre attracting to itself from the blood of the mother the material required for forming the portion of the body to which that nerve fibre belongs; precisely as the attractive force of the crystal centre causes certain crystals to assume one shape, and the attractive forces of other centres cause them to take other shapes. And as one force will attract only the material of one kind of crystal, and other forces the material for other kinds of crystals, so each nerve attracts and moulds its own material only. Thus the nerves of the finger would form a finger by *crystallising* (I use the word only for lack of a better) about themselves, within the ranges of their vital and formative influence, flesh, bone, tendon and other materials that constitute a finger, depositing them within the range of their influence.

If this be so, it follows that the body is shaped in precise accordance with the shape of the nerve system and the lines of force flowing from it, and that *a man is really a nerve system clothed with flesh*, and not as we are accustomed to think of him, a structure of bones and flesh permeated by nerves and shaped by some external formative force whose source and action are equally unknown to us.

If the Reader can picture to himself a man stripped of flesh and bones and nothing left of his body but his nerve system; what would he see? A form, shaped in in all respects like the body, but composed entirely of a maze of strings of different sizes, branching into infinite subdivisions that defy the sight to follow them. If a microscope be used to assist the eye, he will discover still finer fibres shooting out in all directions, and he

will wonder where sufficient space could have been found among that mighty mass of nerves for the bones, flesh and other structures that had enveloped the nerves!

The contemplation of such a *nerve-skeleton* will at once suggest a probable explanation of the process by which the body is built. It is not a structure of bone and muscle into which the nerves have penetrated in process of growth. *The nerve system clothes itself* with flesh, bone and other materials requisite for its own life and action under the conditions to which it is to be subjected. If this be the true structure, "THE MAN" is not *the body* as he appears. The real MAN is *the nerve structure* that by its own *Vital Force* attracts to itself the materials required for formation of the body, ejects them when they are used up and deposits new material in their places. The manner of our growth (according to this suggestion) is partly by expansion, partly by accretion. The nerve system probably grows by *expansion*, that is to say, the unfolding and extension of the closely compacted fibres. The growth of the body that envelopes the nerves is by the accretion of new particles taken up by them. The vital force extracts the requisite particles from the blood, decomposes and recomposes them, and deposits the new material in its proper site.

The ultimate *shape* of the expanded structure is probably determined by the *Nerve* (or vital) *Force* operating in lines that extend to varying distances from the nerve centre. If these lines of force could be defined for a moment and made visible, they would present the precise form of the perfect structure. It is difficult to convey in general terms a clear description of this presumed *modus operandi* of the formative nerve force. I will endeavour to make it intelligible by an illustration, derived from a more familiar process, in which the operating force and the manner of its action are as yet unexplained by Science.

You desire to make a crystal basket. You do not attempt the impossible task of constructing crystals by



your own plastic skill and the formative force of your fingers. You dissolve a quantity of alum in water and thus supply the particles of which the crystals you require are to be built. Then you place in this solution the framework of a basket, to be a nucleus round which the crystals may cluster. There *your* work ends. Nature does the rest. How? The presence of a *force* is manifested. Of this force you know nothing beyond the fact that there it is. Although it is in energetic operation, you know not what it is nor how it works. You can neither see, hear nor feel it. It is not perceptible to any of your senses. It cannot be measured by the most delicate of your metric instruments. It comes you know not whence and it goes you know not whither. Its presence is only proved by its results. But by those results you are certainly informed that the force permeates the solution you have prepared, makes prisoners of the infinitely small particles you have caused to float in it, carries them to the nucleus you have provided and places them one by one in countless millions in the positions necessary for the construction of a crystal. Thus there arises, almost before your eyes—*grows*, as you would term it—a solid form, transparent, beautiful. More wonderful still, it is of perfect symmetry, as if cast in a delicate mould, carved by most exquisite skill, every crystal that encrusts the basket having precisely the same shape. Whence and what is this *formative force*? Is it a *plastic force* operating from without, moulding the crystal as the potter moulds his vessels? Or is it an *attractive force* proceeding from a centre within and drawing the material to itself? Can there be a reasonable doubt that it is an *attractive force* from *within*? But why are those particles arranged by that force in the definite form of the crystal and in that form only? Manifestly *because the formative force itself is* (if I may be allowed so incorrect a term), *in the form of the crystal*; that is to say, it operates in lines of force radiating from a centre. Rays of the force (again an incorrect term, but most nearly express-

ing my meaning) of different lengths and different attractive powers are projected from that centre, which rays of force, if they could be drawn by a pencil upon paper, would exhibit the precise form of the perfect crystal. What that centre in the crystal is we do not know, nor why the force so radiates from it. It is not, however, unreasonable to conclude that from these centres the force is always flowing in those specific lines, although it is apparent to our senses only when it comes in contact with the molecular material which it is its function to attract. Then comes growth into a shape palpable to the senses, and we see in substance the work of that force which, though ever present, our imperfect senses cannot perceive. We recognise the imperceptible presence by its results.

This process of *crystal-making*, which the Reader can witness at any time, will help him to understand the similar, if not identical process of *body-making*, which I am here *suggesting* (not asserting) as being *probably* that pursued by Nature. The nerve cords that branch to the finger form the nucleus of your finger, answering to the framework of your alum basket. The blood is the solution in which, as in your infusion of dissolved alum, the particles are floating that are required for building the body. A *force* proceeds in lines from each of the nerve threads (as from the centre of each of the crystals), and seizes upon such of the particles in the blood as are fitted for the purpose of flesh-building, bone-building, tendon-building, as the case may be, and which it is the proper function of those nerves to attract. The particles so seized are first decomposed into molecules, then recomposed by combination of the molecules into the new substances required, and then deposited, each in its proper place, precisely as are the particles that constituted the alum. Thus in the result a finger is formed, as in the experiment with the alum a crystal is formed. Both have a definite shape. The only difference between the inorganic and the organic product is that the latter, instead of being simple in substance and shape, is complicated



by the operation of some influences peculiar to *vital force*, of which we are as yet ignorant because we have hitherto wholly neglected the scientific study of them. But the important conclusion which I am desirous to impress upon the Reader by this illustration is, that the shape of the finger, like that of the crystal, is probably determined (to use the same incorrect form of expression) by the figure described by the lines of the *formative force* radiating from the nerve threads with various degrees of power, the various lengths of the lines of the force being represented ultimately by the shape of the perceptible organism which it has constructed.

Very cogent evidence to support this suggestion of the process by which we grow from a seemingly shapeless point to the complicated structure of a mature human being is supplied by the history of the growth of a chicken in its egg, which, coming within means of scientific observation, has been noted hour by hour. But a very brief outline of it can be attempted here. The curious reader will find it minutely described in a recent work that cannot be too highly commended. (a)

The only perceptible difference before incubation is that the germ then appears to the eye to be somewhat larger in the impregnated than in the fatherless egg.

Almost as speedily as the hen begins to impart to the egg the warmth of her body, the microscope discovers that the germ has elongated and separated into *two* distinct parts. It is not now a little round ball. The ball has unfolded, and *two distinct lines are visible*. These are obviously the *two germs* in the act of union for the formation of the two sides of the body *before* they have exchanged their nerve systems. These two lines are the rudiments of the brain and spinal cord. Here we find *two* nuclei of *two* brains and *two* spinal cords, in the process of junction for the formation of the nucleus of the

---

(a) *The Elements of Embryology*. By M. FOSTER, M.D., F.R.S., and FRANCIS B. BALFOUR, B.A. London: Macmillan and Co., 1874.

nerve structure. Is not this almost conclusive proof that the fertilisation which enabled the contents of the egg to be converted into a chicken was in fact the contribution by *each parent of one of the two nerve nuclei that are seen at this time to be uniting in the egg?*

They then speedily unite, each forming one side of the spinal cord. Then from one end of *each* of the two spinal cords the brain is seen to sprout, each spinal cord contributing its own hemisphere to that brain.

Expansion continues. From the great nerves shoot out lesser nerves and from these still smaller nerves. These newly expanded nerves penetrate the yelk and draw its particles to themselves. It is the sole supply of the material wherewith the expanding nerves build the body of the chicken.

These nerves draw from the yelk as from a reservoir. What is this yelk that they so take and so convert?

The yelk is an uniform substance, not resembling blood, bone, flesh, tendon, nor any one of the organic structures into which it is to be converted. But it comprises the materials required for the formation of each of the many substances of which a chicken is made. The body of the chicken, being formed wholly within the shell, can obtain no other supply of material than is to be found in the contents of the egg. This uniform substance is converted into a perfect chicken without the supply of any other material from any other source.

How is this marvellous transformation brought about? By what agent is it effected? By what process is it accomplished?

The agent is undoubtedly the nerve system of the chicken acting within the egg. That nerve system is developed, or, as I venture to suggest, expanded, and as it expands builds the body about itself. The instrument with which the agent works is the *nerve force*.

And it works *thus*.

The germ, as first seen, is a mere speck. If infertile, it simply perishes. If fertilized (that is, if the germ of another parent be linked with it), soon after expansion



commences the microscope discovers the two parts of the double germ plainly visible, elongating in two distinct lines. Then the two lines unite and form a centre, from which, in a few hours, nerve threads shoot forth. These are the great nerves with their ganglia. From them shoot forth the lesser nerves, until the entire body of the chicken is constructed upon what, for lack of a better term, we will call a nerve skeleton. As these nerves expand, they penetrate the contents of the egg, which are nothing more than a provision of material for the building of the body. From these two substances, the yelk and the albumen (or white), each apparently uniform, the expanding nerves procure the various materials requisite for the formation of all the various substances that go to the construction of a fowl. These are as numerous and various in the fowl as in a Man. There are blood, bones, muscle, nerve, brain, tendon, mucous membrane and a hundred other organised substances. All of these are made out of *two* substances only. *How?* What converts the yelk of the egg into bone and flesh and tendon? Certainly not a force from *without*. The force, then, is generated *within*. It is certain that this force proceeds from the nerves of the embryo chicken. This nerve force not only attracts the material supplied by the yelk in which it is embedded, but changes it from yelk to bone or flesh, as the need may be. The process is not merely a *selection* of particles—it is an actual *conversion* of one substance into another, and not into one other substance only but into many different substances. The nerve does not merely seize the yelk and wrap it about itself. There is a change in the *nature* as in the *form* of the yelk substance. It *was* yelk and *is* bone. This proves that the nerve force is something more than an attractive force. It decomposes the yelk substance—that is to say, it resolves it into molecules and then recomposes those disintegrated molecules into the entirely new substances that are required for building a bone and forming a muscle. Nor this only. Each nerve has its own office. Some nerves

make bone merely, some muscle, some tendon, some horn, some feather, some gland, some brain.

Thus, throughout the process of formation of the chicken in the egg, we are enabled to note minutely the changes that occur in its advance from the simple yellow and white substances we breakfast upon to that marvelously constructed structure, a perfect fowl. We can follow them step by step. But we cannot perceive *the force* by which the work is done. We know of the presence of this force only by its results. We learn that it is a process of expansion of the germ, itself the nucleus of a nerve system that seizes upon the material in which it is immersed and converts it from homogeneous yolk to infinitely diverse forms of bone and flesh by an actual decomposition and reformation of the substance itself. As no *formative* force is possible from *without*, and no *plastic* force is exercised from *within*, there remains only for a solution of the problem the process of growth by expansion and development from the nucleus of a nerve system which *clothes itself* with the material necessary to its existence when it shall break its shell and enter upon its world life.

Thus the entire body of the chicken is builded before the eyes of the microscopic observer.

If it be suggested that the *formative force* by which this wonderful transformation is effected may be in some way supplied by the mother, the conclusive answer is that the same result may be produced by artificial incubation. The heat of hot water is as effective as that of the hen's breast.

Thus another important fact is *proved*, that the formative force in animal structure is not applied from without but generated *within*. All the operations of the force take place within the shell of the egg. There the germ expands and grows and finds all the material for completing its structure. The transformation of that material into many entirely new materials is manifestly self-induced.

Such being the history of the growth of the chicken



in the egg, which we are enabled to observe with accuracy, it is impossible to doubt that, in the same manner, although we cannot see it, is our own structure builded. This is, in fact, the revelation of *how we grow*.

Thus, then, we arrive at the conclusion that it is *highly probable* (if not proved) that the nerve structure is the individual being; that this nerve structure *clothes itself* with the materials of the body—flesh, bone, sinew, &c.—as with a garment, and that it does this by a process very like the familiar process of crystallization.

If there be truth in the conjecture I have hazarded, it certainly solves many perplexing problems in Physiology and Medicine, and throws entirely new light upon the relationship of mind and body, matter and spirit. The subject is very large and to consider it fully would be a fit theme for a volume. In this place I can only present it in the barest outline, as merely hints for which I ask the consideration of others. I add a few of the suggestions which must occur to all who will give to it a moment's thought.

The first and most interesting conclusion is that, if it be as I have ventured to suggest, the shape of the body is determined by that of the nerve organisation, whose structure enables it to attract, deposit, supply and maintain with vital force only a definite quantity of material within the definite distance to which its attractive force extends. The office of the nerve is to repair as well as to build. Not only does it remove the particles composing the body when unfitted for their work or "used up," but it attracts other new particles and deposits them in the precise position of the particles removed. Hence the fact, at first sight so perplexing, that although the entire substance of the body is continually being changed, insomuch that some Physiologists have asserted, but wrongly, that it is wholly renewed in the course of seven years, the material structure continues to present the same aspect of identity. A birth mark remains unaltered through a life of seventy years, although there have been repeated replacings of the whole substance.

Many scars are indelible. A tattoo mark cannot be erased without removing the skin. Why? Every particle of the substance of the body has been removed and replaced, but the particles of the colouring matter remain precisely as they were deposited. To our consciousness the body we now possess is the identical body we had twenty years ago. It may grow fat or lean; the roundness of youth may give place to the wrinkles of age; there may be failing functions and lessened powers; but the consciousness of *identity* continues unchanged, nor could the most conclusive demonstration of science that no particle of the frame is the same as it was twenty years ago disturb for a moment our conviction that the hand, the foot, the teeth, are what they were. The reason of this is to be found in the suggestion we have been considering. Our *consciousness is in the nerves* and not in the flesh that clothes them. We speak of "*our arm*." The arm we *see* is the material that is crystallised about the nerves that permeate the entire structure. The arm we *touch* is the molecular clothing with which the nerves have invested themselves and which is needful for self-sustained existence in a world constructed of molecules. But *the true arm*, that which *feels* and *acts* in obedience to the command of *the Will*, is the *nerve structure* within the envelope, which preserves to us the sense of continuous identity and assures us that, although the entire of its clothing be changed, the process is, in health, carried on so slowly and insensibly that the consciousness of identity is preserved in spite of continual change.

The change in the material of the body without difference in its aspect is thus accounted for. When a particle, infinitely small, is removed by the action of the nerve force, in the healthy condition of the organism another particle is deposited in its place and thus the entire structure presents no indication of the change, nor is there any consciousness of it in our own sensations. It is as if a house were to be renewed brick by brick, each one as it is taken out being immediately replaced



by another exactly resembling it in shape and colour. The entire of the house might thus be slowly changed without any perceptible difference in its aspect. In the condition of health, when the nerves perform their functions regularly and are supplied with the requisite building material, the process is conducted unconsciously to ourselves. But if the condition be not of health, the processes of growth and repair, not being performed with ease and precision, are attended with inconvenience and pain. The particles not removed, and the particles attracted but for lack of sufficient nerve power not decomposed or recomposed, or attracted but not deposited in their proper places, accumulate and form *sores* and *ulcers* (which are only the imperfectly made or insufficiently removed material of the body), and this is the cause of *struma* and of all its attendant maladies.

Hence it is that certain *scars* are indelible. The injury had destroyed, not merely the material enwrapping the nerves, but that portion of the nerves themselves whose business it would have been to restore the flesh to the wounded part. With the destroyed nerve, the power of attracting the material from the blood, decomposing, recomposing, and depositing it in its proper place—that is to say, of *healing*—is lost, and that defect in the structure is presented which we call a *scar*. And that defect is life-long, because the destroyed *nerve* cannot be replaced. The same explanation applies to *birthmarks*, which, although apparently on the surface of the body, are really the result of a *deformity in the nerve structure* lying below the site of the defect. Thence necessarily results irregularity in the process of building and repairing that part of the body.

These illustrations of the practical application of my suggestion as to the manner in which the body is constructed are but a few out of the multitude that will present themselves to the Physiologist on very brief reflection.

The purpose of the molecular structure that clothes the nerves is manifestly to enable the nerve organization, which alone is sensitive, to exist in the external con-

ditions to which it is subjected in this world. Unprotected by a clothing of flesh and unsupported by a framework of bone, the naked nerve system, exquisitely sensitive as it is, even if guided by the Intelligence that governs it, could not support existence for an hour against the material forces by which it is surrounded.

Think, then, of a MAN as a being composed of an intricate network of nerves radiating from a centre or centres and constituting the actual mechanism of his real, living, Conscious Self. By the formative force possessed by this nerve system flesh and bone have been crystallised, as it were, about the nerves, moulding the man to the shape in which we see him now. This body is not solid, as it appears to our coarse senses. It is only an aggregate of molecules, held in near neighbourhood by an unexplained power of attraction called the *vital force*, which differs greatly from *chemical force* and must be carefully severed from it in our contemplations. These molecules do not touch each other, and doubtlessly they are ever in motion among themselves, combining, separating, and recombining, as incessantly through them are passing the mighty forces of Nature. Besides the *vital force* flowing from the nerve centres, the forces of magnetism, electricity, light, heat (if all these are not, as is believed, mere modes of motion of one force) are incessantly passing and as they pass they keep the molecules of which the body is builded in perpetual movement, with a rapidity of which our minds can form no conception. But this compels the conclusion, so necessary to a right understanding of every question in Physiology and Psychology, that *we are not solid bodies*, according to the popular notion of solidity, but aggregates of molecules not in actual contact, a structure therefore compressible and expansible, and capable of being permeated by other bodies constructed of some other atomic combination than that which forms molecules. These molecules, in various combinations, forming the substances we call by various names, as flesh, bone, fat, tendon, &c., are by the nerve system first attracted, then decomposed, then re-



composed, then placed, then kept in their places so long as they are serviceable to the organism, and then removed when their duty is done. All this is accomplished by the action of the *Vital Force*, operating through the agency of the nerves, which are the builders and the repairers of the tenement we call the body.

Nor does this conception of the human structure in any manner conflict with the theory of cell growth, or indeed with any other modern discovery asserted by the Materialists, who contend that they have traced back to their sources the operations by which organic structure is produced. Granted that we grow by cell expansion and division; still the questions remain, "What supplies the material with which this cell growth is effected?" "What is the force by which the cells are made to expand and their expansion to take the definite shape of a Man?" A cell is composed of particles of some kind and they must be supplied somehow. The air does not wholly feed them, although it may contribute much. Nor does the cell *create* for itself the force necessary for its dilatation and division into new cells. That force must be sent to it from without. If any proof of this be wanting, it is found in the fact that, when the animal dies and the *vital force* ceases to flow, cells cease to be formed. Professor HUXLEY and his coadjutor Physiologists may be, and probably are, right up to the point to which they have traced the formation of organized bodies. At this point, according to their own doctrine, *their labours end*, for nothing beyond this point is obvious to the senses, and all that is imperceptible is, they say, unknowable. But the investigations of *Psychology*, *beginning where Physiology ends*, pursue a path beyond the proper province of Physiology and are directed to discover *what* are the forces that cause the protoplasm to grow into shape, *how* the cells are supplied with the material of which they are constructed, and what are *the conditions* under which that growth and moulding into shape are accomplished.

I repeat (and it cannot be too often impressed upon

the mind of the student of Psychology), that through this aggregation of molecules compacted into the shape of a Man, so long as life continues, amid and about each one of them, with a speed we cannot even imagine and a power we are unable to measure, pass the pulses of ether, the waves of light, and the streams of that magnetism which is *possibly* the one physical force of the Universe.

Why, with so many forces passing continually among the molecules that make the body, do not those molecules fly apart and dissolve the structure?

Because the *vital force* that first attracted and assimilated them and now holds them together is more powerful than the disintegrating forces. So long as that vital force continues to be supplied by the nerve centres, and to be conveyed freely and fully by the nerve cords, the other forces operate upon us harmlessly. But if that vital force be weakened, or its flow impeded, forthwith the other forces resume their ascendancy, that imperfect action of the organism results which we call disease, and then in due time comes death. When the *vital force* ceases to be radiated from the nerve centres, the molecules, that have been by it holden together, separate and submit to the forces that produce the *chemical* combinations. The machine works imperfectly. Then it ceases to move. Finally the bone and muscle that were constructed of the molecules brought by the blood from the beef or the cabbage we had eaten or the milk we had drunk and attracted and deposited by the nerves, being released from the firm bonds of the vital force, fly asunder and are scattered abroad to form new combinations, according to the nature of the force within whose influence they may chance next to come. Thus the structure is dissolved.

Probably many of these molecules are resolved into the atoms of which they were composed, and these liberated atoms again go to form some of the multitudinous other combinations of atoms that construct the various non-molecular substances with which the Universe is thronged.



## CHAPTER V.

## HOW WE LIVE.

By the process we have been surveying the corporeal man is constructed. There is a firm framework of bones; there are muscles by which the bones are moved; there is an apparatus to supply the waste of material in the bones and muscles and a complex system of nerves radiating to every part of the structure from nerve centres; chief of them is the brain, which by means of the communicants called *the senses* is enabled to receive intelligence of the external world. This mechanism is moved by a power we term "the WILL" (of which more hereafter), and its action is directed according to the dictates of the *Intelligence* or the impulses of the *Emotions*.

Such, in rude outline (for a minute and detailed description of this machine would occupy many volumes), is the Being I invited you to contemplate in your imagination as perfected in structure but not yet endowed with life.

Imagine, if you can, this Being suddenly summoned to life and thought. What would be the process of awakened consciousness?

Life would first stir in the *nerve centre*, and by this common name I designate all the sections of the centre, whether brain or ganglia, that are united by the spinal cord.

Life is attended by the presence of a *force* of which, as of the other forces of nature, we know nothing more than its *effects*. This force—*Vital Force*—so called for lack of a better name derived from better knowledge—is carried by the nerve cords to every part of the machine,

which thus it animates and sets in motion. Stimulated by this force all the organs that contribute to the existence of the mechanism commence the performance of their several functions. The heart beats and pumps the blood into the arteries. By the arteries the blood is conveyed to every part of the structure, supplying the material with which the nerves perform their work of repair and renovation. The lungs expand and contract with each act of breathing, absorbing the gases of the atmosphere, which are not the less food for the body because their particles are invisible and impalpable. The brain stirs. Thoughts and feelings arise in the conscious self. Sensations come, brought by the nerves whose function it is to maintain communication with the external world and whose operations are conveniently arranged under the title of *The Senses*. The brain not only receives these impressions from without, but has other impressions, generated in itself, which have been termed the *Emotions*. The WILL, whose source will be considered hereafter, sends its commands through as much of the structure as is designed for voluntary motion. The nerve receives the message at the centre and carries it with speed which, although great, is not incapable of measurement, for it has been proved to be at the rate of about ninety-two feet in a second of time. In obedience to that message the muscle contracts, the limb moves, and thus by a series of commands, messages, contractions and expansions, the desire of the *Will* is done and the body executes the orders of the individual *Self*, whose servant it is.

What is the *Force* that thus sets the machine in action and keeps it moving?

It is necessary to give a name to this force, and it is desirable to adopt one that will carry with it no appearance of a foregone conclusion. I select the term "VITAL FORCE," in preference to the term *nerve force*, because it appears to begin and end with the life of the body—if, indeed, it be not the life itself. Its source is probably in the nerve centres, for a shock to them will often extinguish it instantly. From these centres it is carried



by the nerve cords through the whole frame, giving to every organ the power to perform its proper functions. If the vital force halts at any branch of the conducting apparatus, the powers of life fail in all parts of the frame lying beyond that branch, the functions of organic life are then imperfectly performed and local disease is established. If the vital force declines at the centre, there is general debility and general incapacity of the organs to do their duty.

Whence the *vital force* comes and what it is, if it be at all, which some Physiologists deny; if that force enters the body from without or is generated within; if the product of a certain collocation of the particles of matter, as galvanism is evolved by the contact of metals, we are as ignorant now as if Physiology had never been raised to the dignity of a science. The explanation of this failure is, doubtless, that the solution of the problem *is only to be sought in Psychology*, which Physiology has hitherto treated with such unwise and unphilosophical contempt.

The correlation of the Physical Forces as taught by Mr. Justice GROVE and to a considerable extent proved experimentally by Professor TYNDALL, does not disturb the conclusions as to the existence of a vital force which is neither identical with nor even allied to, the physical forces. It operates in direct opposition to some manifestations of those other forces. In the presence of *vital force* the operations of the force known as *chemical action* are suspended wholly or in part. At the moment the vital force begins to act, the *chemical* force, which is sovereign over the mineral kingdom, yields up its supremacy. But only for so long as the *vital force* maintains its vigour. On the instant that the vital force fails or flags, the chemical force asserts its power. The molecules which the vital force had held together in the various combinations necessary for the structure of the organism are seized upon by the chemical force and compelled to new combinations in accordance with the chemical laws. The organised

form then becomes mineral again and is subject thenceforth to the laws of chemical affinity, until its molecules are once more attracted by the vital force of some other organized being and pass through the same series of changes.

And so through the ages.

The machine thus set in motion wears daily, hourly, momentarily. Power implies waste; for no force is *created*—it is only *transferred*. There is no action of molecular matter, however slight, that does not consume something of the material of which the machine is constructed. In a period that would vary immensely according to conditions too numerous to be detailed, the machine unrepaired would wear itself out and fall to pieces.

For the purpose of repair, the body is provided with an apparatus by which all the materials requisite for such repair that are contained in the food it swallows and the air it breathes are resolved into a fluid—the blood—that circulates through the entire frame. From this fluid the *vital force*, operating through the agency of the nerves, selects the particles needed by each nerve for its own special service. By that force they are decomposed and recomposed into the substance requiring repair, and through the same agency the used-up particles are removed and carried out of the machine by an excretory apparatus provided for that purpose. The stomach and the lungs are the feeders, the liver and the kidneys the scavengers, of the body.

The *nerve system* is the instrument by which the *vital force* is distributed through the mechanism. It is as yet undetermined by Science if that force be generated in the nerve centres—the brain, the ganglia, or the spinal cord. But the evidence that so it is may now be deemed as almost conclusive. However that may be, it is agreed that the vital force flows from the centre to the extremities, and that is by the nerve system that every part of the machine is kept in healthy action.

The nerve system has another important office. It is the telegraph by which the central Intelligence and the



extremities of the body maintain mutual intercommunication. The nerve threads carry messages from the nerve centre to the body and convey intelligence of the world without to the nerve centre and thence to the *Conscious Self*. The *Senses*, as they are termed, are the nerves that telegraph to the brain the impressions made upon them.

Physiologists recognize nerves of *motion* and nerves of *sensation*. Both offices are not performed by the same nerve thread. Each has been separately severed with the anticipated result ; motion ceased when one was cut, sensation when the other was cut.

For economy of space the two classes of nerves are bound together in the same sheath, so that to the unskilled eye they appear as one cord. But apart from protection and economy of space, this arrangement is wonderfully advantageous. A nerve cord carries to the brain a sensation which reports to it the existence of something at the extremity of one or more of the branches of that nerve, and instantly the cord that is bound with it in the same sheath carries back the commands of the brain, which commands are so instantly obeyed, when the machine is in healthy action, that to our perceptions there is no appreciable interval of time between the dispatch of the message and the receipt of the answer. For instance : A particle of dust alights upon the eyeball. In a moment the eyelid descends and removes the dust. By what process ? The nerve whose branches permeate the eyeball carries to the nerve centre the painful report of the intruder's presence. Instantly the adjacent nerve cord bears to the muscles that move the eyelid the command to contract, and so to drop the curtain whose office it is to keep the eyeball clean.(a)

---

(a) This is the received hypothesis of muscular action. But I have sometimes suspected that it might be produced more simply by the process of "induction," the passage of the sensation through the one nerve cord exciting the contrary action of the cord that is bound up with it.

Some of the nerve cords are under the control of the *Will* and of the *Intelligence* (I purposely distinguish them for reasons that will be shown hereafter). These usually act in the manner above described. But others of the nerve cords that run to portions of the structure whose operations are not only not dependent upon the Will or the Intelligence, but would be endangered if they were so dependent, perform their functions involuntarily. These nerve cords do not proceed from the same part of the nerve centre as do those that are governed by the Intelligence, thus plainly indicating difference of function in different parts of the nerve centre. So long as life lasts, the nerves convey the vital force and maintain the functions of organic life in a more or less active condition, without pause or rest. A short pause in their action suffices to extinguish life. By no power of the Will can we control those nerves in the slightest degree. We cannot bid the stomach to digest, nor the heart to beat or to stop. We can influence the action of both directly by mechanical obstruction and indirectly by weakening the vital force; but we cannot, merely by taking thought, increase or diminish the activity of the function, as we control the motion of a muscle whose nerve cords proceed from the nerve centre that is the seat of the *Intelligence* and the *Will*.

As this is not a treatise upon Physiology and Anatomy, but only so much of both is introduced as appeared to be necessary to the understanding of the principles of *Psychology*, I here conclude the outline sketch of the manner in which the human machine is moved and kept alive (which was the single purpose of this chapter), with a summary of the results of the investigation.

The human machine is set in motion and kept in action by a force (not yet sufficiently investigated) to which the name of the *vital force* may be fitly given. This force has its seat and probably its source in the nerve centres, flows from them, and permeates the whole body, being conveyed to every part of it by the nerve system.



The action of the human machine is directed by a *Will* that sends its instructions from the nerve centres through the nerve system to the nerve extremities. The *Will* is controlled by the *Intelligence*.

The *Intelligence* at the centre receives its information of impressions made by the world without through special faculties called the *Senses*.

So long as the *Vital Force* is sufficiently generated by the nerve centres, and properly distributed through the entire machine by the nerve cords, the processes of organic life are maintained and there is the condition of *health*.

But if the nerve-centres, from any cause, fail to supply a sufficiency of *Vital Force*, or the nerve cords properly to distribute it, the processes necessary to the sustentation of vitality are imperfectly performed and the condition of *disease* supervenes.

When the Nerve Centres cease to produce *Vital Force*, or the nerve cords, from any cause, as in paralysis, fail to transmit it, there is the condition of decay and death.

And this is HOW WE LIVE.

## CHAPTER VI.

## HEALTH.

HEALTH consists in the due performance of all its functions by the entire of the organism ;—in a sufficient supply of *vital* or *nerve force* from the nerve centres ;—in an undisturbed conveyance of that force to every part of the structure ;—in the proper performance of their offices by the various organs having special functions for the processes of building and repair of the structure and for the removal of whatever is not wanted or has been used up.

The mechanism is maintained by a *nerve* system, a *digestive* system, a *blood-circulating* system, an *excretory* system.

So long as these are working well we have no consciousness of their action. To feel them at work is a certain indication that something is going wrong. If the sensation amounts to positive pain, we know that a mischief is present that demands attention. The use of pain is to inform us that a part of the organism is disordered, and so by compelling attention to it to prompt to removal of the cause of the mischief and repair of the injured part. Reason alone could not be relied upon for this, and therefore there is the admirable contrivance of *Pain* to secure notice and offer the strongest inducement to the adoption of those measures which, removing the pain, result in removal of its cause.

It is easier as well as wiser to preserve *health* than to remove *disease*. "Prevention is better than cure," is a maxim emphatically true in the matter of health. A few hints how Health is to be preserved may be fitly presented in this place.



In a state of perfect health, the nerve centre (or centres, if they be deemed to be more than one) produces an ample supply of *nerve* (or *vital*) force, which is distributed to every part of the body by means of the nerve cords acting as conductors. So supplied, each organ performs its functions perfectly and without consciousness by ourselves of its action. The stomach dissolves the food and converts it into a fluid in which all the varieties of material contained in the food are presented to the absorbents in a form that enables them to suck up such particles as are fitted for the growth or repair of the complex structure. Thence these materials are carried into the veins and become a part of that wonderful substance, the blood. The blood is borne by the arteries to every part of the body and wheresoever repair is needed the nerves there placed take up from the blood the particles to be used for the growth or reparation of the part of the structure of which they are in charge, decompose their molecules, recompose them into the new materials there required, and deposit them at the precise places where they are needed. But we have as yet very imperfect knowledge of the *process* by which this operation is performed.

The instrument by which is accomplished this wonderful work of distribution of the material for bodily structure and repair is the arterial and venous system. The blood is carried rapidly round the body and to every part of it by a complicated apparatus of tubes branching from greater to less until they are no bigger than hairs, thus pervading and feeding the whole frame, so that no part of it is unsupplied with portions of the stream of blood. Particles of this blood-stream, attracted by the action of the nerve force, filter through the walls of the minutest of the tubes (the capillary), and the particles thus abstracted and detained are the materials by which the growth and repair of the entire structure are accomplished.

But *how* is this accomplished? Granted that the particles are caught and retained for use, *how* are they

used? There they are; but *how* do they become flesh, bone, tendon, hair and so forth?

The *vital force* brought by the nerve cords does it all. The nerve threads are found thickly branching and clustering among and about the blood tubes, embracing the very smallest of them. As the particles of the digested food pass through the blood tubes, the nerve attracts and arrests them and by the decomposing and recombining power of the *vital force* those particles are converted into the special substance for which they are wanted at each locality.

We are wholly ignorant (and it is right that we should acknowledge our ignorance) of the process by which this apparent transformation of blood into bone and flesh is effected. Science has failed to discover,—indeed has not yet cared to inquire by patient and extensive observation and experiment—whether it is that the blood tube deposits upon bone only the particles that form bone, upon flesh only the particles that form flesh, and so forth; or if it be that the particles deposited are everywhere the same, but that, by the nerve force operating variously in each particular part, the molecules of the particles there deposited are re-combined in the proportions necessary for the formation of the material there required. Or is it that they combine in obedience to some law of chemical affinity, like attracting like, precisely as when a solution is made of various salts? The particles of each salt, by some mysterious power of attraction, find out their fellows among the mingled mass, make their way through the throng and, rushing together, recombine and reform into definite crystals, distinct from the crowd with which they had been for a time commingled.

Or may it not more probably be that each nerve attracts the blood from the capillaries and by the *vital force* decomposes its molecules and recombines and reforms them into the new substances required for that part of the structure to which the attracting nerve appertains, and thus it is that bone is deposited upon bone, flesh upon flesh, horn upon hair and nails. Observe,



that the blood, from which the various materials are taken, is neither bone, flesh, nor horn, but a substance different from either. Therefore it must be organically changed—that is, its molecules must be separated and recombined—before bone, flesh, and horn can be made of them. This transformation is the work of the nerves and the instrument by which it is wrought is the *vital* or *nerve force*.

But, whatever the means by which the effect is produced, there is no question as to the result. When in youth the nerve system is working in a condition of perfect health, growth is carried forward steadily. When nerve force declines growth ceases. When maturity is attained, the waste of the machine is continually supplied by new particles deposited in the places of such as are used up, those new particles precisely resembling their worn-out predecessors.

But what becomes of these superseded particles?

By a process almost more wonderful they are carried back into the veins. By the stream of blood that is rushing through the veins they are rapidly borne to the great glands whose function it is to clear the body of its exhausted materials—notably, the liver and the kidneys—and, by the nerve force working in these organs they are again seized, combined, converted into bile and urine, and in these forms expelled from the body.

We inherit with the Life the bodily as well as the mental constitution of *both* parents, each of whom has inherited his or her constitution from ancestors in like manner. Hence the transmission of tendencies to certain diseases commonly and properly called “family diseases.”

The popular belief certainly, and the prevailing medical assumption, is that these diseases are transmitted. If any meaning can be attached to this it must be that the germ has in it the actual seeds or elements of the disease derived from the parent, and which afterwards grow or develope under favourable conditions. But it

may be objected to this that in fact very few diseases have any germs or seeds, and that if they existed they could not well be contained in the tiny point a germ is in its first stage of being. The true explanation of what are termed "inherited" or "constitutional" diseases is that the germ, being a reproduction of the parent is structured in a manner that makes it liable to contract that particular form of disease its parent had. But this structure, and therefore this liability, is first modified by the influence of the germ of the other parent, and then the organism must be exposed to the conditions that cause the disease it has a special adaptation for contracting.

The right understanding of the true nature of inherited or "constitutional" diseases is of high importance in the maintenance of health, for if it be correct, we do not inherit the specific disease, but only a structure having a character that gives a tendency to the disease. Knowing, as we ought to know, what our family diseases are, we may escape them by carefully avoiding the conditions likely to favour the production of those diseases.

*Health* will be best preserved by the observance of a few general rules. It is a fact familiar to the physician that if the attention be long fixed upon any organ its operations are thereby disturbed and actual disease may be produced by thinking of it. The cause is clear. By directing the attention of the mind to any part of our own organism we by the very act of attention transmit thither an increased flow of nerve force. This would have the effect of setting up a morbid sensation, or if that exists already, the frequent repetition of the painful sensations thereby caused will give to the affected nerve a tendency to reproduce the painful impression on very slight suggestion, and even to its self-production. This is the explanation of the recurrence of *neuralgia* in its various afflicting forms. The remedy is to distract the attention by fixing it upon other objects. The obstacle to the employment of this remedy is the difficulty of



finding an attraction for the mind greater than the attraction of the pain.

Science has not discovered any rules for Health to be added to the ancient ones—“*temperance* and *exercise*.” Keep the head cool and the feet and hands warm.

*Temperance* does not mean merely moderation in eating and drinking, but in all exercises of mind and body—temperance in thought and in act, in labour and in pleasure. The capacity for action, muscular or mental, is dependent upon the supply of vital force from the nerve centres. There is a limit to that supply. When the source is too much drawn upon there is, first, a sense of general debility—that is, a decline of mental or of bodily activity or of both. If this warning be not taken and the needed rest given to the overtasked nerve centres, the next and certain consequence is that one (or more) of the organs for nutrition or excretion loses power and becomes incapable of the proper performance of its duties. Thence the maladies resulting from imperfect circulation of the blood, indigestion, diseases of liver or kidney, which are followed in their turn by atrophy for want of nourishment, or struma from incapacity to convert the materials of the food into organic matter or to remove the used-up particles. *Temperance* and *exercise* have a near relationship. That which is temperance when combined with exercise is intemperance with idleness. Neither can be strictly defined. They are relative terms to be tried by the circumstances of each case. A man who walks twenty miles a day may eat and drink with impunity to an extent that would kill in a month a man who does not walk half a mile from his front door. But of this we may be assured, that without *temperance* there can be no freedom from disease, without *exercise* no enjoyment of health.

But although the standard of temperance must be measured for each of us according to the circumstances of the particular case, there are some rules useful in resolving how to be temperate. In the first place it may be observed that the most moderate of us eats more

than is wholesome, and much more than he needs. The quantity of nourishment required for the sustentation of life and repair of the structure, when the body is not much exercised, is exceedingly small, after the process of growth is completed. The waste of the actual structure, that is to say, the material forming flesh and bone, is far less than is commonly supposed. Formerly it was said that the entire material of the body was changed in seven years, and some fanciful notions of periodicity of health were founded on this assumption. But modern Physiology has exploded this, with so many other popular superstitions about the human frame and its functions. It is now known that the process of waste and repair is far more slow. But even if the seven-year supposition had been correct, a division of the work over the weeks would exhibit but a trifling demand upon daily food for material, especially when it is remembered that the real solid material substance of the body is not quite a tenth part of its whole weight—the rest of it being water. But we cannot live upon pure nourishment alone. We should die upon a diet of nutrient particles only. A certain quantity of innutritious material in our food is absolutely essential to health. The skins of most vegetables are indigestible. But they are not therefore to be rejected. On the contrary, they should be eaten. It is the presence of the indigestible skin of the grain of wheat that makes brown bread so much more wholesome than white bread. The skins of apples, potatoes, and of the smaller fruits, would not be removed from our food if we understood the mechanism of the organs of digestion as we ought to do.

So it is with the popular prejudice in favour of animal and against vegetable food. Animal food is assumed to be more nourishing than vegetable food. This can only result from the prevalent ignorance of the Mechanism of Man and the laws of life. There is a popular notion that somehow the identical flesh we eat goes directly to form our own flesh. The fact is that the beef we eat is made of precisely the same



ultimate particles as the cabbage—that it was itself in the form of grass not long ago, and that whatever we eat, whether it be animal or vegetable, is resolved into its molecules, and reformed into the material for our flesh and bones, and these building materials are the same, when used by the nerves for that purpose, whether they were received into the stomach in the shape of beef or of cabbage. But while both forms of food are equally fitted for nourishment, they are not equally wholesome. There can be little doubt that many of our most terrible and destructive maladies are contracted from the flesh of animals taken into the stomach and thence carried into the blood. It is indeed probable that the eruptive disorders, such as measles and small pox, have their origin in the use of animal food. Nature has, however, obviously constructed us to subsist on both, although from the structure of the teeth it may be gathered that they were designed chiefly for vegetable nourishment. The lesson of *Health* to be learned from these facts is, not total abstinence from animal food, but care in its selection, moderation in the use of it, and an extensive mingling with it in our daily diet of abundant vegetable food—in brief, to eat flesh as an accompaniment to vegetables and not vegetables as a mere accompaniment to flesh.

So with drinking. It is a waste of breath or ink to say you must not drink “too much.” Everybody will readily admit this. The question is, “What *is* too much?” Not only does each person set up his own scale of moderation, but there is, in truth, a different scale for each. There is nothing essentially noxious in fermented liquors. Those who say so do not believe it, for they drink freely of ginger beer, which is fermented, and eat of fermented bread—the products of the fermentations being the same whether generated in ginger beer, or in bread, or in wine.

It is otherwise with spirit. This is in fact a selection and concentration by an artificial process of the noxious products of fermentation, which, mingled with the mass

of other ingredients is harmless, but thus concentrated becomes a deadly poison, the more deadly because it kills by slow degrees and destroys its victims unconsciously. Total abstinence from spirit in its pure form, and moderation in the use of fermented liquors, is the golden rule for the maintenance of *Health*.

So also should care be taken to procure an abundance of fresh air. Air is the food of man as of plants. It should enter freely into our dwellings and be welcomed into every room, provided it does not come in the form of "draughts," which not even the hardiest plants can endure. Above all, make it a rule to open the window of the bedroom for the admission of fresh air at night. Never sleep with the window completely closed.

Lastly, daily sponge the body with cold water. Not merely is cleanliness a virtue, but the benefit to health from accustoming the skin to cold, and the reaction caused by it, are of incalculable advantage to *Health*.

A long list of other rules might be given ; but these are the most important, the most easily observed, and their observance will sufficiently secure a healthy and therefore a happy life.

---



## CHAPTER VII.

## HOW WE SICKEN.

*Health* is the normal condition of the organism. *Disease* is an accident. But the sources of disease are so many that few are fortunate enough to escape it altogether. Diseases, or tendencies to specific maladies, are inherited from both parents, and the seeds of them, or the conditions favourable to their production, are transmitted by both germs. And not by the immediate parents only. The ancestors of both parents far backwards, as all experience proves, transmit their ailments. *Family diseases* are as frequent as family features or family dispositions. If indebted to progenitors for the sound mind in the sound body, these may be impaired by malaria, by accident, or by neglect of the laws of health. The consequences of any of these influences are found in an insufficient supply of *vital force* for the performance of the functions of life, resulting in some of the many maladies that have their sources in nervous debility.

Hence, numerous as are the *forms* of human maladies, their immediate causes are comparatively few and the methods of prevention and cure should have reference always to their causes.

What, then, is *Disease*? How do we *sicken*?

An immense amount of misconception prevails in the popular mind, and is not altogether banished from the medical mind, as to the nature of disease.

The common belief is that *Disease* is something distinct from the body itself, something intruded into the body from without, or generated within, but occupying the body

or some portion of it, as an invader having a separate existence of its own, to be combated and driven out of the body by other foreign substances called medicines, or by the force of a treatment which is usually based upon the notion of *expulsion*. Put into this plain shape there will, perhaps, be some reluctance to acknowledge so grave a fallacy. But, although few Doctors would admit that this is *their* conception of the nature of disease, it cannot be denied that the greater portion of the actual practice of medicine is based upon such an assumption, and that the strange uncertainty and ever-changing fashions in that practice are due to some such fundamental error about the nature of disease as undoubtedly pervaded the whole science and practice of medicine in days not far distant. This error is as yet but imperfectly removed.

Before it is possible to form a clear and accurate conception of *Disease*, before a foundation can be laid for a *science* of healing, before a judgment can be formed of any practice in medicine, it is necessary to banish entirely the time-honoured notion of *Disease* as being an intruding stranger, at war with *Health*, whom it is the business of drugs to drive out of us. We must learn to think of *disease* as being no other than the *nonperformance of its duty by one or more of the structures of which the body is builded*.

To treat of disease as fully as it deserves would be a task far beyond my capacity and out of place here. In its relationship to the Mechanism of Man, I can but attempt a rude outline of a subject as interesting as it is important.

Diseases may be most conveniently classified with reference to their origin rather than to their immediate causes. The sources of disease will be found :

In *malformation*—imperfections in the structure at birth or from accident.

In the *insufficient* supply of material for the healthy maintenance of the structure.

In the supply of *unwholesome* material.

In the inability of the vital force to *convert* the material



provided by the blood into the special substances required for the growth or repair of the diseased parts of the structure. This inability may result from local injury to the nerve cords, or from a deficiency in supply of the vital or nerve force by the nerve centres.

In the inability of the vital force to *expel* the *excreta* or used-up material.

Thus viewed with reference to their immediate causes, diseases may be reduced to *three* great classes. Insufficiency of the material for growth or repair is not, rightly speaking, itself a disease, although the immediate result of the presence of disease. These are

- (1.) Diseases resulting from *deficiency* of vital force.
- (2.) Diseases resulting from *poisons*, including all the malarious and infectious disorders, and which are known to medicine as *zymotic* diseases.
- (3.) Diseases caused by *malformation* or *accident*.

And even these three might be yet further reduced, for diseases from accident or blood poisoning are maladies by reason of the diminution of vital force of which they are the cause—so that all disease may be referred ultimately for its immediate cause to deficient *vital force*. It is, however, more convenient to view disease under a greater variety of aspects. A further sub-division is desirable, based upon the more immediate aspects of its generic forms. The following will be found to include the greater portion of them.

*Injury* to the structure itself by some *violence*.

*Failure* of the nerve centre to produce sufficient of *nerve* (or *vital*) *force* to keep every part of the structure in complete repair.

*Failure* of some one or more of the *nerve cords* to convey the nerve force to its destination.

*Failure* of the organs of *nutrition* to discharge their duties of feeding the blood whence the materials for repair are extracted.

*Failure* of the organs of *excretion* to perform their functions of extracting the used-up materials and expelling them from the body.

All *disease* will be found to result from one or more of these five causes. But careful examination will show that many disorders, supposed even by the Physicians to be those of the nutrient or excretory organs, or of the muscular tissues or bone structure, are really disorders that have their seat in the nerve centres or in the nerve branches. For instance :

*Injury by violence* is not in itself disease, but it is usually the cause of one or more of the diseases that come within the succeeding classes.

*Failure of nerve or vital force.* This is better known as "general debility." The nerve centres failing to produce the requisite quantity of vital force, the functions of all the organs are of necessity feebly performed. The stomach digests imperfectly ; the heart and the arteries do not send the blood with sufficient vigour to supply the smaller blood vessels ; the liver does not eliminate the refuse from the blood ; the nerves cannot convert the blood into bone and flesh. If this failure be long continued, specific disease attacks one or more of the organs and death is the result. It happens rarely that death is immediately caused by general failure of vital force, save in old age. The process of death in this manner is very slow, and other more rapidly destructive maladies usually intervene to anticipate the natural ending of the fading life.

*Failure of some or all of the nerve cords* to perform properly their duty of conveying the nerve force forms the most extensive class of diseases. The action of the nerve centres may be perfectly healthy and abundance of vital force may be produced ; but if the nerve cords fail to carry it to every part of the structure, the part so deprived must languish, alike from want of repair and from the noxious effects of imperfect excretion. The used-up particles linger long after their services are completed. They lose their vitality. They become dead matter inclosed in the living structure. The *chemical* force seizes upon and decomposes them. They impede the action of all the surrounding parts.



They press upon the blood tubes and the nerve threads and irritation, ulcers and neuralgic pains are the result. This occurs when the lesser nerve threads are damaged. If the greater ones are injured, we have *paralysis*—which is the failure of the nerve cord to convey the *Will* from the brain to the muscles—and *epilepsy*—which is an irregular flow of the nerve force—and all the formidable maladies of that class. If the obstruction be in the nerve cords that convey vital force to the organs of digestion, secretion, or excretion, we have the long list of diseases arising from functional disorder of these organs. If the nerve cords that perform the telegraphic work of the senses are enfeebled in their action, the consequence is that *the senses* fail to send their impressions *truly to the brain*.

Obviously the remedies for all diseases having these as their primary causes must be directed to the removal of the cause. The care of the Doctor will first be given to ascertain, as nearly as he can, the precise locality of the obstruction, and, that found, to inquire into its nature—if it results from pressure producing an imperfect paralysis, or from lesion, or from degeneration of the nerve cord itself. By far the most frequent cause of this disorder of a part only of the nerve system that is healthy at the centres is pressure produced by swelling of the muscular structure through which the nerve passes. The remedy is by relieving the nerve from the pressure that had partially impeded its operations. But the evil effects of that impediment to the full and regular flow of the vital force are not limited to the immediate seat of the obstruction; they extend to all the branches of the obstructed nerve spreading beyond the seat of injury. These are enfeebled also and to that extent rendered incapable of performing their functions, whether they be those of secretion or of excretion, or of keeping in proper action some important organ. The precise seat of the mischief is often difficult to be discovered, and, sometimes being deeply lodged, the remedies are difficult of application. But in medical science it is important to

know where and what disease is, even although it be out of reach. Where the obstruction is the result of organic lesion or degeneracy, medical skill can do nothing but alleviate suffering and smooth the inevitable passage to the grave.

*Failure* of the organs of nutrition to perform their functions and supply to the blood the necessary material for the repair of the structure.

The causes of this class of diseases are usually to be sought in the nerve centres. The organs of nutrition require for the perfect performance of their functions a greater amount of vital force than is demanded by other parts of the structure. Hence a comparatively slight depression of power in the nerve centres is speedily and severely felt by the digestive organs. Exhausting exertions and passions show their effects in the pain of indigestion, if food be thrust upon the languid stomach in despite of the intimation given by the absence of appetite that it is not welcome.

The remedy for this class of diseases also must be directed to their source. The stomach, feeble for want of a due supply of vital force, is only made irritable and less fitted to perform its functions by drugs addressed solely to itself. The only possible cure is by treatment directed to the restoration of the flow of *Vital Force* by rest given to the nerve centres. Until this is accomplished, all other supposed remedies but increase the mischief they were designed to remove.

The same causes and the same remedies are applicable to all the diseases that are connected with the organs of *excretion*. Their action also is not mechanical, as many persons, otherwise well-informed, appear to believe. It is dependent wholly upon the power imparted to them by the vital force. Their diseases are perhaps more often *accidental* than are those of the other organs, meaning by this term that they are the result of local lesion, not of nervous depression. But the skilful Doctor always looks to the source of the disordered action for the cause of the malady, and if local injury be



not apparent, he inquires carefully into the condition of the nerve centres and then into that of the nerve cords. If they or either of them should be found working feebly or irregularly, he directs his remedies to *them*, satisfied that, if he can restore *them* to healthy action, they in their turn will speedily restore healthy action to the functions of the organs which they feed with *vital force*.

Science is entirely ignorant what vital force is, by what process it is generated in the nerve centres or how transmitted by the nerve cords. It knows only that these are the instruments by which the machine is maintained in that automatic action we call LIFE. But whatever may be the nature of the vital force, or the process by which it is distributed, there is no doubt of the fact that, so long as the flow of that force continues unimpeded, the result is *Health*; if it be obstructed, *Disease*; if it be suspended, *Death*.

Why? The vital force is necessary to the arrest and assimilation of the nutrient particles supplied by the organs of digestion, and equally to the removal of the used-up particles from the structure with which they have ceased to be organically compounded. If the supply of new particles is cut off, the body perishes from inanition; it is starved to death. If the vital force is, from any cause enfeebled, the nerves are unable completely to convert the new particles into flesh, or to remove the used-up particles. In either case there is a consequent accumulation of non-organised matter which, causing nervous irritation, and consequent effort to remove the obstruction, produces the great majority of the diseases that show themselves in the shape of *sores*. In the flesh it becomes *ulcer*; in bone, *necrosis*; in a gland, *tubercle*—the immediate cause of all being either unconverted food or unremoved excreta, and the ultimate cause insufficient vital force for the perfecting of the processes of assimilation and excretion.

The source of diseases of this class should be sought, therefore, not in the locality where the symptoms show themselves, but in the more distant first cause—the

failure of the nerve centre to produce, or of the nerve cords to convey, to the whole frame a sufficient supply of vital force for the performance of the vital functions, foremost of which is that of assimilating foreign materials to its own structure by the conversion of the particles attracted from the blood into flesh and bone, and throwing out and carrying off the used-up materials.

The cure can be compassed only by stimulating the nerve centres to an increase of the production of vital force, or by removal of obstructions to its flow, as the case may be. Remedies applied directly to the diseased organ do not *cure*, though they may relieve *pain*. But how much of medical practice proceeds upon the erroneous assumption that the diseased organ is alone or principally to be treated, omitting to trace the disease to its origin in the centre where vital force is generated and whence it is radiated by the nerve cords?

From this brief outline it will be seen that the vast majority of diseases have their source in the failure of the nerve system to supply a sufficiency of *vital force* or properly to distribute it. A skilful Physician, recognising this fact, directs his first inquiries to this point, and if he here finds the defect, he applies his remedies to the true seat of the disorder, instead of wasting time and labour in treatment of the apparent mischief.

The maladies produced in parts of the frame by an insufficient supply of vital force react upon the nerve centres. The partially assimilated material for the structure of flesh or bone imperfectly decomposed or recomposed, and therefore unvitalised, becomes *pus*, is absorbed, re-enters the blood and poisons it. The poisoned blood permeates the brain and clogs its action. The liver is congested and unfitted for its proper service. The nerve centres are partially paralysed and further incapacitated for the production of vital force. What is the *rigor* that always attends the formation of *pus* but the poisoning of the blood by its absorption, thus irritating the nerve centres and through them all the



vital organs? The presence of the poison causes an instant effort for its expulsion and hence the fever that follows the *rigor*. But these efforts of nature to resist death are limited. If the mischief be not speedily removed, the blood that should convey the food of life conveys only a cause of death, and the end is certain and soon.

So it is if *function* only is affected. The performance of function by an organ is due to the stimulus of the vital force. Lessen or withdraw the stimulus and function flags or ceases. If the function be performed imperfectly, the result is a further diminution of the nerve force through the depression of the nerve centre. Take the process of digestion for an instance. It is the function of the stomach to dissolve the food and prepare it for submission to the glands by which the nourishing particles are sucked into the blood. If vital force fails through imperfect action of the nerve centres or nerve cords, the process of digestion is imperfectly performed. That reacting upon the nerve system, the vital force is further enfeebled, and so from bad to worse until death comes to us in *this* form.

So vast is the department of disease resulting directly or indirectly from imperfect action of the nerve system. The cause ascertained, it is obvious that the cure must be sought by operating upon *the cause*. In all disease, therefore, the first question to be answered is, not merely what is the *seat* of the mischief, but what is its *source*. Is the disordered condition the consequence of a local or accidental injury merely, or is the organ suffering because the nerves that keep it in repair are performing their office inefficiently? If the latter, is this imperfection of the nerve action the result of local injury to that particular part of the system, or of a deficiency in the supply of nerve force generally? And as the answer is so must the remedy be applied.

The diseases resulting from defective nerve force, which for the sake of brevity I will term *nervous*, admit of a classification which, though not strictly accurate, will

suffice for the purposes of this brief sketch of *how we sicken*.

Imperfect nerve action produces

I. Organic disease.

II. Functional disease.

And these may be induced either by

(1.) Disorder at the nerve centre, causing an insufficient or irregular supply of nerve force.

(2.) Disorder of the nerves at the seat of the malady.

Disorder of the nerves at any particular part of the body must inflict more or less of injury upon the body itself or its functions at that part. The business of the nerves being to construct and repair the structure that is crystallised about them, removing from the machine the unfit and used up particles, and supplying their places with others selected from the blood, it is obvious that if this duty is insufficiently performed by the nerves at any part of the body, either the waste particles will not be removed, or the requisite new particles will not be attracted. In the one case there will be abnormal accumulation, in the other case atrophy. If the nerve attracts but does not remove, there will be the presence at once of the noxious matter not duly carried away and of the new matter to be set in its place. Then arises a double mischief. There is the presence of the new noxious used-up material and also of the new material which, not being utilized, becomes itself noxious. This, in plain language, is the condition to which the name of *scrofulous* has been given. In such a constitution the nerves have not power to perform their double functions perfectly. The used-up particles are not removed and the new particles are not converted into perfect flesh or bone nor deposited in their proper places. They accumulate, irritate, sores are formed, and the noxious material is discharged in the form of *pus*, which is only matter that the deficient nerve force has been unable properly to convert into flesh.

Such being a rude outline of the Physiology of nervous



disease, the nature of the remedies is not difficult to be discovered.

When the extremities of the nerves are in fault, is the injury temporary or permanent? If the latter, cure is impossible. It appears that if there has been actual excision of a nerve it cannot grow again; but threads of nerves will re-unite if brought into near neighbourhood. There is no evidence that a severed nerve will shoot forth afresh from its extremities to supply the place of nerve that has been removed. Nor, indeed, is this process possible, if the suggestion be true, that the nerve crystallizes, as it were, the flesh about itself; for the mutilated nerve could not shoot out into space to attract the materials necessary for clothing itself anew with flesh, and flesh could not be formed for lack of the formative nerve force. Hence cicatrices and scars are indelible because, the extremities of the nerves being destroyed, there is no nerve as a centre upon which the removed structure can be rebuilt. In the lower forms of life each ganglion is a nerve centre radiating formative nerve force and each section of the structure has a separate vitality, and is in fact a distinct being. When a part of any such distinct segment is mutilated, if the nerve centre be unharmed, nerve threads appear to be sent forth to construct a new part in place of that destroyed.

The other cause of nervous disease—disorder of the nerve centre, occasioning an insufficient or irregular supply of nerve force—is the most frequent, the most serious, and the most difficult to remedy.

Insufficient production of vital or nerve force may be accidental and temporary; but also it may be permanent. The former is but too familiar in social life. Excessive exertion of the nerve centres, especially of the brain, is the most frequent cause of this condition. The supply of nerve force is necessarily limited; it is produced continuously and there is no storehouse for so much as is not at the moment required. The brain obeys the Will to the limit of its capacities; but when that limit is passed

it collapses. When the nerve centres are depressed the manufacture of vital force flags and the nerves are then unable to supply to the various organs by which the process of growth and repair of the body are conducted the vigour requisite to the performance of their duties. Hence to exhausted *nerve centre* must be referred the vast majority of the diseases we are accustomed to treat as maladies of the organs whose disorder is the immediate cause of our distress.

The cure should be sought and applied accordingly. For diseases resulting from deficient power at the *nerve centres* there are but two remedies—rest for themselves and for the organs whom they supply with nerve force. If the excess of work has been in certain directions of brain labour, abstinence from that work and gentle stimulus of the other mental faculties is the obvious means of cure.

But this must be assisted by equal care to protect the organs suffering from deficiency of vital force. The stomach must not be laden with food which it cannot digest, the heart burdened with blood it cannot properly pump. There is no more frequent nor more fatal error than that which pours food into the languishing stomach under the notion that nourishment is required to give strength to the body. Not only is there no nourishment without digestion, but the very food designed for support adds to the mischief by introducing new disorders. The quantity of food actually necessary to sustain life, especially when the body is at rest, is exceedingly small. The seeming weakness that follows temporary fasting is not actual failure of bodily power, but the unaccustomed sensations of a stomach deprived of its habitual stretching and stimulus. Repose of the brain and of the nerve centres must be accompanied with rest by the stomach, the heart, and all the organs that feed and repair the frame, or the remedy will be but partially successful.

But there is another and probably more frequent cause of insufficient power in the nerve centres—namely inherited congenital defect—commonly described as *consti-*



*tutional debility*. If it be true, as Sir B. BRODIE asserted, that each of us is born with a capacity for living for a fixed period proportioned to the vital power inherited from parents and ancestors, it is obvious that no care can protract life for a moment beyond the term of that natural capacity. But care to avoid premature exhaustion may prevent that life from being extinguished before its allotted time.

Another frequent cause of nervous affections is *irregularity* in the flow of nerve force from the nerve centres. Whether in such cases the *production* of the nerve force is irregular or obstacles impede its *distribution* is not yet ascertained; but there is reason to suppose that the irregularities are due to some undiscovered obstructions in the nerves that distribute rather than in the nerve centres that produce. *Epilepsy*, for instance, would appear to be caused by an accumulation of nerve force from obstruction to its free flow, producing the excessive nerve stimulus exhibited in the convulsion attending the fit. Possibly it is that the muscular contractions aid in removal of the obstruction, for after the convulsion the nerve force flows on as before, and health is restored until the obstruction is gradually reproduced. This would account also for the frequent periodicity of epilepsy. Probably in this manner are to be explained the remarkable physical conditions of catalepsy, hysteria, natural and artificial somnambulism, and other similar nervous affections. There is little doubt that many neuralgic maladies are caused by *irregular* flow of the nerve force. As attention comes to be more systematically given to this subject, it will probably be found that many diseases now placed in other categories really belong to this and are to be cured by the same processes.

My present purpose, however, is to ask if the even flow of the nerve force can be directed by any external influence? In plain terms, is there any and what truth in the assertion, so often made but so invariably repudiated by the Doctors, that one human being can, in some unknown manner, influence the flow of the nerve

force in another human being? Although the cause has not yet been ascertained, there is no doubt of the *fact* that the passing of the hand of one person gently and equably over the surface of the body of another person does make more or less of change in the condition of the nerves of the patient. It soothes and often removes pain. It seems sometimes to give nervous tone and strength and to restore and increase vital action.

Many explanations have been offered of a fact which it is difficult even for prejudice altogether to contradict. But Science can explain the result by reference to either of three suggested causes. They are advanced as conjectural merely, in hope to stimulate some inquiring minds to investigation.

(1.) That the effect is due to excitement of the extremities of the nerves by the act of touch, thus inducing reflex action and thereby stimulating the nerve to a more energetic performance of its functions. Or

(2.) To a *mental* action. The slow passage of the hand causes a slight sensation in the parts touched. The attention of the patient being thus directed to the successive points of contact, a flow of the nerve force to those points follows, or rather accompanies, the mental act. Thus *attention* is distracted *from* the seat of pain. It is a well-known fact that pain is increased by attention and diminished by diversion of thought.

(3.) Another hypothesis is that the force streaming through the vast chain of the nerves is capable of being influenced by the nerve force directed by the Will of another person in contact with it. This is the most frequent explanation and it squares with many of the observed facts. But the second appears to be the solution most in accordance with Psychology. A fourth has been suggested in the force always called in to explain the inexplicable—Magnetism.

But whether it is effected by the process of attraction of the weaker nerve force by the stronger, so equalizing itself, as in electricity and galvanism, or if it be in the nature of inductive electricity, by which a flow of the



force in one direction immediately sets up a contrary current in a body placed in contact with it, we have not sufficient evidence to justify a positive opinion. Only this is certain, that with many persons highly beneficial results are manifested from a process which has the *appearance* of an influence exercised by the nerves of one human being over the nerves of another human being. We are wholly ignorant what that influence is or how it operates.

If, then, there is a power in one nerve force to influence another nerve force, the applications of this power cannot but be of vast importance in the practice of Medicine. The evidence in its favour is so strong as to carry conviction to ordinary observers. The effects witnessed may possibly be capable of some other explanation, but it certainly behoves the Physiologist and the Physician to subject the question to full and careful examination, with a view to ascertain if this apparent influence exists and what is its actual nature and extent.

If the description above given of the cause of what is called *scrofula* be correct, we can readily understand how it is that cures of it have been effected by the touch as for King's Evil, and by passes (as in many well-authenticated mesmeric cases). The manner of its operation is obvious. A stream of the nerve force was thus directed to the particular part of the frame that had been impaired by reason of an insufficient and irregular supply of vitality, and restored health was the consequence of the disordered organ being thus restored to healthy action.

There are other instances of undoubted cures by processes unknown to medical science, all of which admit of a similar scientific explanation.

Cures have been accomplished in all ages and in all countries by the "laying on of hands" and by the *Will* of the operator. The facts are too many and too frequent to be either delusions or frauds. They are, nevertheless, denied by the Physiologists and by those who believe them they are looked upon as miraculous. But many are

true, and yet they are not miracles. They are capable of a simple solution by the same scientific explanation. The process is thus performed.

A patient is suffering, say, from paralysis in one of its many forms, or from a scrofulous sore, or from defective power in the functions of some organ, or from neuralgic pains, or, indeed, from either of the many maladies that result from an *irregular* distribution of the vital or nerve force. He is informed that a certain man has, by the exercise of his Will, cured others afflicted like himself. He has suffered long and hope is almost extinguished. The *true* cause of his suffering is insufficient and irregular supply of nerve force from the nerve centres, and a consequent inability of the nerves to discharge properly their duties of taking up new particles to supply the waste of the system and to eliminate the used up particles or to enable the organs for nutrition or excretion to perform their functions freely. It is over diseases that have their source in imperfect nerve action and these only that the influence of such healers extends. The mind of the patient is strongly directed to the operator, to the operation and to the seat of his malady. This rousing of brain action is in itself the first step to a cure. The operator usually passes his hand over the afflicted part, bids the patient be confident, invokes his *faith*. By the mental stimulus thus given the nerve centre is awakened, as it were; a new force is generated or the relaxed nerves are stimulated to overcome the obstruction by which the free circulation of the nerve force had been prevented. The work of healing begins under the influence of restored activity to the functions of the nerves at the diseased part. Paralysis (using the term to describe generally all diseases resulting from inactivity of the nerves that govern the motions of the body) is often the result merely of loss of power of the Will over the muscles, without organic lesion. Whatever calls the Will into action restores the use of the paralysed part. This result is produced by the direct influence of the more powerful Will of the operator. He



awakens the slumbering Will of the patient by his own firmness and by the faith the patient has in him. This is the Psychology of those seemingly miraculous cures, attested by overwhelming testimony, in which patients who have been for years laid upon their backs, or who were borne on crutches into the presence of the operator, have at his stern command thrown their crutches away, having suddenly recovered the use of the limbs that had been useless before. It looks like a miracle, but it is really nothing more than the restoration of the connection between the *Will* and the *nerves*, by stimulation to action of the morbidly torpid brain.

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

## HOW WE DIE.

So long as the nerve system preserves its vigour and the organs it maintains and moves are unimpaired, there is no apparent cause why life should cease. If the machine could be kept in perfect repair, there is nothing in the visible structure to lead to the conclusion that there is any assignable limit to the bodily life of Man.

But, in fact, a man rarely, if ever, lives for a hundred years. The stories of a life protracted far into a second century are myths; at all events, positive *proof* of the asserted facts has been challenged and in no one instance has it been forthcoming.

Accident, disease, gradual decline and decay of the body—these are the three causes of death. A stricter definition might reduce them to two, for, if accident does not destroy at the moment, it usually kills by impairing some part of the structure and so producing disease. But here I use the term “disease” in its popular sense, as meaning a malady existing within the structure, not being the direct result of external violence.

We die when the nerve centre loses its power to produce vital force, or the nerve system so fails to distribute the vital force throughout the body that the organs whose business it is to supply the material for the repair of the structure are disabled from performance of their functions. Whether we die through accident or disease, the direct cause of death is the same—the nerve centre ceases to send forth vital force. This result may be



induced either (1) by direct injury to the nerve centre, paralysing its action, or (2) by cutting off the communication of the nerve centre with important parts of the body, or (3) by degeneracy in the structure of the nerve centre itself progressing until it is unable to produce vital force sufficient in quantity or vigour for maintenance through the mechanism of the nerve system of the healthy condition of the frame which those nerves first constructed and then kept in repair.

Rarely it is that the action of the nerve centre ceases from mere exhaustion. The far more frequent cause of its paralysis is the action of some poison either generated in the body or conveyed to it by the blood into which a poison, or the germ of a poison, has been introduced. Expressed in another form of words, it may be stated thus : disease usually causes death by some poison that paralyses the nerve centre.

We have seen in the last chapter what disease is, and reference to the immediate causes of disease has reduced the apparently almost infinite variety of diseases to a very few distinct classes. Thence we learn that ; whatever the cause or the character of the disease, death is immediately occasioned by some action that operates in the nature of a poison and paralyses the nerve centre. So long as the nerve centre continues to have life in it, though there may be no personal consciousness of existence, *death* has not come. This is the explanation of revival after apparent death by asphyxia in its many forms, of which the most familiar to the Reader is the recovery of the drowned. But the process is equally applicable to all seeming deaths by suffocation. Every nerve in the body may be impotent to convey vital force to the frame, and there may be every sign of death—cessation of the heart's action and as the consequence of this the arrest of the stream of the blood, followed by the pallor, coldness and rigidity of the corpse—but still life may linger in its central seat. This is the physiology of the condition known as *trance*, but wrongly so called, for true *trance* has other charac-

teristics, as will be seen hereafter. If there be any truth in the stories of premature interments, this is the cause of the apparent death. Physiologically, such a catastrophe is possible and not improbable.

In fact, the moment of *actual death* is never known. Life may retreat from every limb and still linger in the nerve centre for hours, or even for days. What we *call* death is the ceasing of the nerve system to conduct the vital force beyond the boundary of the nerve centre in which it is generated. That condition is instantly followed by fainting, through the stopping of the heart's action, by coma, through the pressure of the unarterated blood upon the brain and the consequent cessation of all the functions of life, mental and bodily. It has been a frequent speculation of science, and the mere imagination of it has brought a vast amount of needless terror to individuals, whether, if life remains in the nerve centre after the apparent death of the body, consciousness remains also. Fearful stories have been whispered of persons who were confined, and even carried to their graves,—their bodies dead and stark, but their senses awake,—hearing the lamentations of their friends and listening to the preparations for the funeral, without power to move or cry, until some sudden shock has broken the spell and sent the life again throbbing through the frame and given power to the voice to shriek its agony.

Those tales have even gone so far as to resuscitate the corpse by the accidental fall of the coffin on its way to the grave or by disturbance of the sanctity of the tomb by thieves.

But the Reader may confidently dismiss from his mind all such terrors. These stories are merely fables. Science shows them to be *impossible*. When the brain is congested, or when the heart stands still, *consciousness ceases*. This is not conjecture merely. There is positive proof of it in the experience of those who have recovered from apparent drowning. A curiously exalted sense of existence is concentrated into the vision of a



few seconds (a condition we shall have occasion to consider fully in the second volume). But all agree in this, that these sensations are but momentary and immediately followed by profound unconsciousness. Before the body can assume even the first aspect of death, the brain itself must be paralysed, consciousness destroyed, and the communication between the conscious Self and the body partially severed, even although that Self may not yet have taken its departure.

The approach of death by any disease that does not almost instantly extinguish consciousness is always gradual. As the body fails the mind weakens. The power to think and feel declines. The consequence of this condition is an imperceptible stealing over us of indifference. Death near looks less dreadful than when contemplated from afar. It has less of terror for the sick than for the healthy. Hence the calmness with which the actual presence of death is almost always received by the patient. Sir BENJAMIN BRODIE left it upon record that, although he had been present at upwards of three thousand deathbeds, he had seen but two instances in which there was the slightest show of dread of death by the dying. But that which will excite more surprise is his further assertion, that in no one instance had he the slightest reason to suppose that the process of death was attended with pain!

Indeed, the notion that death is in itself an agony is as void of foundation as is the fear felt by many that consciousness may remain, perceiving, knowing, feeling, after the body is seemingly dead. The process of death is in itself antagonistic to pain. We die because the nerve system is not supplied with enough of vital force to sustain its vital actions. If the brain were so alive as to be in full consciousness, we could not be in a condition to die. The *act of death* is not, as commonly supposed, the expulsion from the body of a certain entity called *Life*. The convulsions that sometimes attend the dying are *not* the struggles of contention with an entity called *Death* that is trying to take possession of us. They are

caused by the irritation to which the nerve centres are subjected by the presence of the poisoned blood that is paralysing them. Then the *vital force*, instead of flowing equably through the whole structure, flows irregularly, causing irregular action of the nerves, which produces contraction of the muscles, without the operation of the Will and, happily, also without consciousness by the patient.

Disease and debility of body are for the most part followed by a decline in the mental powers. It is probable that disease, as distinguished from accident, never exists without disturbing the action of the nerve centres and diminishing the production of vital force. But, although the mind is so far yoked with the body that it cannot escape entirely from the influence of the body, and is more or less affected by its ailments, there is abundant evidence that the mind has immense power over the body and not only to a great extent can control disease but even arrest decay. It is a familiar fact, that a firm belief in an alleged curative agent will in many cases effect the desired cure, especially in the instance of diseases resulting from irregular action of the nerve system. The process by which this apparent miracle is performed will be considered in a later chapter. In this place it is sufficient to note the fact, in proof of the assertion now before us, that the Mind can and does influence the condition of the body. The sustaining power of *Hope* has rescued many a patient from impending death. The depression of *Despair* has extinguished many a life that disease would have spared. There was profound philosophy in the saying of a great statesman that "he had not *time* to be ill." His mind had no leisure to dwell on small ailments and magnify them by thinking. But this was not all the good he gained by his busy brain. The exercise of the mind was in itself a positive benefit. The stimulus to the brain was communicated to the nerve centres with which it is in such close communion and the consequence was an increased production of vital force, which, conveyed by the nerves



to all parts of the structure, caused every function of every organ to be more perfectly performed.

So it is with the decline of the body in old age. The power of the mind can successfully combat that decline and defer, though it cannot prevent, the decay of the body. Longevity is promoted by mental activity. Mental indolence shortens the term of life. It has been remarked of men who retire from business to enjoy rest and leisure (as they had hoped), that they do not live long to taste of this anticipated enjoyment. In truth, they die of indolence. The brain rusts for want of use. The nerve centres lack the stimulus to which they have been accustomed. They fail to produce enough of vital force to keep in healthy action the various vital functions. Disease establishes itself in the weakest organ and then Life is easily and rapidly extinguished.

Where the activity of the brain is preserved by regular but not excessive use, by distributing its exercise over various mental faculties and avoiding, so far as possible, the exclusive employment of a few of them only, the natural progress of decline and decay may be impeded, although it cannot be altogether arrested. Long after the body begins to fail the mind may not merely preserve its power but grow in power, and the intellect is often seen in its vigour when age has dimmed the senses and enfeebled the frame. It has happened not unfrequently that the mind has continued clear and vigorous to the last hour of a life protracted through a long old age of slow decline, until the machine it moved and directed had become entirely worn out: a fact from which we shall presently see that something may be concluded of vastly more importance than even the lengthening and strengthening of the life of the body, the theme to which this chapter is devoted.

Accidental injury to the body may extinguish life; but even in such case death is for the most part caused either by paralysis of the nerve centre from the shock, as in the

case of concussion, or by exhaustion consequent upon the loss of the material for repair, or, as is the most frequent process, by blood poisoning resulting from the absorption of the decaying matter thrown off from the wounded parts.

We die, therefore, when the nerve centre ceases to produce sufficient of *vital force* to keep the vital organs in vigour for the performance of their functions, or for repair of the waste of the body that is ever going on, or for carrying off the wasted material. The act of death is the ceasing of the nerve centre to produce vital force. If the flow of that force to any part of the body is partially obstructed, that part fails in function and in substance. If the vital force is wholly obstructed in any part of the body, that part dies. Part after part of the structure may perish thus before the nerve centre ceases to live. We are, indeed, entirely ignorant of the precise process by which the death of the nerve centre is brought about, nor can the most skilful discover the very moment of that death. The body may be dead in appearance and in fact, by reason of the failure of the supply of vital force through some obstruction in the nerve cords, but the nerve centre may continue for a time to live and to produce vital force. Again, the vital force may be so feebly produced by the nerve centre as to be insufficient for the supply of the body, which would in such case die, while the nerve centre may continue to live after the rest of the structure is dead.

But such life is very limited. The process of death is also a process of decay. Some parts of the structure die before others. The blood is rapidly laden with particles from the dead parts, and in the vast majority of cases the poison of putridity operates, in some manner as yet unknown, to extinguish life by paralysing the nerve centre and altogether preventing the further production of vital force.

Then, the *vital force* ceasing, the structure which it sustained by its own power, under the control of the organic laws, forthwith falls again under the dominion



of the inorganic laws. The chemical combinations, suspended by the vital force, instantly upon that force being withdrawn resume their sway, seize upon the atoms of which the body was builded and recombine them according to their affinities as governed by the inorganic laws. That which was flesh, and blood, and bone, and tendon, becomes again a gas, an earth, a mineral, bearing no resemblance whatever to the substances into which the vital force had converted it. What it was before it formed a part of *organic* matter into that it is once more resolved.

The transformed particles of the lifeless frame scattered about in various new combinations in due time are again absorbed by vegetable life, in this shape are eaten and absorbed by animals, who are eaten and absorbed by men, or the man may directly absorb and assimilate the vegetable.

Thus the great circle of change moves on majestically through the ages. But it is a change of form, not a change of being; a change of individual, not of collective, identity. "Matter" passes from subjection to the *Inorganic* Laws into the kingdom that is under the reign of the *Organic* Laws. There it is brought again under the sway of the mightier force of the laws that govern the development of *Life*. The self-same particles of matter are mineral to-day, vegetable to-morrow, animal the next day. That which is our living fibre now may be dead earth a few hours hence. There is a germ of scientific truth in the fable of Pygmalion. The marble statue *may* become human flesh. The matter of which the Man is sculptured *may* become marble.

But the material MAN has in him something that commands and controls the material structure, something that seems to hold over it a "sovereign sway and masterdom"—THE INTELLIGENCE.

Can it be that this Intelligence is nothing but the mineral, the earth, the gas, that were a MAN once and will be a MAN again? Is there not *something* that builds the structure with these materials, and *is* not that some-

thing of a higher nature, having a nobler destiny, than the material itself?

We will consider this great question presently. In this chapter I have only endeavoured to describe briefly, but I hope intelligibly, *how we die*.

---



THE  
FORCES THAT MOVE THE MECHANISM.

---

BOOK I. LIFE.  
BOOK II. MIND.  
BOOK III. SOUL.

---

INTRODUCTORY.

THE Student of Psychology possesses now a general conception of the *material* Mechanism of Man—that is to say, of so much of a man as is constructed of molecules. He will view it mentally as a sensitive nerve structure (that being the actual organism and probably the sole *organic* substance) upon which sensitive and organic structure inorganic and insensible matter is incrustated, clothing it with the molecular material necessary to the existence of Man in a molecular, that is to say a *material*, dwelling place.

But from this outline sketch of the perceptible human frame, one part, and that the most important part, was purposely excluded. It was impossible to present an intelligible description of the mechanism immediately

employed to give motion to the structure and to direct its motions, without repeated reference to the movements so caused. I have, therefore, preferred to defer the description of the molecular apparatus through which the non-molecular Intelligence expresses itself upon the material world and holds communication with other Intelligences, until, in pursuance of the plan of this little book, the motive forces that have their source in the brain, and which we recognise under the collective name of *Mind*, should come to be considered.

This, therefore, is the next most important and profoundly interesting question that will invite the attention of the Reader.

The *Forces* that move and intelligently direct the motions of the Mechanism of Man are *three*—

LIFE—MIND—SOUL (the CONSCIOUS SELF).

The motive force of LIFE is a blind force—that is to say—it operates in strict obedience to certain definite laws as fixed and invariable as are the physical laws and is in no way directed or controlled by *Intelligence*. *Life* could perform its functions as perfectly if *Mind* and *Soul* were non-existing. It seems actually to do so in at least one division of organised living being. The *Vegetable Kingdom* has *Life*—performing perfectly all the functions of life—but there is no trace of the presence of *Mind* or of *Soul*. It would be adventuring too far to assert that there is in vegetable life no consciousness nor any intelligence of some sort, differing from that of animals in kind or degree, for recent observations of vegetable action tend to raise some suspicion that vegetable life is not wholly devoid of consciousness. But this may be affirmed: that if there be a vegetable mind, it differs vastly in power, and probably in its very nature, from that which in the higher order of being we call the *Intelligence*. *Life*, however, appears to be the same, or nearly the same, in its nature and characteristics in all organised being.

MIND is not an entity—at least, as it will be considered in this treatise, which proposes to prove scientifically the



existence of *Soul* as a part of the Mechanism of Man. It is necessary to impress this distinction most strongly upon the Reader, because of the prevailing prejudices with which the question is encompassed and the varying conceptions of *Mind* held by the Scientists almost equally with the unscientific. Among the believers in the existence of Soul there is to be found the most perplexing confusion of thought in relation to the distinct being, and the different functions and qualities, of *Mind* and *Soul*. For the most part these terms are used as if they were synonymous, and probably by most of those who so use them they are contemplated as identical entities. This confusion of two terms essentially distinct and of two things that are not the same has furnished the Materialists with their strongest weapon and destroyed in so many the confident faith they once had in the existence of Soul. Indeed, the arguments wielded by Materialism, based, as for the most part they are, on indisputable truths, can only be answered by recognition, founded upon some sufficient evidence, of the fact that *Mind* and *Soul* are *not* the same; that *Mind* is only the molecular organ through which the *Soul* expresses itself upon the molecular existences with which it is encompassed; that the *Soul is the Self*—the *Individual*—the *Conscious I*—the *Man*—and the body but the molecular organ necessary to the existence of the Soul in a molecular world. *Mind* is the name given to the collective action of that portion of the body which receives the impressions made upon the senses and communicates them to the Conscious Self (or Soul).

SOUL, as here contemplated, is that SELF. It is the MAN—that remains unchanged, although every particle of his body and brain may have changed; the *Individual* who is to-day what he was yesterday and will be to-morrow;—the “I,” the “you;” the Being that is not the body, whose limbs may be lopped without the individual being less himself than before; the Being that is not the *body* that perishes and passes away; the Being that is not the *Mind*, which may be maimed by accident

or disease while yet the Soul remains herself ! SOUL, as here contemplated, is that individuality which, not being *body*, not being *Mind*, can exist after the extinguishment of both, because it is constructed of some other combination of atoms than that *molecular* combination which alone is perceptible to the human senses ; a structure which, therefore, can permeate, possess and dwell in a body formed of molecules and live without that body when the molecular structure of that body is dissolved.

---



# BOOK I. LIFE.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### WHAT LIFE IS.

RUDELY sketched—and nothing more than a mere outline is intended—the human structure is found to be a machine of infinite complication in detail, but of singular simplicity in design. The structure is manifestly moulded for existence in a world formed of molecular matter, having a specific degree of substance and of what we term “solidity.” Every part of the body is framed to act upon the molecular matter by which it is surrounded and to be acted upon by it. *The body is merely the molecular instrument by which THE MAN communicates with the molecular World without.* The limbs are his means of locomotion. The trunk is but the workshop for the machinery of the body, in which the material for growth and repair is prepared for use and where what is useless or used up is extracted and carried off.

But, because the body is constructed specially for the conditions under which it exists in this planet, it must not be concluded that no other conditions exist to which organic structure might be adapted. We can conceive of localities in the infinite expanse and endless varieties of creation where structure may be so different in its substance, although composed of particles identical with those that form our own, that a Being called into life there would be developed in quite another shape than ours, or in the same shape with quite a different body,

having wholly other capacities. It is not merely possible, it is highly probable, that there are worlds in which matter is infinitely more compacted, and others in which it is infinitely less compacted, than in our Earth. The organic life upon such worlds must be constructed in accordance with the peculiar conditions to which it is there subjected. In the one, the living things would be as solid as is our granite, in the other as ethereal as is that non-molecular matter we call "*spirit*." There is no reason why the invisible ether itself that floats between the visible worlds should not be inhabited by living beings. On the contrary, it is most in accordance with the whole scheme of Creation, so far as we can penetrate it, that the spaces about us and beyond us should be thronged with life in some shape. Do we not everywhere see an exuberance of life in all that is evident to our senses? Does not the very strongest presumption thence arise that the vast interspaces between the worlds are not void of life? If the same economy prevails in the huge creation that is not perceptible to our senses because constructed of some other combination of atoms than molecules, as we witness in so much of creation as is manifested to us, we must conclude that the Beings who probably dwell in the vast spaces between the solid worlds are constructed of material equally adapted to the conditions of *their* abode, and therefore of material infinitely more refined than anything of which our keenest sense conveys to us the slightest impression. It is not impossible, nor even improbable, that the very atmosphere that enwraps us, from its base upon the solid earth to its summit, should be the abode of embodied beings fashioned for existence in such a sphere, but, because they are of non-molecular structure, wholly invisible and imperceptible to our coarser senses. It is in accordance with the known economy of Creation that so it should be. The absence of positive proof that *so it is* is no argument against its probability, because, from the nature of our own structure, composed of molecular matter adapted to our world structured of molecules, we



could neither see, hear nor feel creatures made of a different structure, nor in any manner by our ordinary senses could we have knowledge of their presence.

What sets this marvellous machine of ours in motion? LIFE.

*What is Life?* What has the living thing that the thing not living *has not*?

I do not hope to present to the reader a clear definition of Life. Science and Philosophy have alike failed to construct a distinct description of it, or to trace the moment of its beginning or of its ending. My present purpose is rather to remove some prevalent misconceptions of the nature of life which exist even in the educated mind, simply because it has been content to accept the current creed and has never exercised its own judgment in a survey of the facts. No more than others who have devoted thought to the subject can I pretend to have solved the problem *what* life is. It is still to me as inscrutable a mystery as it appeared at first—or, I should rather say, the mystery has become more profound the more my knowledge of the facts has extended. But this much has been gained by study of the problem of life: we have learned some of its *conditions*. If we cannot assure ourselves *what life is*, we know what it is *not*; and for the purpose of human progress it is often as needful to *unlearn* as to learn. Ignorance is not so great an obstacle to intelligence as is the assumption of knowledge. The one is merely the empty house, of which possession may be taken; the other is the house barred and bolted against ingress. Nowhere in the whole range of Science does the show of knowledge conceal more profound ignorance than in the provinces of Biology and Physiology.

First, let us clear the mind of prejudices and see distinctly what life is *not*.

And here, lest I should be misunderstood or misrepresented, I must repeat that, inasmuch as this treatise is designed for a purely *scientific* examination of its subject, it purposely avoids all reference to theological doctrine,

and the term "life" is used exclusively in its strictly scientific sense.

We are accustomed to think of *Life* as a specific entity, as a definite thing that comes into us and goes out of us, and as something distinct from the body in which it exists.

No progress can be made in *Psychology* so long as this notion haunts the mind. The student must educate himself to a clear conception that life is merely a condition of matter when combined in a special manner which we term "organic." When an organised body is constructed—be it of Man, animal, or plant—a life does not come from without and enter into it. The life it has is inherited from its parent, or possibly it may be generated within. Wherever there is organic matter there is life. It may be latent until the conditions occur that are requisite for its active development; but there it is, and when the conditions are favourable for combination in certain definite forms it shows itself in the shape of a living being. We are wholly ignorant what is the source of life, or why it exists in atoms aggregated in the specific form we term *organic* matter and not in the aggregations we call *inorganic* matter—if indeed the theory be true that denies life to the latter. We can but rudely guess. Surveying the forces that pervade the universe, it may be permitted to hazard a conjecture, but it must be received as conjecture only. We know that a force of inconceivable power traverses ether, or is the ether itself; that this force strikes upon the worlds in its flight and on our atom of a world among them. This force passes into and through our solid globe and plays about every particle of which it is constructed, keeping all the molecules in continual motion and compelling them to infinite combinations. According to the material upon which this force impinges and through which it passes, it presents itself in different forms and we give to it different names. It is Electricity when passing through one molecular combination; Magnetism when found in another; Light when traversing a third; as



Professor TYNDALL has demonstrated by experimental conversion of each form of the force into the other forms of it.

May it not well be that the self-same force, that changes its aspect to us according to the material in which it is found, is the force that, passing through organized matter, we recognize as LIFE? I do not say that it is so, but only that the suggestion is not improbable. I throw it out as a conjecture merely, for those to ponder on who may be, like myself, in the pursuit of the very truth, and who sedulously keep the mind open to accept the truth upon sufficient evidence, from what quarter soever coming and however seemingly in conflict with scientific dogma.

That *life* is a condition of nerve organization, the product or outcome of it and not something other than the body vivified, is proved by this, that with the lower forms of life, animal as well as vegetable, we may carve them into slices and each slice will continue to live and grow and become a new animal or a new plant. The entire animal or plant was not possessed of more lives than one, yet each becomes many lives by simple division of its body. If the life that exists in the severed section is not the same life that possessed the perfect insect or plant, it is a new life produced in the structure, or to be more correct, it follows that life is a condition of the organic material of which that structure is compounded.

Life does not depart from the body in an instant, as a guest leaves a house, merely closing the door behind him. We so speak of it by custom and perhaps often we so think of it.

Life and Thought have gone away  
Side by side,  
Leaving door and windows wide ;  
Careless tenants they.

All within is dark as night ;  
In the windows is no light ;  
And no murmur at the door  
So frequent on its hinge before.

Close the door, the shutters close ;  
 Or thro' the windows we shall see  
 The nakedness and vacancy  
 Of the dark deserted house.

Come away ; no more of mirth  
 Is here, or merry making sound.  
 The house was builded of the earth,  
 And shall fall again to ground.

Come away ; for Life and Thought,  
 Here no longer dwell :  
 But in a City glorious—  
 A great and distant City—have bought  
 A mansion incorruptible.  
 Would they could have stayed with us.

TENNYSON.

In fact, life does not *quit* the body, it merely *ceases*. The nerve centres fail to supply the structure with so much of nerve force as is necessary to maintain the *organic* combination of the atoms against the force of chemical action, and when this process of disintegration and recombination proceeds life *ceases*. Death does not occur until the whole body is subjected to the chemical force. We live (that is to say, portions of the body have life in them) long after mental consciousness has ceased. The noting of the moment of dissolution, "he died at five minutes after three," is a fallacy. That was the moment of cessation of the heart's action and almost, but not quite, of mental consciousness. The moment of actual death of *the whole body* is not to be discovered by the most experienced observer.

What then do we intend to describe when we say of a thing that *it lives* and of another thing that it does *not live*?

We have some definite notion in our own minds, and when we use the term "*living*" we assume that it will be understood by others in the sense in which we use it. The conception of *life* is distinguished by us in some manner from our conception of a thing that has *not life*. What is the distinction? What is the speciality of the



*living* thing that we contemplate when we say that it is *alive*?

Our notions of what life is are derived almost entirely from our conceptions of what ourselves are when we are living and what we suppose we shall be when we are dead. Consequently our notion of a thing that has life is of a being possessed of self-consciousness and having a sense of pleasure and of pain. When these cease we say that *life* ceases.

But very slight reflection is required to satisfy us that this is not an accurate conception of life. Nature teems with life that has not these capacities, or at least, whose possession of them we do not acknowledge. It is not generally believed that vegetables have either self-consciousness, or a sense of pleasure and pain, although the fancy has been a favourite one with poets and a few speculative philosophers. Knowing that every separate bud is a distinct life, it is difficult to conclude that a tree possesses a sense of individuality; but it is still more difficult to attribute such a sense to each separate bud. Life then must be something other than the possession of the powers we are accustomed to associate with it. It does not consist in a definite shape, for a crystal has more perfect symmetry of form than a Man. Nor is it found in a complicated machinery working towards a definite end, for that may be seen everywhere in inanimate nature.

All we can confidently assert is that life is an attendant upon matter when aggregated in the special manner we term *organic*. But if it is generated by the very act of combination of the particles, or if it proceeds from their combination after the body is formed, or how otherwise, is one of the many problems of Physiology that Science has not yet solved, and, in truth, has but little laboured to investigate.

Is there, therefore, nothing peculiar in organic life to distinguish it from inorganic existence?

One speciality suggests itself to me; but it is as a *suggestion only* that I offer it to the reader.

The forces that govern *inorganic* matter are from *without*.

The Force that governs *organic* matter is *within*.

The mineral is constructed by currents of the electric force that carry the particles of which it is composed from the place where they exist in one form to the place where they are wanted in another form. Build a mimic mountain of clay. Place it in a saucer. In another saucer place the mingled materials of many crystals dissolved in water. In this saucer set one pole of a water battery. At the apex of the mould of clay insert the other pole of the battery. After a while the mimic mountain will exhibit small clefts in the direction of the electric current. Do not disturb it for two years. Then break it open, and in those clefts you will find small strata of the crystals that were dissolved in the water in the saucer. There was no other communication with the little mines in the mimic hill than the wires that extended from the poles of the battery ; yet the particles have been carried by the current of the invisible force and deposited in the clefts of the clay, each in its proper place, according to its affinity, like reuniting with like.

But a living body, be it animal or vegetable, is moulded by a force apparently generated and undoubtedly flowing to it from *within*. It streams from a centre in the body to the circumference of the body.

Life, then, appears to be a property of certain germs, which are nerve centres ; which grow by expansion when the conditions occur that are requisite for growth, taking shape according to the exigency of those conditions ; which produce vital force and distribute it throughout the organic structure by means of the nerve system radiating from those centres.

The importance of a definite conception of *Life*, or I should rather say, of clearing the mind from the *misconceptions* of it more or less generally entertained, will appear presently when we proceed to consider the various problems of Psychology that will come to be treated of hereafter.



With this caution as to the nature of *life* full in your mind imagine, if you can, the body of a man perfectly constructed and matured, but in which life has not been kindled. You behold a mere statue, carved of flesh instead of marble, lacking self-consciousness and the power of self-motion.

Let us now imagine the stream of life suddenly made to flow from the nerve centre through the nerve cords and the marvellous network of nerve filaments that interpenetrate every part of the organic structure. Forthwith, as the vital force flows, the machinery moves and every part of it begins to perform its allotted work. The heart beats and pumps the blood through the arteries and veins ; the lungs expand and contract ; the senses receive the impressions made on them by the world without ; the nerves carry those impressions to the brain and convey the commands of the brain to the body.

But something more than this is requisite for support of the life thus transfused. Motion may be given to every organ and its functions may be perfectly performed, but this would not suffice to maintain a continued existence without something to direct the action of the machine. We might even conceive a mechanism competent to work blindly to a definite end, without the exercise of volition on its own part, as do the machines which ingenious men have constructed in the shape, and performing some of the actions, of human beings. But there would be no choice of actions, no modification of them according to circumstances. Life alone does not impart such a controlling power. Life alone is a blind energy operating in blind obedience to certain laws. Something more than life is necessary for voluntary action.

What is that something ?

INTELLIGENCE.

What then is LIFE ?

The readers, I fear, are few who would not answer on the instant : " Of course I know what life is ; *I* live ; a plant lives ; a stone does *not* live."

But in truth the wisest of us does not *know* what life

is. Only ignorance *knows*. The ignorant always think they know vastly more than the wisest knows that he knows.

The knowledge of our *ignorance* is as needful to progress as other knowledge. The first step to wisdom is to learn *what it is we do not know*.

Here is an instance of that necessity. In very truth we are entirely ignorant what life is, where it begins and where it ends.

Trace it upward, from the things which are supposed *not* to possess what we call life to the most complicated form of life, as existing in Man. Let us assume that there is no life in the mineral kingdom, in the earth we tread upon, in the rock we cleave. For a more striking comparison, let us take a Man and the marble statue of a man. We say, "*This* lives;" "*That* does *not* live."

What do we mean when we so say?

Saying that the one *lives*, we intend to express the conception of a being constructed of a vast variety of materials, each of which performs a special function in the economy of his existence. We intend by the term "*he lives*," that the Man feels, thinks, wills, and moves, in obedience to his Will; that he grows, wastes, sickens, dies. In brief—that he is *organised*.

But when we say that the marble image of the man does *not* live, although the same in outward shape, we intend to say that the marble remains for long ages unchanged, that it has nothing of the structure of a man but the external form, possesses no self-consciousness, has no power of self-direction or self-reparation,—in short is *not organised*.

If, however, we cut off one of the marble fingers, we see that the particles of which the marble is made are not brought together by chance. They are arranged in certain definite forms, as definite as are the forms of muscle, bone, and nerve in the living man. Inquiring further, we find that these particles of the marble have come together in strict accordance with some controlling *force* acting in obedience to definite laws. But this



force, which we can neither feel nor see, whose source we do not know, and whose very existence is recognised only by the reason, although it is ever acting with tremendous energy on all sides, would be quite unknown to us but for the palpable results of its operations. By this invisible, intangible, imperceptible agent the particles that formed the marble were selected from the other materials with which they were mingled, were carried through the molecules of things seemingly as solid as the marble itself to the places where their like were lying, and deposited there in positions having certain definite relationships to the mass. Thus were formed the beautiful crystals of which the marble man is built.

There is nothing more wonderful than this in the structure of the living man. He, too, is built of particles, selected by an unknown *force* from a mass of materials within the range of its influence, carried to their proper places and united in definite arrangement for the production of definite forms. So far as our senses can trace, there is no difference in the process by which the particles are combined to make marble, or to make bone, muscle, or nerve. They are probably collected by a different agent, but there is no perceptible difference in the manner in which like combines with like in certain proportions and in certain directions.

In terms, we recognise these forces as two distinct forces; but we do not *know* that they are two. They may be and probably they are, one force operating differently under different conditions. But it is convenient, for the purpose of scientific investigation, to treat of them as two distinct forces and I shall do so here.

We will call the force that selects, carries, deposits and shapes the particles of the marble the *Chemical Force*, and the force that selects, carries, deposits and shapes the particles of which flesh and bone are constructed, the *Vital Force*. The ultimate particles which each seizes upon for its special work are probably the same. But in combination they form an infinite variety of substances, and probably it is in some of these combina-

tions that they are selected by the chemical and vital forces according to the requirements of each. We are quite ignorant if these forces combine for the production of organised beings, or if each is limited to its own sphere. This we *know*, however, that the *vital force* can and does control the *chemical force*. But only where matter is already organised. Over purely inorganic matter the vital force appears to have no influence. No applied power of vital force could change the chemical combinations of a pebble. But the converse does not hold good. The power of vital force over the chemical force is merely suspensive and limited. There is a point at which the chemical force overcomes the vital force and the chemical combinations take the place of the organic combinations. As the vital force declines, the chemical force grows stronger, and even before death the chemical force often subdues the vital force and dissolution begins. Always and instantly upon the vital force departing with the ceasing of *Life*, the chemical force comes into operation and chemical combinations are substituted for organic structure.

It is by no means to be deemed certain, in our present discreditable ignorance of Psychology, that the *chemical* and *vital* forces, although antagonistic in certain conditions, do not work together in the maintenance of organic structure. May it not be that the vital force selects, carries and deposits the material for organic structure, but that the chemical force then comes *in aid*, and combines the particles so brought into the substances with which the organic structure is builded. The probability of this is strengthened by the undoubted fact of the instantaneous action of the chemical force when the vital force has ceased to operate. Taking full possession of the frame, it severs the chain that linked the particles together, and, having dissolved their temporary alliance, disperses them and compels them to new combinations.

We have already seen that the presence of plastic force is no test of the presence of life. A plastic force moulds the crystal as well as the muscle. We now know



that this plastic force, so long supposed to be acting upon organic bodies from *without* and moulding them to shape, is the vital force working from *within* by the process of *attraction*.

Referring again to the illustration of the marble man. The chemical force constructs the crystals of the marble upon some imperceptible and undiscovered nucleus for each separate crystal. Here, as in organized being, the chemical plastic force is probably a force acting within a certain range from an unknown centre, with various degrees of intensity, attracting more powerfully at the base, with gradual diminution of power to the point that is furthest from the centre and which is a point because there it is that the power ceases. Suppose the chemical force that forms a crystal to exert an attractive power of twenty at the base, and evenly to become weaker as it recedes from the base, until it exercises only a power of *one*. The result would be a crystal pointed at the apex. If I am right in this *conjecture*—and I offer it as nothing more—the process of crystallization is explained, although the causes of it are unknown; that is to say, we are ignorant what the force is and what is the centre whence it proceeds; but we see *how it works*.

If the chemical force constructs muscle and bone much after the same fashion that it constructs a crystal, it is certainly *not* the force by which the functions of organic being are performed. Bone and muscle would be nothing better than crystals if they were not controlled by some force that stimulates them to action, and if that action were not directed to some end. The force that thus operates is the *vital force*, and its functions begin precisely where the work of the chemical force ends—if indeed it is by the *chemical force*, as Professor HUXLEY and other Physiologists contend, and not by *vital force*, that the body is builded. If their theory be right, the chemical force may be likened to the labourer who brings the bricks and mortar, and the vital force to the builder who controls and moulds the shape of the structure.

But I must not be understood as expressing assent

to this doctrine of the Materialists. My purpose is only to declare that this their doctrine in no way conflicts with the views asserted by Psychology. Granted that the corporeal structure is formed as the Materialists assert, such a process by no means excludes the possibility, or even the probability, of the existence of *another* force which undoubtedly directs and controls the actions of the body, and which, whatever it be, is certainly *not* the chemical force.

In what part of an organized being does *Life* lie? Is life something distinct from the substance of the being? Is it the result of certain combinations of particles? Or does it exist in each separate particle? Or is it attached to some particles only and not to others?

Look at the lowest forms of life. Minute and seemingly insignificant, they are organized, they live, they grow, they reproduce, they die. Does the life of such a being reside in all the particles of which it is composed, or only in some centre—the original germ—from which it radiates throughout the entire structure? Pass to a more advanced form of vegetable existence, the cabbage, or the oak. The cabbage lives, but what is its life, and where is that life to be found? Certainly not in one part only of the structure, for if we cut off its head the stump will sprout again and send forth several new cabbages. The oak has in every bud a life separate from itself. A tree is a vegetable polypus. It is not one life, but a swarm of lives. A cow eats the cabbage. The particles that composed the vegetable go now to compose the flesh of the animal; that flesh is eaten by a woman who is nursing her child; some of the particles that composed the flesh of the cow pass into the milk of the mother, and thence into the infant whose growing limbs it helps to form.

Thus that which not long before was part of the organized structure of a cabbage becomes a part of the organized structure of a man. The self-same particles are there, but changed by recombinations into other forms and exhibiting other qualities. If *the life* be in



the particles themselves, the conclusion is unavoidable—the life of the cabbage constitutes the life of the man. If the life of the cabbage was *not* in the particles of which the cabbage was composed, where was it?

Are you satisfied that the life of the cabbage does not lie in any single particle of it? Do you hold that life is the result of a certain combination of those particles? Mark the consequence. The cabbage grew from a single germ hidden in the centre of a very small seed. All of its substance besides that little speck of matter is gathered from the earth and the air. The particles of which it is now composed have multiplied by millions. If its life is not limited to the germ, or the particles that surrounded it in the seed, the added organized substance must be supplied by the soil and the atmosphere; and in such case the particles so abstracted from the earth and the air must have life in them. The particles taken from the soil are in greater part mineral, and it follows from this that the particles of minerals have life; the particles taken from the air are gaseous, and therefore the particles of the gases have life. But what are the gases? Expanded minerals.

Although I have confined the illustration to the cabbage, it is equally applicable to all animal life and to Man. If the life in us is not limited to the germ from which we have grown, if our entire growth is composed of particles abstracted from animals and vegetables, and if our life exists in these abstracted particles as well as in the germ about which they have crystallized, this life of ours is the identical life which was first in the cabbage and then in the ox.

These are some of the difficulties in popular Physiology that have led many thoughtful men to the conclusion that life, or the germ of life, is in every particle of the matter of which the universe is composed, and that it expands and takes its specific form by radiation or diffusion of the vital force from the central germ, in some manner strictly subjected to the conditions under which the development occurs.

Without hazarding an opinion on a speculation so profound and as yet so obscure, I may observe that it is a theory of *Life* that yields a rational explanation of the phenomena and removes many of the difficulties, otherwise insuperable, which on all other hypotheses meet us at every step.

Say that the life is in the *germ*, and that the mature individual is only that life permeating all the particles of which the frame is built, an expansion, in fact, of the life that was in the germ coincident with its material growth. It is not in itself an improbable conception; but then we are confronted with this difficulty. The individual life—say, for instance, that of the cabbage—produces and throws off many thousands of germs, each one of which has a life in it which, if placed in the necessary conditions, would become a cabbage and the parent of hundreds of thousands of other cabbages. It is the same with animals. Probably not one in a million of the germs produced by an individual becomes a cabbage, a sheep, or a man. But each one of the multitude of germs must have been in the being whence they proceeded; consequently each individual being must have had in its structure millions of lives besides its own life. Whence came this multitude of germs? Certainly from the food whose particles build the body in which they are formed. Was the life in those particles before they were united with the body or after they had passed into it? Does a single cabbage life create a hundred thousand new lives, of which ninety-nine thousand nine hundred never expand into cabbages, but perish and pass away? Again, what becomes of the lives that are in the germs that never expand into cognizable being?

What a mystery is here!

I do not pretend even to suggest a solution of it. I am only desirous that it should be distinctly recognised as a mystery yet unsolved, and that we should frankly acknowledge our total ignorance and refuse to base positive opinions upon any speculative dreams of possible explanations which can be nothing more than fanciful conjectures.



## CHAPTER II.

## THE BEGINNING OF LIFE.

WE have traced Life backward to the germ which grows into a living structure. But is the germ the beginning of life? Is it the nucleus of vitality? Is its life self-produced, or inherited from ancestors? It is no shame to say that we are ignorant; that possibly the beginning of life is one of the many mysteries lying beyond the range of the intelligence; that it is too great, or too little, or too deeply hidden, to be perceived by the senses or comprehended by the mind.

But it *is* a shame to us that such weak endeavours should have been made to explore, by experiment, observation and facts carefully collected and collated a subject of such immediate and vast moment to every living man. We have searched the heavens with unabated ardour to learn the laws that govern the far off worlds that have for us so remote and unreal an interest. We have questioned the composition of the earth on which we tread, and inquired curiously into the laws that bind and unbind the molecules of which every form of mineral is constructed. The pursuers of these and other branches of science are legion. But we may almost count upon the fingers the names of those who have sought to explore the mysteries and marvels of LIFE, what it is, wherein it dwells, its beginning and its ending. Again this strange neglect is exhibited, although life is everywhere in us and about us, displayed in multitudinous forms, the most fruitful subject for study, having for every living man the profoundest interest. Surely it

might have been expected that Science would be most eager to bring such a subject within her domain; of Scientists that they would be most active to explore; and of the world without that it would be most anxious to receive from them some enlightenment upon it.

Science may well be ashamed of her neglect of this and kindred subjects of scarcely less importance. This negligence has extended to other cognate questions second only in interest to this. *Anthropology*—the great Science of Man—has only recently, and after a severe struggle and against fierce opposition, obtained admission into the programme of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. It is even now treated there by the Physicists with something like contempt. *Mental Physiology* and *Psychology* are not recognised at all. *Biology* is tolerated; not, however, in its proper and large sense, as the Science of Life, but in restricted reference rather to the things that have life than to *the Life* that is in the living things. Honour is there awarded—most justly—to the men who spend their lives in exploring the atmosphere of the sun, the materials of a pebble, the flint works of prehistoric Man, the bones of a megatherium, or even the structure of a mollusc. All of these find an audience. But that which concerns every human being infinitely more than pebbles, or the stone age, or antediluvian animals, or the make of a mollusc—namely, *Ourselves*—the *Life* that is in us, the *Intelligence* that directs us,—are neglected altogether, or treated with a courteous contempt more humiliating than neglect. Hence the ignorance of the source and seat of Life that is the shame of Science.

The cause of that neglect is doubtless to be traced to a time when Theologians, being the only learned class, extended Theology into regions not properly belonging to it, and sought to dictate as subjects for *faith* alone many that were only questions of fact, with which Theology had properly no concern. To ask what Life is and where it is would then have been looked upon as a religious heresy, life being by the Theologists identified



with Soul, and therefore as not being a subject for any science other than *Theology*. It was forgotten that there is life in animals and vegetables, and therefore that *life* is something other than *Soul* and consequently properly within the province of outside Science. We know better now. Theology has long since abandoned its claims to the domains of Biology and Psychology, as well as to those of Chemistry and Astronomy. But the prejudice formerly surrounding them lingers still, and to look into the sources and laws of life is to many minds a presumptuous prying into things sacred, which it is a species of sacrilege to approach and inspect too curiously.

Hence it is that to the question, "What Life is?" so brief and insufficient an answer has been given in the last chapter, and briefer still, in this one, must be the review of the *Beginning of Life*. As yet we *know* very little indeed about it. As with so much besides that belongs to Psychology, we can only put forth plausible conjectures, the uses of which will be rather to indicate the path of inquiry to those who may desire to explore than to satisfy the craving for positive information by those who desire to learn.

Some repetition is necessary. We must start with this clearly before us. *Life* is not the *Soul* (if there be a Soul—of which hereafter); *Life* is not the Intelligence; *Life* is not in the body structure; *Life* is not in the nerve cords.

*Life* is not the soul (if a Soul there be, which the Materialists deny)—for vegetables have life and have not souls.

*Life* is not the Intelligence; for the Intelligence often departs, even to the loss of consciousness, and life remains. Vegetables have not intelligence and yet have life.

*Life* is not in the structure of flesh and bone, for that may be mutilated without diminishing life. A man who has lost his leg has not lost with it a part of his life. A little man has as much life in him as a big man.

*Life* is not in the nerve cords; for these may be

severed without danger to life, save through indirect mischiefs.

Where, then, dwells *Life*? We arrive at this answer by the process of exhaustion;

In the *nerve centres*—the brain and the ganglia.

But it is doubtful if the whole brain is the seat of life. The part of the brain that performs the functions of intelligence may be stricken with paralysis, even to loss of consciousness, and life may yet remain. But there is a portion of the brain, lying at the base of the hemispheres that perform the various functions of intelligence, differing from the brain in structure and whose uses are not yet satisfactorily explained. This peculiar body is reasonably conjectured to be in close relationship with the ganglionic system. May it not be the ganglion that supplies the vital force to the convolutions of the true brain, with both of whose hemispheres, by its position in the centre and at the base, it is in direct connection? If this be so, the brain system may be likened to the nerve system. As the nerve threads proceed from the ganglia which are the centres of vitality and convey that vitality to the entire body, so the fibres of the brain are the nerve-threads by which the *vital force* is carried from the central ganglion lying at the base of the brain into the hemispheres of the brain, stimulating the fibres to that molecular motion which imparts to the Individual the sensations he calls feelings and ideas. If this conjecture be correct, it explains how it is that the action of the brain is so often seen to be extinguished without the cessation of life, which would be the necessary consequence if the brain were the centre and seat of life.

That life dwells in the nerve centres, that the *vital force* flows from them and is not, as commonly believed, the result merely of collocation of organised material, is shown by the action of certain poisons, which kill, not by destruction of the tissues, nor by paralysing the functions of vital organs, but by some undiscovered action operating directly upon the nerve centres, and



extinguishing the life in them almost instantaneously. Other poisons appear to operate upon the nerve cords, and, by paralysing them, to bring about a slower extinction of life; while others again act by the chemical force overcoming the vital force and so causing the dissolution of the union of some or all of the organic substances of which the body is builded.

But even if we arrive at the conclusion that the nerve centres are the source and seat of the individual life, whence it is diffused through the entire structure by the nerve system, we have not advanced much nearer to a knowledge of the beginning of life. It is, however, more easy to contemplate the problem when thus simplified. Say that life lies in the nerve centres; still the questions arise, *What is it* that thus possesses that handful of greyish matter of a peculiar texture, thence is diffused through the whole structure and passes out of it on death? What is the difference between the substance of that structure when living and when dead? Does the life lie in the whole mass as the product of structure, or does it exist in every particle of the mass, so that the whole structure is in fact an aggregation of lives united to form an individual being, and not one life growing out of the combination of lifeless particles? Whence did it come? When and how did it enter the body? Where does it go when the body dies?

The most probable *conjecture* (for it is nothing more than conjecture) is that vitality is communicated to the particles attracted by the nerves in the process of assimilating them. The ganglionic mass has grown to be what it is from a point so small as to be invisible. It has been constructed by the expansion of a germ attracting the material for its structure from external substances. If those substances have not life in them, it follows that the life diffused throughout the entire mass really resides in the infinitesimally small point of the original germ. But some of the substances thus attracted and assimilated become, as we *know*, germs which, in their turn, become

nerve centres and expand into living beings like the parent. Moreover, hundreds of thousands of these germs are produced by the parent, all of which must have proceeded, not from the germ which the parent was, but from the substances which the vital force flowing from the nerve centres has attracted from the surrounding world—in fact, from the food it ate and the air it breathed.

But another solution offers itself. May not life be in the nerve system only—or rather in that which it diffuses—and all the encompassing molecular substance, a lifeless, inorganic matter? It is a suggestion worthy of some thought.

When, therefore, the nerve centre ceases to live—the ceasing of the supply of vital force causes the instant severance of the combination of molecules that constituted the living being. The substance of the structure being dissolved, the particles of which it was composed separate, to await other combinations to which they may be compelled, according to the force to which they may chance to be subjected and the conditions with which they may be surrounded, to be part of the structure of a plant, possibly of a mineral, before they are again contributors to the structure of an animal feeding upon that plant.

For Life manifestly moves in a grand circle.

Dr. BASTIAN, in his great book on “The Beginnings of Life,” has done much towards the solution of this problem. Carefully and laboriously investigating the lowest forms of life, he has discovered that vegetable corpuscles are in fact interchangeable, the same corpuscles becoming different plants. Those thrown off from a single lichen have been seen by Dr. HICKS to assume the forms and modes of growth characteristic of no less than twenty-three supposed species of *Algæ*; while powders from *Algæ* or from a moss were developed into lichens, *Algæ*, or mosses, according to the conditions under which they were placed, while they sometimes gave birth even to active Monads.



What, then, is the practical result of these investigations into the lower forms of life ?

In few words this :

Life is not something perpetually resident in, or belonging to, certain combinations of particles. It is the property of a certain form of matter which we call organized. The life produces the organisation.

The process appears to be something in the nature of evolution. The particle passes through successive stages before it is fitted for use by the highest form of organisation. It is first found forming a substance we call inorganic, and which we conclude, perhaps too hastily, to have no life in it. The particle is taken into the organism of a vegetable. The vegetable is eaten by a man, and its particles, which were mineral, then vegetable, are, by the operation of vital force, attracted to and form part of the organic structure of the Man. Or the vegetable may be eaten by a sheep, and the particles will become organised by the vital force of the sheep, and so form part of the organic structure of the sheep. Then, eaten in the form of mutton, the particle becomes a part of the organic structure of a Man. In either case it was inorganic; it becomes organised and combines with other particles to form organised structure and clothe a living being.

But Life is exhibited as a force, of the origin, nature, extent, and action of which we are wholly ignorant, which force, operating under certain unknown conditions, diffuses vitality and causes molecules to combine in certain definite forms, the direction of which is determined by the conditions under which the vital force works. "Among the lower organisms," says Mr. WALLACE, "unknown laws of polarity, akin to those which influence the production of crystals, but of infinitely greater complexity, directly cause the development of a great variety of forms; while conditions of existence to a great extent determine the variety of forms that shall arise in each individual case.

"These Forms of Animal Life are not fixed, not

hereditary, not necessarily the product of like parents; they are continually being created by conversion of vegetable into animal life; and as the probable conclusion from this that the higher forms of animal life are produced by combinations of those lower forms of life developed under conditions. If Dr. Bastian's observations are correct, and the conclusions he deduces from them reasonable, we have before us a grand view of the Genesis of Life which must materially modify the present opinion, and give a new direction to the future researches, of the Theologist, the Physiologist, and the Mental Philosopher."

I repeat that these are only advanced here as *speculations* having a certain basis of fact. I adduce them because they must be gravely considered in all future Psychological researches, my purpose in this treatise being to present a kind of outline map of the domain of Psychology, and to point out what may be deemed to be known and what yet remains to be explored. I have found it necessary to direct the attention of the Reader to the profoundly interesting questions, "What Life is?" and "What are the beginnings of Life?" not with any hope to solve them, but to show him what a vast field for investigation is spread before the student of Psychology even in this one alone of its many provinces.

If I have been unable to give any satisfactory answer to the question, "What Life is?" I hope at least to have pointed out some pathways possibly leading to its solution that may be deemed by some thoughtful persons to be worth pursuing.

---



## CHAPTER III.

## THE CESSATION OF LIFE.

"VITAL FORCE," say the Materialists, "is purely conjectural. There is no proof of its existence. What is it? Whence does it come? How is it manufactured and into what is it resolved, according to the law of the conservation of energy? We cannot see it, feel it, detect it with our instruments, and therefore we deny its existence."

Let there be no dispute about mere words. What is here called *Vital Force* is surely recognized by Scientists under some other name. The thing intended to be so named is the power (or force) that makes and maintains the organized structure. If we are constructed by growth of protoplasm, multiplying its cells until they form an arm or a leg, as Professor HUXLEY and other Physiologists contend, then I intend by vital force the force that causes the protoplasm so to grow. It is not the same force that causes a crystal to grow, for it works in a very different manner. But be it what it may, it is not the less *a force*, and being found only where *Life* is, we cannot very wrongly call it the *vital* force. It is the energy of life, possibly the life itself, and its existence is proved by precisely the same evidence as is the existence of the chemical force, which the Materialists recognize, although equally imperceptible, because, witnessing the results of an active power, they presume from those results the presence of the power itself. So, seeing in the structure of the body the result of action by *some*

force, we recognise the existence of that force, and observing that it operates only upon structures that are organized and have life, we call it the *Vital Force*.

We, therefore, confidently assert vital force to be, not a conjecture merely, but a *fact*, proved as perfectly as are the magnetic and the chemical forces, and by the same methods of proof.

Life, then, is a *condition* or quality of organised structure, not a distinct entity. It is not something that passes into an organized being and then passes out of it—something that existed before its present form and will exist after that form is changed. The question, indeed, is still undetermined, if life belongs to every individual particle of which the living thing is composed, or if it be only the product of the special combination of its particles. It is equally an undecided question whether life is a condition of the entire organized structure or of some part of it only. For instance, is the life that is in myself the sum of as many separate lives as there are particles in my body? Or is life the product of the entire combination of those particles, each separate particle having no life in itself? Is my finger, for instance, living in every molecule of which it is made, so that, if it were to be cut off, so much of my life would be subtracted? Or is the life, that was certainly in my finger when it formed part of my body, merely withdrawn from the finger on its severance and, as it were, retracted into the nerve centre whence it issued?

The most reasonable and probable *conjecture* (for as yet it can be nothing more), is that life is *not* in the particles of which the finger is made, but that life, or more properly the vital force, radiates from the nerve centres through the conducting nerve system to the whole body, and consequently that my finger *lives* only so long as the vital force is carried to it by the nerves. If the nerves cease to perform their office, the finger dies—which would not be if each of its own particles were endowed with life.

But another question suggests itself upon this.



Although the flesh and bone of the finger, which its nerves have formed, do not possess life in themselves, does the entire of the nerve system possess that life, or only a part of it? Here the reasonable probability—for this, too, is a problem yet unsolved—is that the source and seat of life in the organised being are in the nerve centres. To return to the instance of the finger. The nerves of the finger have executed the constructive work of nerves; they have made the finger what it is and they keep it in repair, still exercising the functions of vitality. The conclusion from this is, that what the chemists have called organic matter is not properly such, and that the only actual organic substance is the nerve structure—organic matter being by the Scientists known as the matter that possesses vitality.

Another fact supports the contention that life is exclusively in the nerve system and not in all or any part of the structure that is builded about it. If the supply of vital force to any limb or member of the body be interrupted, that limb or member perishes. This would not be if life were in the limb or member itself or even in the molecules of which it is made. They would still have life in them even after severance from the body. The life exhibited by worms and some other animals when cut into pieces is explained by the fact that in them the nerve system is composed of a series of ganglia, each of which is a nerve centre, and from each of which the nerve threads stream that supply vitality to a single section only of the entire structure. These beings may be said to have as many lives as they have nerve centres, and in certain conditions each section so supplied is even enabled to form a new and complete being.

Hence life lasts so long only as the nerve centres continue to radiate vital force. When the vital force flags the body fails with it. The organs cease properly to perform their functions. Thence debility and disease, followed by death. But *death* is not, as we are accustomed to speak and to think of it, a something that comes and takes possession of us and expels another

thing we call *life*. Poets and popular phrases have taught us this language. Scientifically considered, Death is merely the cessation of Life. We know that the life of the whole body may be extinguished almost instantly by a shock that paralyses the nerve centres, or by a poison disabling them for their work of sending forth, if not of producing, vital force. More frequently, however, the process of death is by gradual decline of power in the nerve centres to produce vital force, in which case the leaving of life is a slow process. The nerves at the extremities of the body lacking their due supply of vital force, insensibility ensues and the state we call the *death* of the limb so deprived. By degrees, as the flow of the vital force grows more and more feeble, it is carried to lessening distances from the centre and the ceasing of life creeps onward until the centre itself alone remains alive. In that centre life lingers for a time after the rest of the body has ceased to live. But when it departs thence, and not before, *life* has ended. The Being has ceased to be.

But, as will be shown hereafter, in appearance only. True, the life has ceased in him. Life, however, is not *the Soul*. Life belongs to the body. It is a condition of organized *bodily* structure. It is not a thing, but a *state* or *quality* of a thing. But if the *life* does not depart from the body, but only ceases when the flow of vital force ceases, there is something that does depart—something that has possessed that living material body and given to it the actions and expressions of Intelligence—something that was the *individual* who remained the same though the body was ever changing. That entity is the SOUL that is *himself*. The MAN is not dead. The body is dead, because, vital force having ceased to be supplied, the physical forces are resuming possession of it and reducing it again to its original molecules. But the MAN himself who possessed that molecular body has merely passed away from it. *He* exists still—not as a bodiless, formless Being, but as a Being constructed of some other aggregation of atoms than that of which



molecules are made. A clothing of molecular substance was necessary to his existence in a world constructed of molecules. But that existence ended and a new stage of existence begun, the *Soul*, that was *himself*, finds a new home in a world adapted to its structure of some combination of atoms other than that we call molecular, and which structure also is probably but one of an infinite variety of existences, each having special powers of perception, and a special habitation to which those powers are adapted, in strict accordance with what appears to be the law of Providence—*progress by development*.

---

## BOOK II. MIND.

---

### CHAPTER I.

#### INTRODUCTORY.

##### MIND—SOUL.

How commonly are these words confused alike in apprehension and in use. Not in careless talk alone, but in grave discourse and formal treatise, the terms *Mind* and *Soul* are employed as if they were two names for one thing. Nor is it always a confusion of language only. In the conceptions of the great majority, even of the educated, *Mind* and *Soul* are assumed to be not merely synonymous but identical.

Therefore it is necessary to commence this section of the Mechanism of Man with an earnest exhortation to the Student of Psychology to approach the subject of it with an open mind and a free judgment, throwing aside, at least for the moment, all past opinions or impressions of what *Mind* is, and what *Soul* is, of their identity, of their similarity or of their differences. He must be prepared to contemplate them from another stand point. He must view them now as distinct entities having distinct qualities and functions, and forget, if he can, that ever he had contemplated Mind and Soul as being only two names given to one thing. There can be no accurate understanding of the Science of Man, or of the Science of Mind, or of the Science of Soul, until the Student has



emancipated himself wholly from any notions he may have entertained of his mind being his Soul or of his Soul being his mind.

The Materialists, who deny the existence of *Soul*, do not dispute the existence of *mind*. But they say that what we call *mind* is only a function of certain organised structure; that as the stomach secretes gastric juice so the brain secretes thoughts, and that what we call "sensations" and "emotions" are only certain movements of the molecules of the brain the rapid repetition of which constitutes what we call "consciousness." It seems to be forgotten by those who thus hold, that the molecules of a pebble are in continual motion—but that a pebble is not *conscious*.

If Soul be but a superstition, a myth, the Materialists are right. If there be not *Soul* distinct from *Mind*—if the popular assumption be true that *Soul* and *Mind* are identical—the conclusion asserted by the Materialists is inevitable—that *mind* alone is—that Man is wholly mortal—that there is "nothing in us but doth fade"—that here is the be-all and the end-all for us—that with the passing of life the individual Being is for ever extinguished. If Soul be mind there is no Soul. *Mind* is mortal. The fact is patent and indisputable. It is known to every reader that *Mind*, equally with the body, is subject to disease, to decay and to destruction. *Mind* grows with the growing brain; it matures when the brain matures, shares both its healthy and diseased conditions, is suspended when the brain is paralysed, declines in vigour as the brain decays and ceases when the brain dies. *Mind* can be excited by wine, dulled by laudanum, extinguished by a blow. Degeneracy of the brain structure is attended by imbecility or insanity. The capacity and character of mind are wholly dependant upon the capacity and character of brain.

With these facts before him it would appear to be impossible for any reasonable man to hold that this *mind* is the *Soul*, if Soul man has. Nevertheless, so little cultivation is given to *accurate* thought that the vast majority,

even of the educated classes, entertain a vague notion (for not having been reasoned out it does not amount to a *conviction*), that *Mind* and *Soul* are one, and so speak of them and probably also think of them if ever they think on such a subject. This remark refers particularly to the many persons who believe the existence of *Soul*, but rather as a *faith* than as a *fact* of which they had satisfied themselves by positive *evidence*. No such caution is required by the Materialists who deny the existence of *Soul*, for they recognise nothing but *mind*, and that *mind* as being merely a function of brain and therefore perishing with the death of the brain by which it was generated.

Before we enter upon a scientific search after *proof* of the existence of *Soul* as an entity distinct from mind, I must ask the student to accept for the moment the being of *Soul* and assume its distinct existence, as necessary to a clear understanding of the following description of the mechanism of mind. If, after examination of these proofs, he should fail to be convinced by them that *Soul* exists, he may reject so much as is here advanced on the assumption that *Soul is and that Mind is not Soul*.

*Mind*, in this conception of it, and as here intended to be described, is the collective name we give to the aggregate sensations, ideas and emotions that impart to us the consciousness of personal individuality and of the existence of a world without us. It is the expression of the *Soul* as the voice is the expression of the thought, but it is not the *Soul* itself.

But *how* do I thus feel and think? My own consciousness alone does not inform me. By the most patient observation of my own sensations I am unable to perceive the process. I cannot even discover the conditions under which my thoughts and feelings are produced. Contemplating my own sensations, ideas and emotions, all I can learn about them is that they arise within me, sometimes suggested or excited by external circumstances, sometimes spontaneously, as it seems to me. There is no present indicator, no sense teaching me that the ideas are formed, the emotions excited, the sensations



brought from without, by means of an elaborate and complicated mechanism that is a part of my material body, growing with it, living with it, sickening with it, dying with it.

Plainly, therefore, little is to be learned of mind by reference to our own inner consciousness and contemplation merely of our own mental movements. If we would discover by what process it is that this *mind* of ours performs its functions, we must pass out of ourselves, inspect the visible mechanism of other Minds, examine the structure of that mechanism, observe its action alike in its abnormal as in its normal conditions, study profoundly its relationship to the whole mechanism of the body, investigate the manner in which it controls that mechanism, and, above all, the relationship it bears to the *Soul*, which is the MAN. Only by such a scheme of inquiry may we hope to attain to some satisfactory knowledge of the *Mechanism of the Mind*.

This is the course of investigation to which the Student of Psychology will be invited in the following chapters, devoted to the examination of MIND as one of the forces by which the Mechanism of Man is moved and directed.

The molecular machine by which *mind* performs its operations in its mutual relationship to the molecular world without and the non-molecular Conscious Self (or Soul) within is the brain and nerve system.

## CHAPTER II.

## THE MOLECULAR MECHANISM OF MIND.

WHAT is the *Force* that sets in action and maintains the machinery of the body?

LIFE.

But Life is a blind force. It acts in definite directions, in obedience to fixed laws. It has neither intelligence, nor a Will, nor consciousness.

The mechanism of the body is directed to ends desired and sought by an *Intelligence* within the structure that possesses the capacity to choose and the ability to attain them.

Therefore that power is manifestly something other than *life*.

But that power does not operate directly upon the structure of the body. The muscle is not moved by a mere exercise of the intelligent Will. A machinery is interposed through which alone, in the normal condition of the structure, the Intelligence can direct or control the action of the body.

We can *see* that intermediate mechanism and what do we find?

A marvellous scheme of fibrous structure, compacted into a large mass at one extremity, having smaller compacted masses at intervals, which masses are linked together by a long straight cord. From these masses streams forth a complicated system of nerve cords branching in all directions. These cords maintain the communication between the centres and extremities, conveying the commands of the Conscious Self to the body and carrying to the Conscious Self the messages delivered by the senses.



We are treading now closely upon the threshold of *Psychology*. We are in the border land where *Physiology* ends and *Psychology* begins. Physiology exhibits to us the mechanism of mind. We must turn to Psychology for instruction as to the products of that mechanism, for it is to the aggregate of those products that we give the name of *mind*.

The functions of all the organs of the body necessary to existence are performed by the *vital force*, without the direction of mind and (in the condition of perfect health), without consciousness. These functions know neither sleep nor rest nor can we by any exercise of mental power arrest or control them.

At this point Physiology parts company with Psychology. "There," say the Scientists, "our inquiries end. This is the ultimate knowledge attainable by the only instruments of investigation *we* can recognize in the researches of our science, the scalpel and the microscope. With these assistants to our senses we see a certain delicate structure on the condition of which depends the condition of the mind. As this structure grows in strength so does the mind grow. If the state of this structure is that of health, so is the mind healthy. If the structure degenerates, the mind fails with it. While the structure lives, the mind lives. When the structure is dead, the mind is dead also. The conclusion from these indisputable facts is obvious and unavoidable. That fibrous mass is what you call "the mind." Its functions are what you call the operations of the mind. Intelligence is a secretion of the brain, as nerve force is a secretion of the ganglia or gastric juice a secretion of the stomach."

The answer of Psychology to this argument of Materialism is an admission of the alleged facts, an acknowledgment that the Physiologists are right,—so far as their researches extend—but an assertion that they have halted too soon; *that the brain they have truly described is only the molecular mechanism through which communication is maintained by the Conscious Self (or*

*Soul) with the molecular world in which it exists for the present.*

The Psychologists say that the existence of this SOUL is not to be discovered by the scalpel and the microscope because it is not constructed of that atomic combination called molecular, which alone those instruments can exhibit. Consequently it is governed by other laws and its existence proved by facts of a different class, and by research in quite another direction.

All this, however, is for future consideration. It is referred to here only that the Reader may understand why it is that, at this stage of the inquiry, we exclude the great question "If there be Soul and what is it?" Starting with the undisputed fact that *mind* is, we proceed at once to examine the profoundly interesting process by which *mind* maintains its communication with the external world to the conditions of which it was necessary that its construction should be strictly conformed.

Whether *mind* exists apart from the material structure, or is only that structure itself, in no way affects the subject now to be considered. It will be agreed by all that, in its normal condition, *mind* is only cognizable by our senses when acting by means of the mechanism of molecular structure.

It will be convenient to call this molecular structure "THE MECHANISM OF MIND," about which there is little difference of opinion, to distinguish it from Mind itself, about which there is great diversity and dispute.

Let us first endeavour to trace this mechanism from the body, whose motions it directs and controls, to its source and seat.

The mechanism of mind lies wholly within the body. It is born with the body. It grows with the body. It declines, decays, dies with the body. It differs in degree of capacity, not merely in the various races of men but in the individuals of every race. It is not peculiar to Man. It is possessed by animals also and it must be confessed that as yet Science has failed to find the precise link in the long chain of animated nature at



which mind, as exhibited in voluntary action, ends and mere *unconscious* obedience to controlling law begins. Hence we may assume that mind, viewed as the molecular organ of the Conscious Self in action, must be sought somewhere within the structure. In fact, we *can* distinctly trace its seat. Sever the limbs from the body, there is no diminution of the Intelligence; but sever a portion of the brain, there *is* a proportionate diminution of Intelligence. Destroy or paralyse the brain, Intelligence ceases. The brain, then, is the bodily seat of the Intelligence. But the brain is not in all animals one collective ganglionic mass. It is sometimes severed into many segments lying apart but connected by a chain of nerves that associates the sections for common use by the individual. Ganglion, which is the name given to these scattered knots of brain, is only brain placed for special uses in other parts of the body than the head. Man has ganglia that are, in fact, lesser brains, really parts of and associated with the principal organ that is the seat of the Intelligence, although as yet Science has failed to discover the precise functions of these lesser brains or parts of the brain. The cause of this failure to find is that Science persists in looking for *function* in structure, instead of carefully observing and noting *action* in the normal, or more profitably in the abnormal, conditions of the organ. Physiology and Psychology will be found to depend for their future progress mainly upon the study of *function* as revealed by *action*, regular and irregular, in health and in disease, of the various organs by which the work of *life* and of *intelligence* is carried on.

We are accustomed to think and speak of *nerve* as being something distinct from brain and ganglion. But these are one, in fact. The nerve cords are only filaments extending from the brain to every part of the body. The brain is the centre upon which the nerves ultimately converge. Nerve is but an extension of brain, which could neither receive impressions of the world external to itself, nor direct its own force so as to affect the external world, unless means of com-

munication were provided by its structure. This necessary communicating medium is the *nerve system*. The nerves are threads passing from the nerve centres to the entire of the body, receiving the impressions of external objects and carrying them to the brain and conveying the Will of the Conscious Self from the brain to the organs that are in contact with the world without.

Trace the nerves from the extremities where they divide into innumerable branches covering the whole surface of the body with a network of filament, to the ganglionic centres whence they arise. No definite point of junction between nerve and brain can be discovered. The nerves run into the brain mass and appear to form a part of it. There is no sufficient evidence of a distinct structure to which, at a certain visible point, the nerve is joined so as to be nerve at one side of the point of junction and brain at the other side. The nerve is not a thread attached to the brain but an expansion of the brain itself. In this sense, the nerves of the stomach, the lungs, the heart, are only an extension of the brain, and the entire body is nothing but a huge mass of nerve threads encrusted with bone, muscle, membrane and other materials of which the body is builded.

And here we are met by a problem not so easily solved as they who have not reflected upon it might suppose. Is the *nerve* itself sensitive to the impression made upon it or does it act merely as a carrier of the impression to the brain? Take, for instance, the nerve that conveys the sense of sight. When the optic nerve receives the impression made upon the retina, is the perceptive faculty in the nerve, as being but an extension of the brain, or does the nerve in a merely mechanical manner carry the impression made upon it to the brain, as the receptive organ by means of which the Conscious Self obtains the perception? For practical purposes it concerns us little which of these is the true mechanism for communication between the Conscious Self and the world without. But it will be seen hereafter that it affects some not unimportant questions in Psychology. It is noted now with



purpose merely to impress upon the memory of the Reader that it is still a moot point and that neither solution of the problem can be taken as a safe foundation for argument. It is as yet entirely unsettled.

To make the undisputed mechanism more intelligible and not as asserting such to be the *fact* but with the emphatic declaration that it is still *doubtful*, I assume that the nerves are mere carriers, like the wires of the electric telegraph, and are *not* themselves sensitive to the impressions they convey.

Some of the nerve threads run to the brain, but some run to certain nerve centres that are clustered upon a thick nerve cord that passes down the back bone and which, at its upper extremity, expands into that bigger mass called the brain.

Thus will the nerve system be seen to consist of one large and several smaller nerve masses or centres, from which nerve threads pass to every part of the structure after the manner of the branches of a tree, the main branches dividing into smaller branches, and these again dividing and diverging until the branchlets are so small and so many that they appear like a mass of intricate network. If all the building material which the nerves have attracted and constructed about them could be shaken off or dissolved, as with the skeleton leaves on our drawing-room tables, the nerve structure would bear a very marked resemblance to a leafless tree. From these central masses the nerve threads convey *the vital force* (whatever that may be), *the Will* of the ruling Intelligence that controls and directs the actions of the body and *the force* (not known) that performs the involuntary functions of organic life. Special nerves in like manner carry to the nerve centres the impressions made upon the senses and thus the Conscious Self obtains information, more or less perfect and reliable, of what is going on in the structure and in the very small circle of creation outside itself that comes within the range of the perceptive power of the senses.

Brain and ganglia together are the centres of life

and of Intelligence; but as yet Science has failed to establish definitely the precise functions of each. The seat of the Intelligence appears to be in the frontal portion of the brain; that of the impulses necessary to the preservation of animal life in the lobes of the brain that lie behind and on the summit of the spinal cord; and that of the functions of organic life, over which mind has no control, in the other ganglia. But there are some abnormal conditions that throw considerable doubt over the strict correctness of this simple and convenient distribution of duties among the nerve centres, inasmuch as each under certain conditions appears to perform the functions of the others. It must be taken as conjectural merely.

But the brain hemispheres may be certainly accepted as the organ through which *Intelligence* is exercised, for, as a general rule, the amount of Intelligence is proportioned to the size and quality of that brain; whatever injures the brain to the same extent affects the Intelligence and whatever paralyzes the brain destroys the Intelligence.

Let it, then, be understood distinctly that in this treatise the term *mind* is employed as the collective name intended to designate only *the collective action of the brain*, and in this sense only it is that we speak of "the Mind" as being injured or extinguished by injury to the brain. This fact is the basis of Materialism, but Psychology contends that it is perfectly to be reconciled with the other fact (if such it be), that the Conscious Self is something other than the brain, which is only a molecular mechanism provided for the purpose of communication with an external molecular world. Consequently, if this mechanism be disordered, it must communicate wrong messages, whether they be brought to the Conscious Self from without or conveyed to the external world from within.

---



## CHAPTER III.

## OF THE BRAIN.

WHATEVER differences of opinion may prevail with respect to the definition and nature of Mind, it is now universally agreed that the brain is the organ by and through which mind is exhibited in action. Materialists contend that it is the mind itself. Psychology contends that it is merely the material organ by means of which are conducted the operations of that imperceptible entity we call *the Conscious Self*. But whether the brain be the mind, or merely the mechanism of mind, it is now admitted by all physiologists, although long disputed, that the brain is the bodily instrument by which the work we call "Mind" is performed, and that the character of the work depends on the structure, character and capacity of the machinery by which it is executed.

The brevity compelled by the largeness of the subject of this treatise forbids more than such a mere sketch of the structure of the brain as will suffice to make the general scheme of its mechanism intelligible to the Reader.

We are conscious that the head is the abode of the *Intelligence*. Nobody in his senses doubts that he thinks in his skull and not in his chest and that his emotions have their source in his brain and not in his bosom, although our common speech is loaded with phrases attributing so many of our sentiments and impulses to that central pump—the heart.

Looking into the skull, where we know that we think and feel, what do we see? A pulpy mass of peculiar texture called *the brain*.

Like the body, this brain is constructed of two distinct halves set closely side by side, the point of contact being distinctly visible. It presents precisely the appearance that a physiologist would have predicted as the result of the body being formed by the junction of two germs—as suggested in a former chapter and as actually seen in the first stage of existence of the chicken in the egg.

This brain is planted on the summit of the great nerve system, of which it is the crown and over which it exercises more or less of control. It is directly connected with the entire of that system by the spinal cord.

The brain of Man is in fact a great ganglion, or rather group of ganglia. It is inclosed in the skull, a case of strongest bone which protects it from external injuries. It occupies the greater portion of the head, whose shape closely resembles that of the brain within.

But the brain, besides having two hemispheres, presents other marked divisions. It is not merely one whole constructed of two halves, like the skeleton, but each hemisphere is divided into parts, differing considerably in structure and as may be thence presumed, each part having a different function. The frontal section of the brain, technically termed the *cerebrum*, fills the frontal cavity of the skull. Then comes the middle lobe. Behind it and annexed to it is a third lobe, called the *cerebellum*, whose structure is more pulpy and less fibrous than that of the *cerebrum*.

At the base of the brain is a pulpy mass, the *medulla oblongata*, lying between the brain and the spinal cord, and from this there extends another ganglionic mass occupying the whole base of the brain, running almost from the back to the front of the hemispheres and thus placed in direct connection with every part of the brain. This mass of brain matter is not homogeneous and anatomists have found it to consist of parts to which it is assumed, but not yet proved, that separate functions belong. To this centre have been traced the extremities of the nerves of the Senses. But, although composed of parts, these are not separated, but run one into another,



so that the entire ganglion is, in fact, a whole made up of parts. To this whole no definite function has been assigned. It *appears* to be nothing more than a base or bed for the brain. But it is in fact the point at which the nerves of the senses deliver their messages to the brain. Closely observed, this ganglion will be seen to hold a position that places it in immediate communication with every part of the brain—alike with the front and back lobes, with both hemispheres and with the entire of the nerve system that permeates the body.

Such a position suggests some very important office in the brain system for this central ganglion. The site seems to indicate some functions affecting the common action of the whole brain, for all its parts are here united and to all it affords a common base and a common point of junction.

May not, therefore, this centre, upon which the several parts of the mechanism converge, perform the important office of uniting all the parts of the brain structure so that all may work together? Is it not a reasonable conjecture that it is by means of this centre that we are enabled to call into exercise what mental faculties soever, one or many, that may be required for any purpose? If such be the office of this ganglion, what must be the process by which the brain actually conducts its operations? It will be an instructive inquiry to endeavour to trace it.

An impression made on one of the senses is by the nerve of that sense instantly communicated to the part of the brain upon which the nerves of all the senses converge. This centre is in direct communication with every other part of the brain. On receipt of this impression from a nerve of sense, the special mental faculties, which the communication so made is adapted to stimulate into action, are on the instant excited and the Emotions are kindled by it or the Intellectual faculties are prompted to deal with it, or both, according to the nature of the impression so brought by the nerve of sense.

Mental action pursues this regular course although

so rapidly executed that we are not conscious of the intricacy of the process. For an illustration, let us suppose that the external object is a wrong done. A ruffian strikes an unoffending woman. The impression of that object upon the retina is carried to the sense-centre by the optic nerve. The sense-centre communicates it to the brain hemispheres and the organs of the appropriate mental faculties are excited to action. Instantly a sense of wrong and an impulse to punish the wrongdoer and protect the victim is prompted by the Conscious Self. As instantly a message is sent by the Will to the brain and thence by the brain to the muscles of the arm. In obedience to that message they contract and the fist hurls the ruffian to the ground, while the other hand snatches the victim from his grasp. Here we see a series of psychic mental actions followed by a series of bodily actions, but so swiftly that perception of the several links in the chain of action is not possible to us at the moment of their occurrence and are recognised only when we slowly and calmly review the process. They are not, however, the less certain, as will be apparent on the slightest reflection.

The suggestion here offered as to the probable function of the central ganglion at the base of the brain supplies a complete and rational solution of the problem. If this ganglion be, as asserted, the common centre at which all the parts of the brain are united, the course of action for the performance of such a process as that adduced for illustration is at once made clear. To summarize it. The sense receiving the impression of the external fact conveys that impression to the central sense-ganglion. Thence, by impact at the point of junction, the impression is conveyed directly to the brain hemispheres and to the seats of the emotions of anger and of benevolence, which also meet at the same centre, and whose function it is to come into play when the appropriate object is presented to them. These brain actions thus excited are instantly conveyed to the Conscious Self, which issues its command (the Will) to the nerves of motion that con-



trol the limbs and they, in obedience to that command, perform the desired acts of punishment and protection.

If this suggestion of the primary function of the nerve centre at the base of the brain be right so far and if this be the medium through which the machinery of mind, constructed as it is of many various parts, is brought to act in concert for whatever purpose the Conscious Self desires, may we not advance another step and ask if it be not also probable that this nerve centre is the point at which *THE WILL*—the name given to the propelling force exercised by the Conscious Self commands the brain and body.

Intelligence is not a visible and tangible entity : it is not a structure ; it is only a *function*. As digestion is a function of the stomach, Intelligence is a function of the brain,—that molecular mechanism by which the Conscious Self (or Soul) acts and is acted upon.

But Intelligence is not the single function of a single organ, as is digestion of the stomach or blood aeration of the lungs. It exhibits itself in various definite forms. We are perfectly conscious that we exercise different faculties when we reason, when we imagine, when we love, or fear, or see, or feel. We know that it is the same individual Conscious Self that experiences all these various sensations ; but we are conscious also that these are not identical operations of the mechanism. Experience assures us that the whole brain is not occupied in the performance of any one or more of its many functions. In short, while convinced by our own consciousness that the recipient Self is one entity, we are equally compelled by that same consciousness to the conclusion that this homogeneous Self receives its impressions, performs its own operations within, and conveys its desires to the body or to the world without, through *a variety of organs* ; or, to speak more accurately, through some organ constructed of various parts, each of which has a distinct office.

The presumption, therefore, is that if the brain be the organ of the intelligent Conscious Self it is not one

homogeneous whole, acting as a whole in all its operations, like the stomach, for instance ; but that it is composed of *parts*, each part having its own functions, like the nerves which, although inclosed in one sheath, has each its own office. It is improbable that the whole brain should be employed in every act of thought, of feeling, of imagination. The theory is equally inconsistent with the observed facts ; for if the whole brain operated in every act of intelligence or of emotion there could be no variety of *power* in the *various* expressions of the same mind. The same person would be equally weak or strong in *all* his mental faculties ; whereas the very reverse of this is the case notoriously. There is no human being who has not some mental faculties inferior and others superior to what may be termed his average mental condition. The *facts*, without an exception, point to the conclusion that, if the brain be the organ of the Intelligence, different parts of the brain perform different functions, whether these be intelligent or emotional.

But it must be admitted that Anatomy has failed to discover any *visible* divisions of the brain corresponding with the various mental faculties. \* Even with the help of the microscope we can find no definite distinctions, no lines of demarcation, nothing that confirms to the eye the *à priori* probability of distinct organs to correspond with distinct faculties. In the absence of such demonstrative proof, it has been sought by extensive comparison of mental character with *shape* of brain to ascertain if there be any, and how much, correspondence between development of certain mental faculties and of certain parts of the skull, which is admitted to present, with rare and abnormal exceptions, an exact map of the size, shape and surface of the brain. GALL and SPURZHEIM first, and afterwards GEORGE COMBE, devoted the greater portion of their lives to this investigation, and they claim to have discovered the sites in the brain of the various intellectual and moral faculties. It is a strong fact in their favour that they did not set themselves to their task with any preconceived notions as to



the precise localities in which certain of the mental powers were to be looked for. They were content merely to observe and note *facts*, without theorizing, until a vast mass of facts had been accumulated. Nevertheless, when they came to classify these facts and to make a map of the brain in accordance with their observations of correspondence between form and faculty, it was found that all the *Intellectual* powers, as they had traced them, were grouped together upon the brain map, as also were the *Sentiments* and the *Propensities*. Seeing this, which is marvellous if a mere coincidence, it is not surprising that they should have made it the basis of a Science of Mind which they opposed to all previous theories, nor that they should have found many disciples.

They were answered, in the usual manner of the established Hierarchy of Science, not by investigating and disproving the asserted *fact*, but by argument *à priori* that, inasmuch as the fact conflicted with certain theories assumed to be true, it *could not* be and therefore *was not*. They called it an imposture or an hallucination. They declared that the observers did not see what they asserted they had seen. They avoided the only scientific answer that can be given to the allegation of newly discovered facts,—examination of those asserted facts by experiment and test. The assertion of the investigators was, that certain shapes of the brain were associated with the possession of certain faculties of the mind. Science and Philosophy were challenged to inquire; if the fact were so found to declare it frankly, if it were found to be otherwise, that the doctrine should be demolished by demonstration of its error and so to dissipate the delusion. But, instead of acting thus, Metaphysical and Medical Science took their stand upon simple denial of the *facts*, without bestowing on them the slightest examination or inquiry, content to declare that Anatomy cannot find the alleged divisions of the organs, and, *therefore*, that they could not be.

But if the Phrenologists failed, as to some extent they did fail, to adduce demonstrative proof of the correctness

of every part of their map of the skull, as representing the particular faculties of the brain beneath it, they established many important points in Mental Physiology. They settled the controversy if the brain be the organ of the *Intelligence*. This is not now denied by any Mental Philosopher or Physiologist. They *proved*—and it is now almost universally admitted—that the whole brain is not employed in every mental operation or emotion. It is now agreed that but a part of the brain is engaged in each mental process. It is further admitted generally that the frontal part of the brain is mainly employed in the operations of the intellectual faculties.

It is acknowledged that certain largely developed forms of forehead indicate certain marked mental capacities. But it cannot be affirmed that phrenology has *established* more than this. It has constructed an elaborate map of the surface of the brain, but it has not yet *proved* the existence of corresponding brain structure lying below the surface. The evidence is more or less strong. It is not yet conclusive. But not, therefore, is it a baseless science, a fantastic philosophy, having *no* foundation in fact. The skull is indeed a correct cast of the surface only of the brain it incloses. It may be that the brain itself has no variations of external form corresponding with the variations in the features of the mind. It may be that the brain is a homogeneous mass without parts, as some anatomists declare. These are yet unsolved problems and a decisive judgment cannot be pronounced upon them. Phrenology is certainly very imperfect in its proofs of all that portion of its teachings which belongs to *Cranioscopy*, the section of it by which it was best known to many and only known to more. But even if all these questions of the shape of the brain, and of the skull as moulded by the brain, and the power to read character by the shape of the brain as shown on its bony coverlet, be rejected as unproved, there remains to phrenology the high honour of having investigated the mechanism of mind more carefully than ever it had been explored before, of introducing distinct



definitions of the mental faculties, of arranging them in admirable scientific order, and of tracing the manner of their action separately and in combination.

If, therefore, phrenology has not yet made out its whole case—if it has failed to prove the possibility of reading on the skull an accurate map of the entire mind,—it has undoubtedly performed a service vastly more important. It has given to Science the most correct map ever drawn of *the mental faculties*, even if it has failed to construct a perfect map of *the brain*. The *facts* that mind works through separate organs having distinct offices—that in the combinations of the various mental faculties we must look for the key to the various mental operations—are of the highest interest to psychology. The classification of the mental faculties in their natural order; the admirable definitions of them perfected by successive investigators, are of incalculable service to mental science, even if the whole theory of cranioscopy (based on the assumption that the organs of the faculties underlying it are exhibited on the skull) be held to have failed in proof. Phrenology has undoubtedly given to the world the first rational analysis of the human mind. It was the first successful adaptation of mental science to the practical business of society. It brought that science down from the region of metaphysical abstraction to the region of common sense and to the intelligence and common uses of every day life. Mental science was by phrenology subjected for the first time to the same process of investigation that had wrought such wonders in the physical sciences. Patient observation and gathering together of *facts* were substituted for dreams of inner consciousness. Instead of merely contemplating themselves, the students of mind were taught to observe the minds of *others*, and especially to note their actions under abnormal conditions. In brief, the great principle of the Baconian philosophy was shown to be as applicable to the investigation of mind as it had already proved in the investigation of matter. As rich a harvest speedily rewarded the work.

Admitting, then, that the phrenologists have not yet established their doctrine that the mental character is exhibited upon the skull—setting aside entirely, as unproved, the assertion that they have found the precise locality in the brain where each variety of thought and of emotion has its birth, it must be acknowledged that they have succeeded in producing the most rational and perfect analysis of the mental faculties ever given to Science. They may not have found the particular part of the brain or the very spot upon the skull where the molecular organs of the faculties of Imagination, Music, Hope, Fear, or Self-esteem are located. But they have established by conclusive evidence that such faculties exist as separate parts of that abstraction we call “the Mind.” It may well be that further research and observation will find some of the mental faculties now looked upon as distinct to be only modifications or combinations of the actions of other faculties. New faculties may be discovered. But these cannot materially affect the accuracy of the grand outline of the machinery of the Mind traced by the successive labours of GALL, SPURZHEIM and COMBE. Their scheme of the mental faculties may be said to be now more or less adopted by the mental physiologists of our time as substantially the true one, and to be generally accepted as the only practicable and rational theory of the human mind.

I repeat that theory in few words, asking the reader to commit it to his memory.

*Mind* is not a definite entity, like the body. It is not a thing that has shape and substance. It is the collective title given to the aggregate of active and passive sensations that are conveyed to and from the brain and through the brain to the Conscious Self.

Thus viewed *Mind* is the name given to the aggregate results of the action of the various organs, each of which constitutes a distinct faculty or power. In every exercise of the Intelligence at least one of these faculties is called into action. Each faculty has its own functions, but the function of each is modified by its combination with



others in the production of all our ideas, thoughts, and emotions. To these combinations of the mental faculties we are indebted for the infinite variety of human character, which is unaccountable upon any of the previously received theories of the unity of the mind.

In this sketch of the Mechanism of Man I adopt the analysis of mind enunciated by GEORGE COMBE; not affirming it to be in every particular certainly correct, but as being, upon the whole, the most rational, as it is certainly supported by the most powerful array of evidence; as the most consistent with all other branches of Science and most recommending itself alike to the reason and to the experience of every man who observes the mental actions of his neighbours, instead of limiting his researches to the observation of his own. It will certainly convey to the Reader a far more accurate conception of mind and its operations than he could derive from any of the numerous theories of the Metaphysicians. Who does not lay down the treatises of the transcendental Philosophers with a painful consciousness that, instead of increased knowledge, he possesses less definite notions of his own mind than he had when he took them up? But he rises from the perusal of COMBE with a far clearer conception than he before possessed of mind and its operations. He feels that the knowledge he has there obtained is capable of hourly application to the practical affairs of life; whereas the teachings of the Metaphysicians are never practically useful; they must be received as intellectual exercises only and not as being applicable to daily and hourly intercourse with living men.

Even if the brain possesses no parts specially appropriated to each mental faculty, various distinct mental powers exist, enjoyed in various degrees, not only in different minds, but by the same mind. The same man may have one or more mental faculties in excess while others are defective, a fact which of itself proves that mind is constructed of parts, or that the Conscious Self acts through a machine made of many parts that have different functions. Careful noting of the various opera-

tions of the mind has exhibited a long list of distinct faculties which it is not difficult to classify according to the nature of their several manifestations. It was to the power to perform these operations that the name "*Faculty*" was given, and the Mind was said to possess certain "*faculties*," or capacity to perform certain recognised acts, as to reason, to imagine, to imitate, to feel self-esteem, or attachment. To these capacities of the mind so to operate were given the names we employ when we speak of the *faculty* of reasoning or of loving—meaning by this only that the mind reasons or loves.

It remains for the Reader to understand distinctly the sense in which the term "*faculty*" is used in this and the following chapters. It is not a satisfactory name to be given to the thing intended to be designated. But there is no other in common use, and to invent a new name, however it may conduce to scientific accuracy, is a process very liable to scare those whom it is the special purpose of such a book as this to tempt into a field of practical science that has been hitherto made almost repulsive by enveloping it in abstractions and technicalities.

By the use of the term "*mental faculties*" nothing more is intended to be affirmed than that *mind* manifests itself in various distinct and definite forms of expression. The term "*faculty*" is here given to the special forms in which mind so manifests itself. Sometimes they are called the *mental powers*. We can learn the minds of others only by their expression through some one or more of the mental *faculties*. It is otherwise in self-contemplation. We can think of our own mind as being a whole and perfect MIND, apart from its exhibition through its faculties. We have in fact a consciousness of the existence in ourselves of some entity distinct from the mental mechanism. In common thought and speech this entity is called the MIND; but in truth it is the SOUL. *Mind* is only a collective name for the aggregate product of the action of the brain.



It is to the almost exclusive devotion of Mental Philosophers to the study of this self-consciousness, combined with almost entire neglect of the mechanism by which mind works, and which mechanism is apparent only when we observe the minds of others, that is to be ascribed the unprogressive condition of Mental Philosophy, while all physical science is advancing by leaps and bounds.

Let it then be understood that by the term *Mental Faculty* I design nothing more than to describe the power the mind possesses to do certain acts or feel certain sensations, as to reason, to perceive, to hope, to fear, to love. When the term "faculty of hope" is used, there is intended to be expressed by it this only—that the mind has in its mechanism a capacity for a certain action of that mechanism which the Conscious Self perceives and feels in the form of a certain emotion to which the name "hope" has been given. And so with the others.

The process is probably thus :—An idea or emotion is conceived by the Conscious Self. That Self, being non-material (that is *non-molecular*) can express itself to the external world only through a molecular medium. The medium provided for that purpose is the brain and nerve system. So, when action is set up in any part of the mechanism of the brain by an impulse from without, it is communicated to the Conscious Self, to whom that action of the brain suggests an idea or an emotion.

This is difficult to understand, but, I hope, not unintelligible. I have endeavoured to make it as clear as the novelty and intricacy of the subject will permit.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

## THE DUALITY OF THE MIND.

THE brain, like the body, is, as described in the last chapter, constructed of two distinct halves (or hemispheres, as they are improperly termed). So distinct are these that they are actually separated by a membrane—the *Falx*—thus called from its resemblance in shape to a sickle.

Hence, although we are accustomed to think and speak of the brain as if it were one whole, we have in fact *two* brains, from each of which descends a complete system of nerves that cross as they quit the brain and permeate, possess and supply with nerve and vital force each the half of the body opposite to the side occupied by the hemisphere from which it springs. The right hemisphere of the brain provides the entire nerve structure, and therefore controls the entire action, of the left side of the body and *vice versâ*. Obviously thus it is that the junction of the paternal and maternal germs is effected and unity of form and action secured.

Each hemisphere is a complete brain and from similarity in structure it might be presumed that each is competent to the performance of all the functions of a brain. Nothing in their aspect nor in their anatomy indicates any differences of function from which it might be presumed that one hemisphere has duties distinct from the other or is in any respect a complement of the other.

If, therefore, the brain be the material organ of *mind* and we have two perfect brains, each of which



can act independently of the other, the conclusion is inevitable—that we have *two minds*.

Are there facts that bear out such a conclusion? Are there mental phenomena, inexplicable otherwise, that may be thus explained? These are the questions to be considered in this chapter. Their importance to *psychology* is incalculable. If the *duality of the mind* be a truth, almost a new science of mind must be constructed.

But I must preface the consideration of the question with another of those repetitions, impossible to be avoided in a book such as this, which treats of a subject so large, so encompassed with preconceptions and where at every step there is more or less of unreflecting prejudice to be encountered.

So almost universal is the practice of looking upon *Mind*, *Soul* and *Self* as identical—as in fact three names for one thing that few are the readers who will not be startled by the suggestion that we have *two minds*. In their conception of *mind* this is equivalent to an assertion that we have *two selves* and *two Souls*. (a)

But here, as in all parts of this book, it is necessary to the clear comprehension of the argument that the Reader should keep distinctly and firmly before him the proposition that *mind*, as now to be considered, is neither *the Soul* nor *the Self*, but the common name given to the aggregate results of the action of the material mechanism of the brain, and of which action the Conscious Self takes cognizance as *ideas* and *emotions*.

Nor is there anything special in this fact of a double brain. All our bodily organs are double. We have two

---

(a) This preconception of *mind* as being identical with *Soul* was remarkably exhibited in a discussion upon a paper on "The Duality of the Mind" which I submitted to the *Psychological Society of Great Britain*. A great majority of the speakers, although psychologists, combated the argument for duality, not by disputing the duplex structure of the brain or the facts that indicated a double mental action, but by assuming that Mind was Soul—if there be a Soul—forgetting that what for scientific purposes we term *Mind* is the product of brain action.

eyes, two ears, two nostrils, two arms, two legs, two nerve systems. Each of these duplex organs is distinct and complete in itself and in that respect the two brains resemble them.

Unfamiliar as the fact may be, and therefore strange and startling as it may appear on its first presentation, the duality of the brain, and the consequent *duality of the mind*, is not a new suggestion, although it has been but lately brought prominently under public notice through the announcement of the conversion to this opinion of the foremost Physiologist of the time,—BROWN-SEQUARD. It was maintained many years ago by Dr. ARTHUR WIGAN in a volume entitled “The Duality of the Mind.” It was affirmed by a still more distinguished physician, Sir HENRY HOLLAND. It has been lately demonstrated by the experiments of Professor FERRIER, and now it is asserted, without hesitation or doubt, by BROWN-SEQUARD, as a proved fact in physiology.

It was stated in the preceding chapter that the brain is composed of bundles of minute fibres. But probably few readers have formed the slightest conception of the wonderful nature of this fibrous structure. With the aid of a powerful microscope the number of fibres in a very minute surface section of the brain has been counted, with the astounding result, as stated by Dr. ERASMUS WILSON, that a square inch of brain is composed of no less than *one hundred millions of fibres*. If it be, as is not merely possible but probable, that each fibre has a distinct office, may not that account for the infinity of thoughts and emotions that pass through the brain in the course of a lifetime and for the still more marvellous memory of them?

The history of this great discovery is remarkable.

Thirty years ago Dr. ARTHUR LADBROOKE WIGAN, a Physician of considerable eminence, whose practice had given him an extensive acquaintance with cases of Insanity, had the moral courage boldly to reassert the doctrine GALL had taught, and in defiance of the hostility of his profession and of the metaphysicians, whose prejudices he



directly defied, to proclaim the "*Duality of the Mind*." Not merely did he adopt the doctrine that the brain is the organ of mind, but he advanced a step beyond GALL, and asserted that the two hemispheres of the brain are not only two parts of one mind (as GALL had taught), but that they are two distinct and perfect organs as of *two minds*. Reflecting on this fact of the complete duplicity of the brain, he instituted a most patient investigation into the phenomena exhibited by brain action in its various phases, and especially in its abnormal conditions, and thus he was brought to the conclusion that as the brain is so is the mind. He proved by anatomical examination that each brain hemisphere is a perfect brain—that we have in fact two brains, as we have two eyes and two ears—and he deduced from this the conclusion that, as the brain is the organ of mind and we have two brains, we must have two minds. Careful examination of the phenomena of mind satisfied him that so it was, and, with a moral courage that cannot be too highly commended, he published a volume entitled "*The Duality of the Mind*," (a) in which he detailed the experiments and observations by which he had been conducted to this conclusion.

Dr. WIGAN found the same fate as Dr. GALL. The Scientists of *his* day excommunicated him. The abundant facts by which he supported his arguments and his manifold experiences as a physician were declared to be impostures or illusions, and his deductions from them fallacies. They would not condescend to inquire if his asserted facts were true, for they averred that such facts *could* not be true, inasmuch as they were inconsistent with the established principles of physiology and mental science. Had we not whole libraries of books by the highest authorities, based upon the assumption that Mind is a metaphysical abstraction—a thing without parts, or

---

(a) "The Duality of the Mind proved by the Structure, Functions and Diseases of the Brain, and by the Phenomena of Mental Derangement, and shown to be essential to Moral Responsibility." By A. L. WIGAN, M.D. (Longman & Co.)

shape, or substance, wholly incorporeal in essence and in association? Were these big books to be reduced to waste paper by a new quackery and the authority of all the great M.D.s destroyed by facts and phenomena noted by a little M.D.? Were the arguments of so many philosophers to be answered by reference to the sayings and doings of madmen and somnambulists? "For our own parts," said the Scientists of that day, as some of the Scientists of our own day say now, "we will not waste our time in looking at facts and phenomena which cannot be accepted in opposition to established principles of science and known laws of nature, and which, therefore, even if we beheld, we should not believe?"

So Dr. WIGAN was put down in his turn.

But truth is immortal. A *fact* may be suppressed; it cannot be killed. It will turn up again and again and in the end it will prevail.

This fact of the *duality of the brain* and consequently of the *mind*, announced by GALL, proved by WIGAN, approved by Sir HENRY HOLLAND, was long after confirmed partially by FERRIER, and now is proclaimed boldly, positively and without reserve by BROWN-SEQUARD, hitherto held to be the foremost in his Science, but who, perhaps, will at once be deposed as labouring under "diluted insanity," or as having a natural proneness to gullibility—the characteristics, according to some Scientists, of all who differ from themselves.

What is the teaching of these four famous Physiologists?

Dr. WIGAN says of the material mechanism of the Mind:

The two hemispheres of the brain are really and in fact two distinct and entire organs, and each respectively as complete (indeed, more complete) and as fully perfect in all its parts, for the purposes it is intended to perform, as are the two eyes. It would be just as reasonable to talk of the two lobes or globes of the eye as of the two hemispheres of the brain. The decussation of the fibres in the *corpora pyramidalia* is not merely visible, but proved by innumerable consequences necessarily resulting from it, as Hemiplegia and Paralysis. Each set of fibres retains its separate functions in passing to the



opposite side and the opposite columns of the spinal marrow. That some of the powers and functions may be combined in the *medulla oblongata* is no greater objection to the absolute completeness and individuality of each hemisphere of the brain, or evidence of their forming but one organ, than the fact of our seeing only one object with two eyes proves that the two eyes are not distinctly complete and separate organs, each capable of acting alone when its fellow is injured or destroyed.

The late Sir HENRY HOLLAND maintained the same doctrine of the duplicity of the brain and the consequent duality of the mind.

BROWN-SEQUARD fully admits this to be the anatomical structure of the brain, and makes a practical application of it by asserting that, as the necessary consequence of such a brain structure, if brain be the mental organ, we have *two minds*. He accepts this conclusion without hesitation and proceeds to make practical application of it to education and other mental uses.

The *Duality of the Mind* being thus established as a *fact*, it will be found of incalculable importance in psychological science, every branch of which it must modify more or less. It will solve a multitude of problems that hitherto have baffled the most sagacious of the mental and moral philosophers. It will throw light upon the sources of the earliest forms of life. It will revolutionise mental science. It will advance the science of Soul. Nor is it of theoretical and scientific interest merely. It is of immense practical value in the processes of education, in the guidance of our own minds, in observation of the minds of others. It would be impossible to do anything like justice to so great a theme in one short chapter. Nothing more can be attempted than a meagre sketch of the most prominent of its features.

But first let me anticipate some difficulties that will probably occur to those who have heard of this suggestion but have given no thought to it. "Are we," they will say, "*conscious* that we have two minds? Does any sensation inform us of a double mental action? Would not confusion result from two different ideas being presented by the two minds? What if they were

to conflict? Are the two minds identical in structure? If not, how do they act in concert? If they did not act in concert, what confusion of ideas and emotions must follow?"

The answer to these not unreasonable objections is that the two brains, as organs of thought and feeling, work together precisely in the same manner as do the two eyes and ears. In the normal condition of the organism the two eyes and two ears are so adjusted that the brain receives the impression of one object and communicates that impression to the Conscious Self. In fact, two objects are presented by the two eyes to the optic nerve; but at the point of junction of the two optic nerves at the base of the brain the two pictures presented on the two retinas fall into exact focus, and thus one picture (and not two pictures) is presented to the brain and thence to the Conscious Self. So the ears receive two sounds, but the brain only one sound. But if the two eyes be thrown out of focus by the slightest pressure, we are instantly conscious of their double action, for we perceive two pictures instead of one. If we close one eye, the objects seen by the other eye appear in a different position, which is again changed if we close that eye and open the other, and then changed again when we open both. So it is with the double brain. When the two brains are acting together, the Conscious Self receives only one impression and as a rule they work in perfect accord. But in many abnormal conditions, as in reverie, in dream, in somnambulism, in trance, in insanity, the two brains do not act together.

These conclusions of GALL, SPURZHEIM, WIGAN, Sir HENRY HOLLAND, and BROWN-SEQUARD being accepted as the *actual* structure of our mental mechanism, there remain the questions so important and interesting to us—

What are the consequences of such mental structure?

To what extent are those anticipated results ascertained by observed mental phenomena?

When the brain or a part of it or the medium of communication, whatever it be, between the Conscious



Self and the brain, is in an abnormal condition, we find precisely the same results as present themselves when the two organs of sight or of hearing are in an abnormal condition. The unity of action is disturbed or destroyed, according to the extent of the disorder. The two organs are thrown "out of focus," as it were. We see two objects instead of one, or the object is distorted. We hear two sounds or no sound. We have lost the measure by which we obtained our knowledge of form, size or distance and blunder accordingly.

So it is with the brain. As with the other double senses, and indeed the entire nerve system (which is duplex also) the double action of the double brain does not make itself perceptible to our consciousness when the machinery is working healthily, because the two brains, like the two eyes and the two ears, unconsciously *adjust themselves* so as to produce upon the consciousness the impression of but one object. It may be, indeed, and probably is that, as with the two organs of sight, the unity of perception is not caused by one impression being thrown over the other so exactly as to produce upon the sensorium the sense of a single impression, but the perception is of two impressions that do not fall precisely upon each other, but which are so admirably adjusted that the impression upon the conscious Self is that of a single object more roundly and fully perceived than it could have been by either of the impressions alone, precisely as the stereoscope shews it to be with the two eyes. It is probable that the double organs of the brain assist each other after something of the same manner and that the expression of the idea or sensation to the Conscious Self is more complete and rounded, as it were, by reason of this duplex action. There are many phenomena which appear to bear out this conjecture and which have received no rational explanation on any other hypothesis. In physiology, argument by analogy of action in cognate organs is always weighty. The eye is only an extended brain, and what that part of the brain does in the case of

a double organ at one extremity may be fairly adduced as raising the strongest probability that it does the like with another double organ at the other extremity.

As we are not conscious that we are using two distinct organs of vision and receiving two distinct impressions when we look at an object with both eyes, so we are not conscious that two organs are at work when we think a thought or feel an emotion. We become conscious of the fact only when the organ is in some manner impaired. In the normal condition of the structure, we are in happy ignorance of the working of the mechanism. But in abnormal conditions of the organism the duplex action becomes plainly perceptible alike to the patient and the observer. The mental states are many in which this influence of the double brain is distinctly to be discerned. It explains not a few of the hitherto inexplicable phenomena of *Dream*, as is shown in the chapter treating of that strange psychological condition, which, were it not so familiar, would fill us with wonder, kindle our curiosity, and command the profoundest investigation of physiologists and philosophers. Half the mysteries of *Somnambulism*, natural and induced, are revealed by reference to the facts of a double brain and duplex mental faculties, as also will be described hereafter. Many of the most remarkable phenomena of *Psychism*, too hastily attributed to supernatural agency, are found to be clearly explicable by reference to this structure of the brain. Dr. CARPENTER has given shape, substance and name, if he be not discoverer, to a peculiar state of the brain which he appropriately calls *Unconscious Cerebration*—that is, brain action without consciousness. While we are thinking or doing some one thing and our attention is fixed upon that mental operation, the brain works automatically in some other direction. A familiar instance of this is the forgetting of a name which the more we try to remember the further it seems to fly from us. But if we fix the attention elsewhere and divert the brain action, as we suppose into another path, and cease voluntarily to think of it, the name suddenly flashes upon the memory. The



brain in fact has been at work unconsciously to ourselves. One brain has been unconsciously labouring at the one object while the other brain has been consciously at work upon another object. This is but one of a multitude of instances in which the operation of unconscious cerebration is to be discovered, solving problems in mental physiology utterly insoluble on any other hypothesis. Of such great importance to every branch of Psychology is the existence of this condition of unconscious cerebration that it is made the subject of a distinct chapter in another place and to that the reader is referred for further facts relating to it. In this place it is noticed only so far as it bears upon the *duality of the brain and mind* which is the subject of the present chapter.

Dr. CARPENTER has proclaimed, if he did not discover, a great truth. But he appears not even to have suspected the cause of his "unconscious cerebration." He has based his entire system of Mental Physiology upon the assumption that the cerebrum is one homogeneous organ working as one whole in all mental operations. He denies that it is made up of parts of which each has its distinct function, as one for the emotion of anger, another for the imagination, and another for reasoning, but asserts that whether we are angry, or imagining, or inquiring, the whole cerebrum is employed for the performance of each act, however differing. Hence he has been driven to resort to the most egregious fallacies. He asserts, rightly, that while the brain is doing one thing consciously, it does some other thing unconsciously. But how is that consistent with his assumption that the *whole brain* works in every mental act? If in the act we are consciously doing the whole *cerebrum* is employed, the consciousness must be of the whole and no place is left in the brain for *unconscious* action. If, on the other hand, there be unconscious cerebration, some part of the brain must then be acting, not only unconsciously to the other part, but in a different manner, thus proving by his own theory that the

*cerebrum* does *not* work as a whole but has parts that perform different functions. I leave Dr. CARPENTER to this dilemma.

But the phenomena of *Unconscious Cerebration* are perfectly explained by the fact that we have two brains, and that thus there are two organs for each of the mental faculties. In this mental condition one hemisphere of the brain is employed in one way and the other hemisphere in another way. Consciousness can be of one impression only at the same instant of time, and the impression of which it takes cognizance is that to which *attention* is directed by the Self. While, therefore, we are voluntarily directing our thoughts to one subject the organs of certain mental faculties are in action, and we are conscious of that action. But if for instance we try to recal a name and fail to find it, the mental faculties do not cease from action because, by another exercise of Will power, we have directed the attention to the working of other faculties. One brain continues the task automatically while the other is acting consciously, and perhaps with more power because it is not distracted by the perturbing operation of Consciousness. The attention is at once *recalled* to the other brain by the act of finding the name, the attention of the Conscious Self being always directed to whatever mental faculty is the most active at the moment.

A multitude of undisputed facts prove that one brain may be destroyed, or its action paralysed, and yet the other brain preserve its power and perform the mental functions. This result is remarkably exhibited in paralysis. One half of the body has lost sensation by reason of disease in one brain only ; the other half continues in full possession of its powers of sensation and obedience to mental action because that other brain is uninjured. Dr. WIGAN tells us of a boy who, climbing a tree, fell on a sharp edge of iron which sliced off a portion of the skull and brain on one side, 4oz. of the brain being lost. His mental faculties remained uninjured until



death from hæmorrhage many days afterwards. In another case, one hemisphere of the brain was wholly destroyed by disease, but the man conversed rationally. Dr. CONOLLY records the case of a man of family, one side of whose brain was found on examination to have been annihilated by an abscess, and in its place was "a yawning chasm." His mental faculties were apparently perfect to the moment of death. Dr. JAMES JOHNSON reports another case of a man who preserved his mental faculties, although on a *post mortem* it was found that one hemisphere of the brain had been reduced to a thin membrane, the whole solid contents of one-half of the cranium having absolutely disappeared. A similar case is recorded by CRUVEILHIER of complete atrophy of the left side of the brain without apparent injury to the intellectual powers, proving conclusively that the functions of mind were performed wholly by the right side of the brain.

These are but a few of many cases reported by medical observers. They are adduced here merely as illustrations of the evidence upon which the great Physiologists named have based their contention that each brain is a complete machine, capable of performing alone the mechanism of mind.

But I must accompany this proposition with a slight reservation. Neither Dr. WIGAN, nor Sir H. HOLLAND, recognises the existence of distinct mental faculties as being located in distinct parts of the brain. It is, therefore, necessary to accept with caution their unreserved assertion that in the cases noted by them of injury to one brain only the *entire* of the mental operations were unaffected. It is almost certain that with the two brains, as with the two eyes, the double action gives more completeness to the mental view. Vision with the two eyes conveys to the mind that sense of roundness in objects wanting in vision by one eye, a condition shown in and explained by the stereoscope. It is probable that the double brain operates in the same manner. It is also more than probable that certain mental operations need

the assistance of *both* brains, such as the process of reasoning, which is the work, not of one faculty only, but of many, and for its perfect accomplishment probably requires the co-operation of *both* minds. Dr. WIGAN, indeed, recognises the fact that the highest exertions of mind require the concentration upon them of the action of *both* brains, and he has noticed in all cases of extensive disease of one brain alone an "inability to exercise continuous study, or to learn by heart." But the one healthy brain continues to exercise the more ordinary functions of mind.

Dr. WIGAN presents the argument in this conclusive form :

One of two things must be : either each hemisphere is a perfect whole, capable of exercising all the functions which in the aggregate form the mind of the individual, or else each half must exercise some of those functions, and the other half the remainder, so as between them to make up a *mind*.

The results of this duplicity of brain are to be found in many mental conditions not otherwise explicable, but which are thus readily accounted for. In this place it is impossible to do more than briefly direct the attention of the Reader to a few of them. For a full exposition of the subject he is referred to the very interesting work of Dr. WIGAN, which ought to be reprinted, seeing that all he there wrote, and which, as is usual, brought down upon him only abuse and ridicule from the Mental Philosophers and Physiologists of his time, has now been proved and adopted by the foremost men of our day. He was, indeed, a man in advance of his age.

Sir HENRY HOLLAND opens a chapter "On the Brain as a Double Organ" with these words, "I am not sure that this subject of the relation of the two hemispheres of the brain has yet been followed into all the consequences which more or less directly result from it. Symmetry of arrangement on the two sides of the body is common indeed to all the organs of animal life. But the doubleness of the brain, like all besides pertaining to this great nervous centre, offers much more of curious specula-



tion than the same constitution of other parts. That unity of consciousness in perception, volition, memory, thought and passion, which characterises the mind in its healthy state, "*illud quod sentit, quod sapit, quod vult, quod viget,*" is singularly contrasted with the divisions into two equal portions of the material organ which more immediately ministers to their high functions. Yet, on the other hand, in the almost exact symmetry of form and composition of each hemisphere, in their relation precisely similar to the organs of sense and voluntary motion on each side of the body and on the structure of the nervous connections subsisting between them, we find argument not merely for the correspondence of functions, but even for that unity or individuality of which consciousness is the interpreter to all. This unity, indeed, as it actually exists, is of necessity compatible with the conformation of the brain as a double organ, even if we had no such presumption to refer to."

And he proceeds to the narration of cases proving his position. "A familiar example is that of certain musical sounds coming unsought for into the mind, and even tormenting it by their persistence, despite every effort to put them aside." Here is the one brain having the undesired impressions, the other brain feeling that they are undesired. The wrong action of one is too powerful to be controlled by the right action of the other.

Similar experiences must have occurred to every Reader, especially in relation to imaginary voices, sounds, sights, and other sense impressions. One brain in abnormal action has presented them; the other brain has told him they are not real and banished them.

Sir HENRY HOLLAND observes further, "It has been a familiar remark, that in certain states of mental derangement, as well as in some cases of hysteria, which border closely upon it, there appears, as it were, *two minds*; one tending to correct, by more just perceptions, feelings, and volitions, *the aberrations of the other*, the relative power of the two influences varying at different times."

Dr. WIGAN says, "How complete this separation—this perfect individuality of the two brains—is, is shown by the extent to which disease may progress in one of them, absolutely in contact with the sound one, and yet the latter remain in all its essential functions unaffected. The great commissure forms at once a bond of union and a wall of separation, and, as far as my experience goes, it is absolutely incapable of transmitting inflammation or malignant disease from one organ to the other. Both indeed may be liable to the same disease, because both may have been supplied with unhealthy blood, or subjected to the same moral or physical causes of disturbance and disorder, but I believe that whenever disease spreads from one cerebrum to the other, it is through the *meninges*, and never through the *corpus callosum*."—(P. 115.)

Monomania is disease of one brain only. The patient is perfectly sane when exercising the other brain and often is conscious of his own delusion and endeavours to control it, sometimes successfully. The well known cases of hallucinations, such as those reported of themselves by NICOLAI, the bookseller, and Dr. FERRIER, who saw spectres involuntarily and banished them at will, were manifestly the illusions of one disordered brain corrected by the other healthy brain.

Who does not find himself often carrying on two mental processes at the same time? Bank clerks have been known to cast up a page of figures while maintaining an animated conversation. I knew a distinguished shorthand writer who could dictate to two clerks at the same time. How often do we hum a tune while deeply absorbed in thought upon some subject that appears to occupy the whole mind. Dr. WIGAN narrates an annoying habit of counting his steps when deep in reflection upon questions that had presented themselves while visiting his patients. "I then attempted by incessant conversation with the person who was accompanying me to prevent the annoyance, but in vain. On arriving at the top, I always knew the number of stairs; however



numerous. . . . I cannot devise any other explanation of this disease, if I may so call it, than the discordant exercise of two brains, and the inability to stop the involuntary process of that which was disturbed.”—(Pp. 150, 151.)

The uses of the double brain are obvious. “The fact of Man being composed of two halves gradually united together, being clearly established,” the theory is “obviously in harmony with the known laws of nature. We may even show that such a combination of two distinct animals into one is not only the invariable practice, but that, little as we know of its objects, it possesses some advantages, inasmuch, for example, as that the slightest accident would otherwise disturb the whole system. There will be little difficulty in conceding that the thinking organ more especially should partake of the same duality since, but for such a precaution, the guide which is to direct all our voluntary actions would be dethroned when most needed. If the consciousness be single, it suffices to establish the individuality of the being. If it were permitted to argue a physiological and pathological question with reference to the presumed designs of Providence we might ask : “Is it likely that when each of the comparatively unimportant functions of sight and hearing is provided with two distinct organs, perfect and complete—each capable of performing its duties during the indisposition, disturbance, disease, or destruction of the other—is it probable that so pre-eminently important a function as ratiocination (a function essential to the well being and almost to the existence of the individual)—that this would have been entrusted to a single organ, so that the slightest injury would annihilate its completeness as an instrument of thought, or, as it is usually termed, a medium of communication between mind and the material world? It seems to me that all who believe in the responsibility of man must at once acquiesce in at least the strong probability of my theory ; for if a slight injury or disease could destroy the completeness of the mind, how could there be room for those struggles which

constitute the merit of a responsible agent, when the means by which he had to judge of the morality of his own action had been annihilated?—he had no longer a complete mind, and was necessarily no longer responsible. The more deeply we contemplate the structure and functions of man, as adapted to the world in which he is destined to live, the more are we struck with wonder at the implement by means of which such mighty results are produced. A slight inequality in the two brains is sufficient to produce all the varieties of character which are to be found in the world.”—(Pp. 156, 157.)

To this I will add only that the purpose of the duplex structure of the whole body, as well as of the brain, which appears to perplex Dr. WIGAN, is shown in a former chapter to be the requirement of two parents each contributing a germ, and thus it is that Providence has secured the infinite variations of individuals combined with strict preservation of the species.

Maniacal impulses to murder and suicide, so frequent in the annals of crime,—the patients describing them as a voice exciting them to kill—a devil tempting them—a power they could not resist lifting the arm and propelling the deadly blow, in spite of their better natures and after long wrestling of conscience with the foe—are explicable in like manner. One brain is disordered—insane in fact—and prompts the crime. The other brain, still sound, strives to restrain it. But in the end the abnormally excited brain obtains the mastery over the sound brain and the deed is done.

Dr. WIGAN records many instances of this. One of the most remarkable is the case of a boy, whose attachment to his brother was so intense that they could not endure separation for a day. They were sent to school together, and the elder was punished for some trifling fault. Soon afterwards his love for his brother suddenly ceased and changed to intensity of hatred, insomuch that he made repeated attempts to murder him, and otherwise exhibited such dangerous propensity to homicide that he was placed under restraint. While in this condition he fell madly in



love with an elderly lady who visited his home, and she was enabled to exercise over him the most absolute control. A word from her instantly soothed his most violent paroxysms of madness and he would then lay his head upon her lap and weep bitterly and become as gentle as a lamb. The Doctor who attended him noticed a slight depression in the skull. Seeing that recovery was hopeless, he proposed to the father, as a last chance, that he should trepan the skull at this place. It was done and on lifting the excised bone a spicula of the bone an inch long was found to have penetrated the brain at the part which the Craniologists have indicated as the seat of the organ of destructiveness. He had for a punishment been struck on the head at this part by a ruler. Immediately on the removal of this source of irritation he began to amend and in a few weeks his mania ceased, his original gentleness of character was resumed and his attachment to his brother returned with all its ancient ardour.

Here, again, we see one brain disordered by an accident that inflamed to madness one of the mental emotions. In the other sound brain the passion of love was excited to such an extent that, when called into action by the presence of the object, it subdued the abnormal excitement of the injured brain. The cure of the latter revived the normal condition of the whole brain and the balance of the mind was restored—that is to say, the two brains were enabled again to act in concert and all the mental faculties to work together in harmony.

That we have two distinct organs of thought, as we have undoubtedly two distinct and perfect brains, the experience of every reader will remind him. How often are we conscious of having what we actually express by the terms "*two minds*" in matters very trivial as well as in matters of moment. Who has not felt a conflict between his animal and his moral dictates; between inclination and prudence; between fancy and fact; between whimsical impulse and good sense? If the mind be one whole, the entire mind acting in every

mental operation, as the metaphysicians assert, and as is contended even now by Dr. CARPENTER, how are these contradictory operations possible? The *same* mind cannot be *at the same moment* wicked and good, wise and foolish. These conflicting states might be conceived as succeeding each other in time; but they are felt by all of us to be in fact simultaneous. No other rational explanation has ever been suggested than that they are the result of our being constructed with two distinct organs of mental action. This explains them perfectly.

It equally solves all the perplexing problems connected with insanity in its various phases. Monomania is no longer a mystery. The frequent instances of insane persons being conscious of their insane delusions are the obvious consequence of one brain being sound while the other brain is diseased, and probably insanity is not complete until the disease involves both brains. This state of things caused the once prevalent belief that madness was possession by an evil spirit. The contradictory expressions when the insane impulses have the mastery sometimes and reason at other times confirmed the superstition. Hence the horrible treatment to which the disease of insanity was subjected, until the advancement of science showed that insanity is only a disease of *the brain* to be treated like diseases of any other bodily organ.

Mr. SOLLY, the distinguished surgeon, in his great work, "*Physiological Inferences from Pathological Notes*," after adducing numerous cases of extensive injury to one brain (or hemisphere) with possession of the intellectual faculties, remarks that this "has also been accounted for by the phrenologists upon the principle that the mental organs are double, and that the loss of one is not therefore easily perceived; and this opinion," he adds, "*is certainly supported by the fact that there are no cases on record in which the mental faculties have remained undisturbed when the disorganisation has extended to both sides of the brain.*"

Dr. WIGAN, who was an opponent of Phrenology,



proceeds to say that "if it be true, notwithstanding the denial of some anatomists, and the consent of others, that each brain is divided into three lobes, it is probable that the three great divisions of the intellectual organs described by phrenologists are correct. It is certain that the intellectual portion of the brain does really exercise a control over the propensities, as there is clearly some degree of self-command exercised by those who have lost one cerebrum from disease. . . . The cerebellum has been taken away in slices, without interfering with the *mental* functions of the animal." He contends it to be highly improbable that disease should of necessity involve, not only both brains at the same time but the same parts of both brains, which are perfectly separated by the membrane spread between them, so that not even an artery passes from one to the other. Indeed, according to the theory of unity of the mind and brain, could the same brain be at one moment sane and the next insane? But with two unequal brains the explanation is simple and clear. Dr. WIGAN says:—

"The diseased action which produces one mode of mind in the right cerebrum may be balanced, or neutralized, or controlled by another mode of mind produced by the healthy action of the left cerebrum, which, having thus the possession of reason, can call to its aid external circumstances to resist in the government of the disordered right cerebrum, as in the cases alluded to. A healthy organ must be *cæteris paribus*, more than equal in power to a diseased one; and the wholset of mental functions moving in harmony and order like a regular army, must on ordinary occasions overpower a tumultuous mob of impulses in its fellow. When the opposing forces are in great disproportion, and the healthy brain can no longer control the unhealthy brain, the case becomes one of partial insanity or conscious delusion, or else it is absolute mania, when all self-government is lost. . . . We see one person perfectly conscious of his ungovernable impulse, and when exhausted by the physical exertion excited by his cerebral disturbance, he can reason upon and lament his extravagance; another is continually conscious that he is acting wrongly, and even during his most violent paroxysms of rage, laments and bewails his wicked impulse, and feels remorse while he is giving way to it. One man is capable of watching the vagaries of his other self, and even finds amusement in the process—

another is distressed and alarmed at the contemplation. . . . All these seem to me modifications and degrees of disorder in one brain more or less under the influence of the other, just in proportion as that other partakes or does not partake of the disease which disturbs the functions, the perceptive or effective faculties, or the reasoning power of its fellow."—Pp. 98, 99.

The conclusions from the facts and arguments so briefly sketched in this chapter may be thus stated.

The brain, like the body, is duplex, consisting of two distinct halves (or hemispheres, as they are termed) which two halves are completely separated by a dividing membrane, and are united only at the foundation on which they rest, which acts the part of a common basis and bond of union, thus securing common action.

These two hemispheres are, in fact, two complete and perfect brains.

*We have, therefore, two brains.*

The brain is the molecular organ by which all the mental processes are performed. We reason, think and feel through the mechanism of the brain, which is the molecular medium of communication between the non-molecular Conscious Self and the molecular existences with which we are associated in the present stage of being.

Having two brains, and brain being the organ of mind, we have, therefore, *two organs of mind*, each complete in itself, both nearly resembling each other, but not precisely alike.

If these two distinct organs of mind were always to act in perfect harmony, their duplication would be useless. If they differ in their action, they should present the phenomena that would result from two minds partially independent existing in the same person.

This is found to be the fact, as proved by numberless instances.

*We have, therefore, two minds, as we have two brains.*

---



## CHAPTER V.

## THE NERVE FORCE.

THE *Vital* or *Nerve Force* is diffused by the nerve system throughout the entire of the organism. A question has been raised if this force is generated at one or more of the nerve centres and thence transmitted through the nerve cords as conductors, or if it may not be produced by the nerve cord itself. Two facts, however, appear to be conclusive as to this. If a limb be severed from the body, that limb dies. If the communication between the nerve centres and any part of the structure be cut off by severance of the nerve cord, or by pressure, the part so deprived of nerve force speedily perishes. The instance of life in the severed parts of insects that has been adduced to support the suggestion of nerve vitality is not in point, for each section of the body thus preserving life has in it but one nerve centre at the least generating nerve force, so that the supply of nerve force is maintained for a very long time. If the head of a fowl be chopped off, the bird will run and fly for a considerable distance with all appearance of voluntary action. If it meets with an obstacle, it will even endeavour to surmount it. But the ganglia whence the nerve force comes that moves the muscles of the wings and legs are intact, and continue to transmit their influence until they also die from loss of blood. If they were removed before the head, the bird would instantly cease to exhibit action although, if the brain be uninjured, consciousness would continue until the brain also died from the same cause. But whether the nerve force be

generated in the brain or in some of the other ganglia is not yet certainly known. We know only that parts of the brain may be extensively injured without destroying life or apparently diminishing the vitality of the limbs. Thence it may be reasonably inferred that the ganglia at the base of the brain attached to the spinal cord are the chief, if not the sole, producers of vital or nerve force. If it be so, it is an admirable provision, for if the production of vital force had been placed under the control of the brain, it would have been subject to all the caprices and the frequent neglects of the Intelligence. By thus setting it beyond the power of the Will, its continuous action is secured, subject only to the laws of health. Hence it is that, when the brain is destroyed by disease or accident, the body is so often found to continue a purely animal existence and even to enjoy improved health when no longer subject to the disturbing influences of the mind.

I must now ask the Reader to exercise his imagination for a few minutes while I endeavour to make plain and intelligible to him certain necessary results of such a structure as he has been surveying, pervaded as it is by a self-generated force that keeps it alive and active. He must call imagination to his aid, because the condition we are about to contemplate is not perceptible by the senses. But not, therefore, is it the less real. It is, however, a condition of the greatest importance, inasmuch as it explains many hitherto inexplicable psychological phenomena and doubtless will be found hereafter to explain many more.

Because our sight can perceive nothing beyond that compacted molecular surface of the body we call the skin, we are accustomed to speak and think of ourselves and of others as being bounded by that skin. In the popular conception, that compacted form is the human being, sharply outlined as is a statue. The Man is what we see and touch—nothing more—and what we see and touch is all that constitutes the Man.

But the *fact* is otherwise. Our bodies are always



encompassed by an atmosphere of our own. Every moment of our lives emanations are pouring forth from every part of the surface of the body, filling the space immediately about it and spreading far away from it. This will be proved to you if you sit in the sunshine and look at your shadow as it falls upon the floor. Your head will then be seen to be encompassed by a halo from the light reflected from a stream of rapidly outpouring vapour. Round your body the projected waves of the atmosphere, laden with particles of which you are composed, are seen in continual dance. I have traced this efflux visibly to a distance of eighteen inches from the skin, but vastly greater must be the actual extension of this surrounding beyond what the limited vision can perceive.

Nor is this efflux of particles all that surrounds the body. There is an equally abundant influx of the impalpable and invisible materials which are attracted to the body and absorbed into it from the encompassing air. An interchange of particles is, in fact, taking place incessantly, the throng being dense at the surface of the skin and becoming less dense as the distance from that surface increases.

If the coarse molecular material of the body envelopes it thus, how much more distantly projected from the surface may we not expect to find the flow of that powerful *vital force* which is continually building, repairing and moving the entire mechanism? There is no cause to conclude that the flow of this vital force comes to a sudden stop at the extremity of the nerves conducting it. On the contrary, to produce perceptible action beyond the limit of the body it must be itself operating beyond the boundary of the body. How far this force extends we do not know, and in truth, as yet there has been no endeavour to ascertain. Dr. RICHARDSON has recognised its existence, contending that the entire body is enveloped in what he calls a *nerve aura*, projected from the body to distances that vary with various persons, probably in proportion to the

relative power of their natural nerve structure. To what further limit this nerve aura is projected we have as yet no knowledge. But there are psychical phenomena, only to be explained by such an aura of vital force, that indicate its probable extension through a space far exceeding any that has been suspected. The presence of such an aura of vital force enveloping the human frame affords an obvious solution of many of the problems of Sleep and Dream, of Somnambulism (Natural and Artificial), and of Psychism, as will be seen when these psychical phenomena come to be treated of in the next volume.

Apart, however, from these extraordinary phenomena there are facts familiar to all of us that point to the existence of some medium of communication between human minds extending beyond mere physical contact. The mind often perceives the near neighbourhood of other persons, although no sense can discover their presence. Brain action, whether for ideas or for emotions, within the experience of all of us, is often set up in another near brain without a whisper or a sign,—as it would seem, by the mere fact of neighbourhood. Sympathies and antipathies are often felt before a word is spoken, a look exchanged, or a hand grasped, no cause for them to be even conjectured, but felt as strongly as if they had grown out of long knowledge. Nor are these attractions and repulsions limited to human intercourse. The animal world is subjected to the same influences, as all have daily experience to whom is intrusted the care of dogs, horses, cows, sheep, birds and even bees. We carry with us always and everywhere an atmosphere of good or evil, of love or hate, of liking or loathing, that extends beyond our bodies, we know not how far, influencing unconsciously the minds of we know not how many.

We are referring here only to the force that gives life to the molecular structure, be it vital force or nerve force. Hereafter it will be shown that there is in us another force, whose power is greater still and its influence



vastly more extensive in range—the force exercised by the SOUL—the *Psychic Force*. This will be fully considered hereafter.

Now for that exercise of imagination to which you were invited at the beginning of this chapter.

Again ask yourself, “What am I?”

Clearly to comprehend this, in fancy disembody yourself, pass out of yourself, view yourself from afar as with the eyes of one whose larger sense is not limited to perception of molecular substance or to things of such magnitude as to impress themselves upon the human senses. Imagine yourself to possess a range of vision extending not only to the infinitely greater, but to the infinitely less, than the human senses can perceive. Think of yourself as invested with the extended powers of perception we may reasonably conjecture as attaching to the SOUL when it ceases to be dependent upon molecular structure for its perceptions and is competent to exercise the larger faculties that very probably are possessed by many other of the multitudinous combinations of atoms with which creation is thronged.

How in such case should we see ourselves?

Not, as we appear to ourselves and to others, in distinct and definite shape, solid, opaque, with hard and massive framework and soft but firmly compacted flesh inclosed in a membrane that separates this structure sharply from the surrounding world, a form as definite in outline as is a marble statue.

Instead of this, we should see a shape having no definite outline, more compact at the centres than at the extremities of the limbs, but dense only by comparison with the encompassing flesh. The most compact parts of this structure, the bones, will present themselves to the mental vision more as fluid than as solid masses, for their particles do not touch each other and are in continual motion, the materials for their own reparation and the particles that require removal passing with ease among them, coming and going, in constant influx and efflux. All the physical forces permeate and move them. Ligh

passes through them readily. The seemingly solid body is seen to be almost fluid and the opaque structure to be certainly transparent. The skin that to the eye of the body seems so perfect an envelope is now seen to be but a network through the meshes of which the organism within is continually pouring out some materials and receiving others. The entire of this structure is invested with an envelope of moving particles, some pressing to be absorbed, others retreating, and all in mazy dance. But not without a plan, for they are moving at obedience to definite law—the law of that *vital force* by which they are attracted or repelled.

This is what we should appear to a Being having other senses than we possess, or the same senses multiplied in power. Our own senses cannot exhibit this structure to us, but *we know that such it is* and that knowledge is essential to the Student of Psychology which cannot be rightly pursued without the clearest conception of these characteristics of the nerve structure and of the operation of the nerve force upon the Mechanism of Man.

To more powerful senses than our own *we* should appear very much as ghosts are supposed to appear to ourselves—unsubstantial, imperfectly outlined, translucent, vapoury. Only to our own imperfect and limited senses and the mental conceptions we derive from *them* do we appear as *solid* and *opaque*. These are but human notions, consequent upon our molecular structure. *There is neither solidity nor opacity in nature.*

---



## CHAPTER VI.

## THE SENSES.

BESIDES the communication maintained *within* the structure, by help of the nerve cords, between the brain and the structure whose motions it directs, a special contrivance was requisite for communication with the world *without*. The Will commands the hand to be raised to the head; the nerve cords convey that command to the muscles; the muscles contract accordingly; the arm is raised as desired and a message is carried back to the Intelligence that the command has been obeyed and that the limb has so moved. We are conscious that we have lifted the arm in obedience to a desire to raise it and the WILL that it should be raised. But by this command of the muscles alone we could attain to no knowledge of the world about us. Nothing of the forms, colours, sounds, motions, that are presented every moment of our lives, would be revealed to us. If we had an intellectual notion of the outer world, we should have no sensible *perception* of it. We could not communicate with it in any manner but for certain special perceptive faculties that have been bestowed upon us, admirably constructed to enable us to hold communication with the material—that is, the molecular—world around us. These special faculties are called "*the Senses*."

There are five recognised senses. The purpose of all of them is the same—to enable us to learn something of the world that is without us by conveying to us communications from that world.

The five senses are called the senses of SIGHT, HEARING, TOUCH, SMELL, and TASTE. Each of these senses communicates to the brain a distinct and peculiar impression, notifying the presence of an object which that particular sense is constructed to perceive and imparting to the Conscious Self a sensation indicated by the expression, "I see it," "I feel it," and so forth.

Each of these senses has an apparatus of its own for receiving and conveying the impressions made upon it. This apparatus is employed exclusively in carrying to the brain the impressions so made upon the sense nerve by external objects. They are not much, if at all, under the command of the Will. In a healthy condition of the body, the Will can neither prevent nor control the receipt or transmission of an impression made upon either of the senses.

These senses are precisely and perfectly adapted to receive impressions of material—that is, *molecular*—structure, and *of that structure alone*. The world about might throng with structure of some other combinations of atoms than molecules, and yet no sense could perceive them and no knowledge of their existence could be conveyed by the senses to the brain or by the brain to the Conscious Self. They would be absolutely imperceptible to us, even although as real as that which the senses actually perceive.

All that we really *know* of the connection between the impression made upon the sense and the receipt of it by the brain is, that the result follows in immediate sequence. But *how* the impression is received, or how communicated to the brain, we are wholly ignorant. For an instance. A complicated picture is actually painted upon the retina. The nerve in contact with the retina receives the impression of that picture. The other extremity of that nerve is in the brain. The impression made at the portion of the nerve that meets the eye is transmitted to the brain and there it is communicated to the Conscious Self. So far this process is not difficult to understand. But now comes the mystery. How does



the brain receive, by transmission through a nerve cord, the transcript of a varied picture, so that the whole is vividly seen by the mind's eye—that is to say, is pictured to our contemplation as it was actually painted upon the retina? Here is a problem whose perplexity only grows the more we think of it. The philosophical explanation is, that what we call “colour” is merely a mental impression produced by the beating against the optic nerve of a vast number of small waves of light, the various colours being caused by more or less rapid vibrations of these waves. These vibrations are communicated to the molecules of which the nerve is composed and by them conveyed to the brain, producing there a similar action. Of this action we are *conscious* and on feeling it we say, “I see a blue, or a yellow, or a red object,” as the case may be. But there is still a link wanting to complete the explanation. The brain receives the vibration from the molecules of the nerves; but how do *I*—the Conscious Self—receive from the brain the communication thus made? Physiology explains the former process. It is the province of *Psychology* to ascertain the latter. As yet it has failed to do so.

Each of the senses is designed to bring to us an impression of a special kind made upon us by certain portions of the external world. The sense of *Sight* conveys the colours and shapes of objects *not* in actual contact with it. The sense of *Touch* carries to us a perception of the shape and substance of things with which it *is* in contact,—or rather what we call “contact,” for, in fact, no two things ever actually touch. Sound is a peculiar sensation produced by waves of the air of different lengths impinging upon the tympanum and causing it to vibrate, the vibrations thus communicated to the molecules of the nerve being carried to the brain, in like manner as with the waves of light. *Smell* and *Taste* are sensations excited by the impinging of extremely minute particles of matter upon the appropriate nerves.

The function of each sense is distinct, with the possible exception of *Taste* and *Smell*, which have something in common and are very closely associated. Each sense conveys to the brain a different class of impressions. No sound will carry to the mind an accurate conception of an object of sight. Neither *Taste* nor *Smell* gives to us any notion of the form or colour of the thing that causes the sensation. *Touch* cannot tell the hue, the scent, the taste, nor the relationship of the thing touched to other things not in contact with the nerve. It is impossible that a person wanting either of the senses can enjoy as accurate an intelligence of the existences external to himself as he who possesses all his senses. No cultivation of the other senses can altogether compensate for the absence of any one sense; the patient must ever be an imperfectly developed human being. Education of the remaining senses may do much to improve his condition, but

“Wisdom at one entrance quite shut out,”

the mind remains in partial darkness, the conceptions of the external world are defective and the Intelligence is restricted accordingly.

If one could conceive of a man coming into the world deprived of all the five senses, what sort of a creature would he be?

Without raising the vexed question of innate ideas, it may be affirmed that his Intelligence would be a perfect blank. No communication could come to him from any person or thing external to himself and he would be unable to impart his thoughts and sensations, if he had any, to others. He would move merely as a machine, urged by impulses from within to a limited series of actions, but wholly wanting in the materials requisite for reflection or for fancy.

Give to such a being but one sense and instantly subject matter is supplied for the Intelligence to employ itself withal. Restricted though the range of his knowledge must be, still it is an immeasurable advance



from the previous blank. If this gift be *Touch*, he receives ideas of form with which to exercise memory, reason and imagination. If it be *Sight*, what a world of wonders has opened to him! If two Senses be bestowed upon him, how will his knowledge expand! If three, if all, be imparted successively, what words could adequately describe the increase of his enjoyments, the growth of his intelligence, the store of material for infinite combination of thought thus supplied from so many sources with the knowledge necessary to the expansion of the mind within and the extension of its acquaintance with the world without.

But these five Senses can carry to us perceptions of a very small portion indeed of the Creation that is external to ourselves. We know how large an amount of intelligence is lost to us by the deprivation of any one of the senses, and we may, to some extent, measure by this the amount of intelligence that would be added by the addition of another sense. There is no reason whatever to suppose that no other sense exists in Creation, or in the animal world about us, or even in ourselves, than the five with which Man is admitted to be endowed. It may well be, and hereafter I shall endeavour to show it to be probable, that the animal world possesses one or more senses that Man has not, or which are latent in him, reduced to mere rudiments save in certain exceptional cases where they seem to crop out under abnormal conditions. It is equally impossible to assign a limit to the number of senses that may be gradually expanded in Man, if there be truth in the Darwinian theory of perpetual development and progress.

On the other hand, it must in candour be admitted that we have no positive assurance of a direct relationship between our senses and the external Creation as it is in reality. Our knowledge of the outward world is conditional only and the conditions are in ourselves. Impair one of the nerves that carry the impressions of the senses and quite a wrongful idea of the object would be

imparted to us. We cannot even be sure that any two human beings receive precisely similar impressions from the same object. Noting this, some Philosophers have gravely argued that each individual man is his own world, his conceptions being such only as he derives from his senses, which are admitted to be very fallible. In truth he receives an idea only and not a fact. The argument cannot be answered for lack of positive proof. But the doubt is of no practical importance to us. All of us agree in thinking and acting in relation to ourselves as to others in the confident assurance that our Senses tell us truly and that there *are* other things than *ideas*. No philosopher maintaining the doctrine in argument would dare to act on his own theory.

At all events, for the purposes of the present enquiry I shall assume that there is in Nature a world external to ourselves, of which when in health our senses give us tolerably correct impressions, but with an admitted liability to error which should teach us to be cautious in receiving, and extremely careful in testing, the evidence of the senses.

Besides these five senses by which we are informed of some portion of the world without us, there are two senses that give information to the Man through the brain of what is going on in the machine of which the brain is the director.

These are the senses of "PLEASURE" and "PAIN."

When all goes well with the machinery there is a sense of calm and continuous satisfaction very different from that vivid enjoyment to which the name of *Pleasure* is given by the unreflecting. This sense of satisfaction results, not alone from the healthy performance of all the vital functions, but also from the exercise of all the faculties of mind as well as body. The active use of the limbs is pleasure. So is the moderate indulgence of every mental emotion, of every intellectual faculty. Mere existence, if unattended with pain, is a positive pleasure. Death is never desired, save as an escape from pain, mental or bodily.



The Sense of PAIN is the consciousness of something going wrong in the machinery of the body. The obvious purpose of this sense is to give warning to the Intelligence of the presence of the mischief, that it may direct its attention to the removal of the cause. But for the notice so given, and the check imposed by pain upon heedlessness, the human machine would speedily fall out of gear and dissolution would occur before it could be known that any part of it was damaged. True, that the amount of *pain* is not always proportioned to the amount of injury it notifies. Of the reason for this irregularity we are at present wholly ignorant; but it may be affirmed that pain is never present without the presence also of some mischief in the structure. If we took more heed to these warnings of *pain*, and were better instructed as to what they indicated and how we should proceed to remove the offending cause, the health, and consequently the happiness, of mankind might be indefinitely improved. It is neither needful nor possible that every person should master the science of Physiology; but all might learn enough of their own structure, of the functions of its various organs and of the general laws of health to which these are subjected, to know how best to keep themselves healthy and to restore health when injury has been inflicted.

*Pain* (I am treating now of bodily pain only) has three marked distinctions, known to every reader as the *ache*, the *smart*, and the *spasm*. The character of each cannot be described in words, but it will be at once recognised by the reader. *Ache* appears to be produced by *pressure* upon a nerve; *smart* by *severance* of a nerve; *spasm* by abnormal *irritation* of a nerve, producing involuntary contraction of the muscles with which it is connected. Of these the hardest to bear is an *ache* because it is continuous and there is no relief but removal of the pressure that is its cause. *Smart* and *spasm* are more severe during the paroxysm, but usually there are intervals of cessation which, if but momentary, make

them more tolerable than the wearying agony of a continuous ache.

But it will be necessary to look somewhat more closely into the office and action of the Senses and therefore we will proceed now to examine each one of them separately.

---



## CHAPTER VII.

## THE SENSE OF SIGHT.

By the sense of *Sight* we obtain the most extensive knowledge of the world without us. Our perceptions of sound are limited to vastly lesser distances than our perceptions of the objects of vision. The sense of *hearing* is restricted in its range, receiving and distinguishing a far less number of impressions in the same period of time. The senses of *smell* and *taste* are still more limited than that of hearing, and the sense of *touch* is very nearly, if not quite, confined to that which is in contact with us.

The *eye* is the external organ by whose aid the sensation is produced to which the name of *Sight* has been given. All we *know* of this organ is, that the rays of light pass into its centre, where lies a lens behind which a small screen is spread upon whose surface the objects from which those rays of light proceeded are depicted in miniature. From this screen a nerve cord runs to the brain, uniting the screen at one end with the Intelligence at the other. By this nerve the impressions made upon the screen are carried to the brain, probably by motion communicated to the molecules of the nerve, each colour and shade of colour (as is surmised, for we do not positively *know*) producing a different rate of motion of the molecules and consequently a different series of impressions upon the brain. It is to the *sensations* caused by these various motions that we give the names of the various colours and forms. Hence it is that we do not really perceive the object itself. All that

the *mind* perceives is a variety of sensations caused by the impressions made by the picture on the retina. Experience alone informs us that the picture so painted there is an image of objects actually existing without us.

This, briefly stated, is the outline of the process by which we obtain our knowledge of so much of the world outside ourselves as comes within the radius of the eye and is cast upon its screen.

Whatever impedes the action of any part of this apparatus limits to that extent the power of the sense of Sight. If the lens be dimmed, the objects are imperfectly painted on the screen. If the screen be faulty, no picture at all, or but a partial one, or a distorted one, is painted upon it. If the nerve be impaired, it will cease to carry the impressions from the screen to the brain. If the brain be disordered, it will fail to receive the impressions from the conducting nerve or to communicate them to the Conscious Self.

When we say that "we *see*" an object, what do we intend by the expression?

We thereby affirm, not only that there is existing without us something that is capable of being perceived, but our belief that the object is in fact that which it appears to us to be. We *know* it to be because we *see* it.

But, although there is the very strongest presumption that the impression upon the Intelligence within is a reflex of the actual without, it is yet necessary to correct conceptions of Psychology that we should keep clearly in our minds the truth, that this correspondence between the images within us and the world without us is only conjectural and neither proved nor capable of proof. We suppose we *see* the stars. In truth we do nothing of the kind. All we can positively assert is, that a certain impression is made upon the Intelligence by a series of motions of the molecules of the nerves and the brain, which motions produce the sensations we call roundness, light and colour, and to which group of sensations we have given the name of "star." We are compelled to believe that the impression upon the mind thus made corresponds with some



external object, and our own innate belief in the reality of that which causes the sensation is confirmed when we find that other persons, turning their eyes towards the same spot, receive impressions which they describe as precisely resembling our own.

The brain procures the greater portion of its knowledge of the external world through the eye. But if that organ, or the nerve that links it with the brain, be disordered, faulty or even wholly false impressions may be made upon the nerve, or right impressions on the eye may be wrongly carried to the brain which may thus receive impressions never painted on the retina and give to the Conscious Self information that has no corresponding reality in the external world. The same result would follow from a disordered brain, which might receive right impressions from the optic nerve but convey those impressions distorted and disguised to the Conscious Self.

Although it is right and necessary to recognise the fact that the sense of sight does not of itself prove the existence of an external world, nevertheless, the information it conveys raises the strongest presumption of the reality of a creation other than ourselves, and of its correspondence, so far as *sight* extends, with the impressions brought by that sense. At all events, we are constrained to accept the conclusion and to act upon it, and it suffices for every practical purpose of our existence to act and think in the implicit belief and confidence that there *are* things without us answering to the impressions made within us.

To some extent this conclusion is confirmed by the other senses. For instance, the eye pictures a gun; the ear receives the impression of a sound when the image on the retina exhibits this gun as held in a certain position and handled in a certain manner. If the hand be touching it at the time when the image is seen and sound heard, it feels a blow, and the nose speedily receives the sensation of a powerful odour. Thus all these various impressions upon different senses, being imparted by one object, add to the conviction that it is a real

object, which is further confirmed by the fact that every other person being as near to it as ourselves has received similar impressions upon all of his senses.

But here again arises a curious problem, which I briefly notice that the reader may be conscious of the magnitude of the questions involved in the science of Psychology rather than with any hope to solve it. Is it certain that, although we all agree in calling the thing that makes a certain impress upon the sense of sight "a gun," and the noise made on its discharge "an explosion," that the impression conveyed to the mind of each of the spectators is precisely the same? May it not be that my conception of the gun may differ much from your conception of it? Again, if our conceptions of the gun be the same, have we assurance that these conceptions of it resemble the external object? This difficulty lies at the foundation of the famous philosophy, so wrongly attributed to BERKELEY, which disputes the proof, although probably not intending to deny the fact, of the existence of an external world. BERKELEY did not go so far as to assert in fact that there was no existence outside ourselves, nothing actual but the contemplating Mind. He contended only that we have no positive *proof* of the being of external existences, inasmuch as all the intelligence we have or can have of them is *an idea*, which may or may not resemble something external to us. When we say we see a star we are not speaking accurately. All *the mind* perceives is an impression brought to it by the nerves of vision, causing a sensation to which the name of light has been given and presenting certain conditions as to shape, size, colour and such like, which combination we call "a star." There can be no reasonable doubt that, in truth, the object resembles the impression of it; but it is necessary to keep the distinction clearly in view, because the mind continually has sensations without corresponding external objects to produce them, and we should fall into serious scientific and practical errors if we were to assume an invariable correspondence between the mental impression and an



external object. It is very questionable indeed if ever we obtain perfectly accurate impressions of external objects through any of our senses; not merely because of their imperfection, but by reason of the modification those impressions receive through the operation of the mind in the very act of receiving them. But this has more of speculative than of practical interest. Our knowledge of things as our senses present them to us is sufficient for all the uses of life. It would be a needless perplexity to concern ourselves about the actuality of the objects of which the mind receives the impression. The correspondence is accurate enough to be the foundation of action and of thought. Although we sometimes find ourselves misled by our senses, in the vast majority of cases they report truly.

But while we generally accept the evidence of the senses as proof of the facts they report, it is necessary to recognise fully and frankly the limitation of the trust we are entitled to place in them. For scientific purposes especially, we must ever keep clearly before us the truth, not only that our perceptions of the external world are limited to that which the senses convey to us, but that the senses themselves are subject to deception from many causes. Therefore, we have no right to say of anything that it does not exist merely because our senses do not perceive it, or to assert of anything that it is as it appears to us to be, merely because the senses so present it to us. In the business of life we continually discover that we have been deceived by our senses, and Science can scarcely take a step in any direction without learning that what our senses do or can perceive by any cultivation of their powers, even with all the aids of mechanical art, is but an infinitely small fraction of the existence that encompasses us. What we can ever know through the medium of the senses is but as a grain of sand to the sun itself in comparison with what the senses *cannot* bring to us. It has been truly said that "Our knowledge is but a molehill compared with the mountain of our ignorance." Since that saying was sent forth our

knowledge has extended a thousandfold ; but only to teach us more and more how little we really know. And the more we *learn* the less we shall *know*.

The foundation of all accurate conception of psychological as well as of physiological science is a clear understanding of the fact that our perceptions, in the normal condition of existence, are confined to the operations of the senses and that those operations are extremely limited in direction and extent and subject to many aberrations in the course of the conveyance of the impression from the object to the brain.

These remarks apply to all the senses equally with the sense of sight. Having stated them here, it will not be necessary to repeat them hereafter.

Whether all see the same forms, or if there be with some persons the same in capacity to perceive certain shapes as undoubtedly is found in many persons in relation to certain colours, is problematical. It is remarkable that the fact of colour-blindness, as it is termed, has been but lately discovered, although it must have been coeval with the human eye. A defect existing for ages in a considerable percentage of civilised men has escaped detection either by the patients or by others. The reason of this is plain and forcibly illustrates the preceding remarks on the liability of the senses to error. A person having colour blindness sees red as yellow, or *vice versâ*. Red and yellow are only names given to certain mental impressions caused by the striking of a certain number of rays of reflected light upon the eye curtain and thence carried by the nerve of vision to the brain. The striking of so many of these waves upon the retina in a second of time causes a *sensation* which we call yellow. Colour is not a thing existing in the object seen, but a *sensation* merely. If there were no eye there would be no colour. To an eye or a brain constructed to feel the same sensations by a different series of waves of reflected light the colours would not be what they now are. That which is now yellow would be then green, or red,



as the case might be, and colours now unknown to us would be recognised by an organ framed to perceive a series of waves differing from those the human eye perceives. It is readily conceivable that beings may exist who can perceive sound by the eye and colour by the ear. To other beings differently constructed, having only an imperceptible change in the formation of a nerve cord, there may be no such thing as colour, or colours may be altogether different from that they appear to us. The reflected rays of light might cause to them sensations quite unlike those that are conveyed to our consciousness. Colour is not in the object of vision. What we so call is merely a *sensation*, caused by the beating of the waves of light upon the nerve that passes from the eye to the brain. All that is actually possessed by an object we call "coloured" is a surface whose particles are so arranged that they reflect some one or more of the rays whose union is "light." The waves of these reflected rays entering the eye excite mental *sensations* varying with the number of the waves. These sensations we call "colours," and to each variety of sensation we give the name of a particular colour. Therefore it is that not only can we *not* be assured that the same rays produce the same sensations in all human beings, so that all see the same colours, but it is possible and even probable that animals have perceptions of colour quite other than ourselves, and that what appears to be green or yellow to us may appear to a bird or a butterfly to be of a hue entirely different, or may excite quite a different sensation, or even be the subject of a different sense. Colour blindness, which changes certain colours to the perceptions of the patient, or wholly extinguishes the sense of certain hues, teaches us practically how very slight an alteration in the structure or in the function of the eye, the nerves, or the brain, would suffice to change the entire aspect of so much of the external world as is presented to the sense of sight.

Bearing this in your mind, you will form a clear conception of the capacity and limit of the sense of sight.

It receives and conveys to the brain certain impressions made upon the optic nerve by the waves of light coming from objects within the circle of space presented to the eye. If the rays of light are intercepted, or if none are reflected from the object, there is what we call "darkness." If the object reflects waves of light and is surrounded by darkness, we perceive the *shape* of the object. If the surface of the object reflects a uniform series of similar waves, the nerve imparts to the brain a certain sensation we call a "colour." If different parts of the surface of the object reflect waves of light having a diversity of size and speed, each variety of wave, striking upon the optic nerve, causes a difference of impression to be carried to the brain. That difference in the sensation occasioned by the impact of the waves of light produces what we call different colours. The sense does not perceive the object itself, as we suppose, but only the picture of the object as painted on the retina. There is the very strongest presumption that the picture upon the retina is a representation of a real object, and that the intelligence of its form and hue carried to the brain by the optic nerve corresponds with the actual condition of the object. But it must also be remembered that the impression made upon the brain by the sense of sight cannot be relied upon at all times. Forms and colours are frequently there impressed without any corresponding external object. No sense is more subject to be thus imposed upon than the sense of sight. In certain well known conditions the brain creates shapes which it is unable to distinguish from external objects. As will be seen hereafter, it has a tendency to project without itself the ideal forms that exist only within itself, and to look upon "the air drawn dagger," which is in fact but "a vision of the mind," as an object having a real external existence.

It is by no means certain, however, that the Conscious Self is incapable of receiving the forms and hues of external objects through some other medium than the organ of sight—a question that will come to be considered hereafter.



## CHAPTER VIII.

## THE SENSE OF HEARING.

As the sense of sight perceives the waves of light (or that condition of the ether which we call light), so the sense of hearing perceives the waves of the atmosphere when set in motion at certain rates of speed. To the sensation thus excited in the brain the name of SOUND is given.

The apparatus by which this sense operates somewhat resembles that employed for conveying the perceptions of the sense of sight. A special organ is devoted to it. There is a hole through which the atmospheric waves pass to a membrane stretched so as to be sensitive to the slightest impact. Behind this membrane is a nerve that conveys to the brain the impressions thus made upon it by the waves of the atmosphere and those impressions create in the Conscious Self the sensation we call "hearing."

Sound, like colour, is not something that has a positive existence apart from ourselves. It is merely a *sensation*. If no ear existed, or if no nerve were constructed for the purpose of communicating the motions of the air to the brain, the disturbance we term "Sound" would be no more than any other motion of air. The ear responds only to certain waves and combinations of waves. There may be other ears framed to receive other waves of sound that are imperceptible to us. As the size and intervals of the waves of the ever restless atmosphere are countless, it is not merely possible, but probable, that other animals have very different perceptions of sound, may hear sounds that are inaudible

to us and be deaf to sounds we hear. We know that with ourselves, in certain abnormal conditions of the brain, sounds are painfully audible which in health are imperceptible and distant sounds are often heard by sensitives when far beyond the normal range of the sense of hearing.

This sense yields to us the pleasure of *harmony*—which is the combination of waves of atmosphere of equal size; the pleasure of *melody*, which is the succession at measured distances of waves moving in exact sequence; and the pain of *discords*, which are the clashing of waves that do not follow in orderly succession. To this sense we owe the existence of *music*, whose various notes are only various waves of the atmosphere set in motion by the instrument. These beat upon the drum of the ear and the motion is conveyed thence by the auric nerve to the brain centre. There the motion is perceived by the Conscious Self, and translated into the sensation we call a *sound*.

There is no reason to suppose that music, at least as we know it, exists out of ourselves. It is not in the atmosphere. It is not in the flute. It is not in every ear, but in those ears only that are constructed with a certain delicate mechanism for perception of motions of the waves of the atmosphere. If the ear cannot, the mind does not, perceive them. A deaf mute, so born, has no sense of music. He can feel a certain pleasure in the regular beat of the vibrations in the woodwork of the pianoforte when the strings are played upon, and which vibrations he *feels* by the touch. Notions of *time* are thus conveyed to him but not of *tune*. An ear that could not perceive these waves of sound could have no conception of music. An ear constructed to perceive other waves or combinations of waves would have quite other notions of music. That which is music to our ears would be discord to that ear, and *vice versâ*.

This is much less assurance of the existence of an external object as its cause in the case of sound than in the case of sight. It is a sense far more subject to



delusion, although its range is vastly more restricted. Nevertheless, we are dependent upon it for a considerable portion of our pleasure. But for this sense the intercourse of mind with mind would be grievously restricted, as is painfully witnessed in the case of the deaf mute. Moreover, it contributes greatly to our safety by giving us warning of the approach of things that might be hurtful to us. Deafness is said to be a greater affliction than blindness.

## CHAPTER IX.

## THE SENSES OF TASTE AND SMELL.

I TREAT of these senses together because, if they are not identical, as some physiologists have held, they are very nearly allied. The connection between them is such that if the sense of *smell* is from any cause suspended the sense of taste is always more or less affected. If the nostrils are mechanically closed, the sense of taste is almost completely paralysed, a condition of which advantage is often taken for the administration of a nauseous medicine. In catarrh, when the power of smelling is extinguished, the capacity for taste is commonly extinguished also, although the membrane strained over the nerve that receives the sapid particles may be wholly unaffected by the inflammation. But whether they be two separate senses, or one sense, the manner of their operation resembles that of sight and hearing. There is a membrane that receives the impression made by the subject matter to be perceived. Behind this membrane is a branching nerve which conveys that impression to the brain. That impression excites in the Self a peculiar sensation. To this sensation we have given the name of *Taste*.

So it is with the sense of *Smell*.

But there is between them an important difference. The senses of sight and hearing do not directly receive the impression of the object itself, but only that of the waves of ether and of air that flow from the object. The senses of taste and smell receive the impression of the object of their perception immediately by seeming contact.



This may appear inconsistent with the fact that we can perceive both the odour and savour of objects without actual contact. But, in truth, what these senses perceive are particles emanating from the object; whereas the senses of sight and hearing perceive nothing more than motions of the atmosphere by which they are enveloped. For instance, a pineapple is placed upon the table: waves of light are reflected from its surface and beat upon the eye and through the nerve the brain receives certain impressions which are called 'forms' and 'colours.' Particles infinitely small and infinitely numerous escape from the fruit and permeate the atmosphere of the room. As we breathe, some of these particles pass with the air into the nostril and fall upon the mucous membrane. Their presence at once agitates the nerve. The molecules that compose the nerve are set in motion and carry the impression to the brain. A sensation is there thus excited which we call *Smell*, and we say "I *smell* a pineapple." If the fruit be cut and a slice of it placed in the mouth, particles of the juice pass over the membrane behind which is the nerve that carries the impression of them to the brain and we say, "I *taste* a pineapple."

With these as with the other senses we have no certain knowledge if the scent or flavour is in the external objects or only in ourselves. It may well be that the sensations produced in ourselves and in other animals are different. That which gives pleasure to us may be disagreeable to them, or the reverse. Indeed there is some evidence that so it is. Many animals, and especially dogs, manifestly luxuriate in odours that are nauseous to us and are as eager to besmear their coats with matter most offensive to our nostrils as we are to use the most delicate perfumes.

In contemplating the senses and their operations, as in all study of the facts of Nature and the laws that rule them, we must keep steadily before us the remembrance, already inculcated (but which cannot be too often repeated) that nothing in the Universe within the circle

of our observation, not even our own bodies, is *solid*, in the commonly received understanding of that term. We must never for a moment forget that all things about us, equally with ourselves, are only agglomerations of atoms not in actual contact. Between every one of these atoms there is a space, about and through which the Forces of the Universe are for ever passing and upon which they are for ever vigorously operating. When I say that the particles of the pineapple touch the membrane above the nerve that gives us the pleasurable sense of Taste, it must be carefully noted that these particles do not actually touch the nerve, but only approach it nearly. *Nothing touches.*

The Senses of *Taste* and *Smell* are strictly limited to impressions of flavour and scent. They give to us no perception whatever of form, colour or texture. They have special functions to convey to us intelligence of a special kind. They inform us of certain qualities of objects of which the other senses can make known to us only the form and hue; and the qualities they so make known are necessary to enable us to select our food, —obviously the primary purpose of these senses.

---



## CHAPTER X.

## THE SENSE OF TOUCH.

TOUCH is the most limited of the senses in its range. The senses of sight and hearing perceive distant objects. The senses of taste and smell perceive particles passing from an object even if far off. The *Touch* takes cognizance of that only which is in actual contact with the body.

Here, again, I must caution the Reader against misconception of the meaning of the term "contact." He must not forget that this word is only a conventional phrase, implying nothing more than *very near*. In fact, there is *no* actual *contact* between the human form and any material of the world in which it dwells, as there is none between the molecules of which that form is constructed. All that occurs when we "touch" something, or something "touches" us, is that this something is brought so near to us that action is excited in a certain nerve; that is to say, the molecules of the nerve are set in motion, the motion is communicated from one molecule to another and ultimately to the brain, which imparts to our consciousness what we recognise as a *sensation*. But in what manner, or through what medium, the near presence of the object of touch sets the nerve in motion we have as yet no knowledge. It is highly probable that nerve force is the operator. But that is only conjecture; it is not *proved*. The fact, however, which alone I am desirous to convey distinctly to the mind of the Reader, inasmuch as it is essential to a clear conception of every

other psychological and physiological fact, is this—that there is no *real* contact, even where the sense of *touch* is operating.

The apparatus by which we exercise this sense is very similar to that employed by the other senses. There is a membrane that first receives the impression of the near object. Behind that membrane lies a nerve, or plexus of nerves, carrying to the brain, through the nerve system, the impression made upon the membrane. The motion brought by the nerve excites an action in the recipient brain. That action of the brain causes the Conscious Self to feel the sensation which we call the *sense of touch*.

This sense takes cognizance of shape and substance only. All that it really recognises is a certain amount of resistance operating within the surface of contact. This informs us of the outline of shapes, while different degrees of pressure within that space inform us of the nature of the substance, as whether it is rough or smooth, hard or soft. By the degrees of resistance in the body touched we measure its solidity or fluidity, while the limits of that resistance inform us imperfectly of its shape. If the object is larger than the extent of the surface of the nerve threads in contact with it, no intelligence as to external shape is conveyed, but only if it be round or flat, smooth or rough, soft or hard, at the point of contact. These qualities of the bodies we touch are presented to us by the various degrees of pressure produced by every sensible variation of the surface touched, each of which excites in us a distinct sensation. To each of these sensations we have given a name. But we have transferred the sensation to the object and instead of saying, as the fact is, "I feel a sensation here which I call hardness," and so forth, we say, "This stone is hard," "This pillow is soft." In scientifically viewing the other senses, so in contemplating this, we must bear in mind that our knowledge is of the *sensation* merely. There is no positive *proof* that such a corresponding external object actually exists, or that it is impressed by the sense upon



the brain. But, although positive *proof* is wanting, there is no substantial reason to doubt that the object answers to the sensation. It is necessary for scientific accuracy that the absence of actual proof should be recognised, for, if it be forgotten, the door is opened to many errors. For all practical purposes we may—indeed we *must*—accept external existence as being like that which is impressed through the senses upon our consciousness and treat the sensations as *facts* for common sense to recognise, although Philosophers amuse themselves by disputing them.

## CHAPTER XI.

## THE EVIDENCE OF THE SENSES.

THE caution inculcated in the preceding chapters is necessary, if only to make us vigilant over the extent of reliance we place upon the intelligence brought by the senses and that we may understand clearly the relative value of mental and sensual testimony. The brief sketches here given of the manner of the operation and the range of the functions of the senses will show what is their liability to be deceived and how carefully we should examine and test the evidence they bring to us. It is not enough to say "I saw it," "I heard it," "I felt it." Eye, ear and touch may be deceived. The nerve may convey a wrong impression, as when a marble is rolled between crossed fingers. The connection between the nerve and the brain may be imperfect and then the message will be wrongly delivered. The brain may be disordered and receive the message wrongly, or the communication between the brain and the Conscious Self may be more or less interrupted and then only partial information will be given. The Intelligence, in short, may disguise or mis-report the information brought by the senses. But the evidence of the senses is not therefore to be rejected. It is required of us only that in any question of importance the reports brought by the senses should be tried by sufficient tests before they are accepted as *probably* true; in all cases before they are treated as *indisputably* true.

And here may be appropriately introduced a few



remarks in reference to this hotly contested question of the assumed fallibility of the senses, of which so much irrational use has been made alike by the assertors and the opponents of new or strange facts. Let us endeavour to ascertain what reliance we may reasonably place upon the intelligence conveyed to us by our senses. May we put *any* trust in them? May we trust them *implicitly*? What is the *value* of their evidence? May Science wisely reject their testimony when seemingly opposed to its own theories? Is Science bound to accept a sense as a witness? Is a Scientist entitled, upon argument alone, to pronounce judgment against the evidence of the senses as to the existence of a fact, or may he reasonably contest a fact, asserted by credible witnesses, by any other process than disproof by actual trial and test?

The answers to these important and interesting questions mainly depend upon the view we adopt of the relative value of sensual and mental impressions. Beyond doubt, both are extensively liable to be deceived. The Senses suffer from insufficient power, from imperfect conditions, from defects in their own mechanism. They may not receive the impression rightly. They may not convey it rightly to the brain. The brain itself may wrongly receive a right impression or wrongly conceive what it rightly receives. Mind is subject to at least equal causes of error. The senses, however, have this great advantage over the mind, *that their evidence is capable of confirmation*, which that of the mind is *not*. The senses of any one person are so liable to err that it would be impossible to accept as thereby *proved* anything that one person only asserts that he has seen, heard or felt, without some corroboration by other circumstances. He can truly assert of himself no more than this, that on his *mind* there was an impression which seemed to him to have been conveyed by the eye, the ear or the finger. He knows not, and he cannot know, by his Intelligence alone, that these mental impressions were not creations of his mind which no sense had brought to him. The Conscious Self has a natural tendency to

project, as it were, its ideas out of itself, and to contemplate as an external and independent object that which was but a mental vision conjured by itself within itself; as may be recognised in the act of dreaming, where the pictures wrought in the brain always present themselves to, and are accepted by, the Conscious Self as external objects the impressions of which were brought to it by the senses.

But, fortunately for the progress of human knowledge, there is a test of truth applicable to the messages conveyed by the senses which, although not absolutely perfect, is so nearly perfect that for every practical purpose we are justified in accepting as true the messages so brought, and acting accordingly. The senses of any one man may be deceived as to the existence of the external object. It may be only a mental image, or a false impression upon the sense, or a real impression wrongly conveyed by the sense to the brain or by the brain wrongly delivered to the Conscious Self. But if *two persons* receive a like mental impression of the same object as existing without them at the same time and in the same place, the probability that such an object exists becomes as cogent as is the improbability that two persons should have precisely the same defect in brain, nerve, or sense, showing itself in the same manner at the same moment. This improbability is multiplied enormously if *three* persons have the same perception simultaneously. The weight of evidence increases in geometrical ratio with every added witness. If, for instance, B. declared that he saw the spirit of a dead friend at such a time, in such a place. This would be no proof whatever that B. did with his eyes *see* such a spirit. Let him be ever so trustworthy a man, his evidence would be almost worthless, because of the impossibility of proof that it was not a vision of the mind or a deceit of the senses. But if two persons, not communicating their thoughts at the instant, see precisely the same form, in precisely the same place, at precisely the same moment, it would be very potent evidence indeed that



they did see *some form*, although it would be *no* evidence that the form so seen was a ghost. If four or six had also seen the like object under the like conditions, without anything that could be deemed mutual suggestion, the evidence would be conclusive of the fact that *something* was visible—so far, at least, as any human testimony can be accepted.

The senses, therefore, although very untrustworthy witnesses individually, are the most trustworthy, indeed the only reliable, witnesses collectively. Not only are they reliable when we have the accumulated testimony of the senses of many persons, but they have considerable value in giving verity to each other. One sense may be brought in aid of another and that which was dubious on the testimony of one sense may become reliable on the added information of one or more of the other senses, until it becomes positive *proof*, and may claim acceptance as a *truth*. The eye may deceive us as to the existence of some form seen in a dim light; but if the hand comes to the aid of the eye, and a form is felt as well as seen, the proof of the presence of a form is greatly increased. If to this be added the testimony of the ear that it heard the form speak when the eye had seen and the hand had felt it, the proof becomes very powerful. It is overwhelming if two or three persons had experienced the same sense impressions at the same time.

It is otherwise with impressions on the *mind* not presently conveyed to it by the senses. The most intelligent man has no proof whatever that his mind is representing to him truly the world without himself, other than as his senses give him information of it, confirmed and corrected by the senses of other persons. It is the favourite but most fallacious assertion of some Scientists that the evidence of the senses is of little worth and not to be accepted if it appears to be in opposition to some previously pronounced verdict of the mind. The truth is the very reverse of this. *The conclusions of the mind as to the existence or non-existence of a substantive fact are of little worth unless confirmed by the senses.* The ultimate

appeal must always be from the MIND to the FACT, and the fact can be ascertained only by the senses. The ingenuity of the Intelligence may exercise itself for ever in arguing that this or that thing can or *cannot* be. The question must come back at last to this—Is it? To the inversion of the relative worth of abstract argument (based upon inner consciousness or assumption that certain cherished principles are absolutely true) and of the testimony of the senses, must be ascribed the slow growth, in the ages past, of knowledge that never advanced beyond the narrow bounds of argument based upon introvision and self-consciousness. As soon as men began to free their minds from these self-imposed fetters and dared to pass out of themselves into the boundless regions of creation lying beyond themselves,—when they had learned to employ their *senses* in making search for *facts*, without permitting their minds to be chained by preconceptions and their views coloured by pre-judgments—knowledge made that great bound onwards and is advancing now with ever increasing speed.

Strange it is, and sad as strange, that with this proof before them of the relative importance of *sense* and *intellect*, of fact and theory, so many of our modern Scientists should be found still cleaving to the old discarded folly of making their own mental conceptions the test of truth, not only rejecting facts that do not square with their theories, but refusing even to inquire and investigate, contending that asserted facts are not facts because, according to their preconceived notions, such a fact is impossible. What is this unphilosophical folly but a tacit assumption of infallibility? Common sense as well as experience should teach them that the course of wisdom is to deal with a *fact*, asserted by credible witnesses, by bringing to it careful investigation, with patient trial and test, and thus to ascertain if it be a *fact* or a *fallacy*. If it be found to be A FACT, then it is their business to make that fact square, as assuredly it will, with the other facts of Nature. It is the duty of an honest



truth-seeker to mould his own theory, as best he may, to new facts found. Unhappily for the cause of science, this appears to be too severe a toil, or perhaps is thought to be too humiliating a confession, for philosophers who claim omniscience and infallibility. So they go on obstructing, instead of promoting, the progress of all knowledge that happens to be in discord with their assumptions.

It is sad to see learned Professors of Physical Science, exhibiting this dogmatism, more odious in them than the dogmatism they so lavishly charge upon the Professors of Theology. The history of Science is one long record of the impossibilities of one year becoming the accomplished work of another year; of the *rejected* facts of to-day received as the *accepted* truths of to-morrow.

The prevention of this error is to be found in a clear recognition of the relative values of the evidence of the *senses* and of the *mind* which it has been the purpose of this chapter briefly to define.

Only by strict observance of these principles of *evidence* can TRUTH be sought and found.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

## THE MOLECULAR STRUCTURE OF MIND.

THE Mechanism of the Body is moved and its motions are directed by *the brain*.

That brain is a marvellous mechanism, of whose structure, the uses of its various parts and the manner of its action, we have as yet but very imperfect knowledge (or to put it more truly), we are in almost entire ignorance. Our most advanced Physiologists are at this moment in disagreement if the brain be a homogeneous whole, acting as a whole for the production of every thought or emotion, or if it be structured of parts having distinct functions. Nevertheless, it is upon the determination of this question that the foundations of mental science must ultimately rest.

But this much is certain. It is through the agency of the mechanism of the brain that all the operations we term *mental* are conducted. Thus *the brain is certainly the organ of mind*.

Perhaps it would be more correct to say that brain and mind are one. But the meaning of such an assertion would probably be misunderstood by the majority of readers who, misled by the popular confusion of the terms "*mind*" and "*soul*," and accustomed to employ those terms indiscriminately to express the conception of the individual Man, might hastily conclude that, by calling the brain the mind, I am asserting intelligence and consciousness to be—as Professor HUXLEY declares and Professor TYNDALL implies—no other than a function of bodily structure perishing and passing away with that structure. The contention of this treatise is that there



is *both* Mind and Soul; that what we call *Mind* is but the collective name given to the aggregate of the various actions of the brain. But brain is not the prime motor but only the molecular agent by which the Conscious Self—the *something* that is other than the molecular body with which it is invested—maintains its communication with the molecularly structured world in which its present dwelling is, receiving its impressions of that external world through the molecular mechanism of the brain, and through the same molecular organ expressing itself to that external world. This *action* of the intermediate mechanism is what we call *Mind*. The intermediate *machine* by which the communication is maintained is *the Brain*. The Director of the action of the mechanism is the Conscious Self. The agent by which that Self sets the molecular mechanism in motion is what we call the WILL. The force or energy proceeding from the Conscious Self, by which the commands of the Will is executed, is the *Psychic* (or Soul) *force*.

It is necessary, however tedious, again to remind the reader that when I refer to “the Mind” I must be understood as intending by it, not the *Soul* (which is the Conscious Self), but the action or the result of the action of that molecular mechanism of brain through the medium which alone can the Conscious Self express itself in the normal condition of the mechanism.

Various facts and phenomena will be adduced hereafter from which the Reader will be invited to draw the conclusion that there is *Soul* as well as *Mind*; that the *Conscious Self* is something other than the *Mind*. It will be proved to demonstration that the brain can and often does perform the operations of mind while the Conscious Self, (or Soul) is not only not controlling the action of the brain, but is not conscious of that action, and is even acting independently of the brain at the same moment of time. Thus are the Conscious Self and the brain shown to be two distinct entities.

Let us pause for a moment to review the stage at which we have arrived in this survey of the Mechanism of

Man. We see before us a machine wonderfully structured for perception, locomotion and independent action, having an apparatus within itself for self-support and self-reparation. But our senses cannot show us how it is to be set in motion, how kept in motion, or what it is that controls and directs its motions.

It is not necessary here to repeat the experiments that prove the source of motion of the mechanism of the body to be in the nerve centres, generating a force that is conveyed to every part of the body by the nerve cords. No further proof is required that the force which controls and directs the voluntary actions of the body proceeds from the brain, and there is governed by a *conscious something* that adapts means to ends. That something we term the *Intelligence*.

The brain, then, is the *bodily* seat of this Intelligence, of this Will, and of this Consciousness. It is the molecular mechanism through whose agency the commands of the Conscious Self are expressed to the external world.

The brain is a huge ganglion—a mass of nerve structure. But the former chapters have shown that it is not one whole. We have distinctly *two* brains and each brain is divided into three parts. There is a definite base of special structure. From this base rises overlapping it a mass of a greyish colour and distinct structure called the *Cerebellum*. Above this mass, resting on it and filling all the frontal region of the skull rises another and much bigger mass called the *Cerebrum*.

The same structure is found in the animal world, and it has been observed that precisely in proportion to the size of this central crowning mass of the cerebrum is the intelligence of the animal. In Man, as a rule, the size of this *cerebrum* is, *cæteris paribus*, the measure of intelligence. Its *size* is the measure of mental *power*—its structure of mental *activity*. But these are of course subject to infinite modifications, alike from external as from internal influences. A big brain, like a big arm, is *primâ facie* an indication of *strength*. It is powerful unless some antagonistic condition prevails.



At all events there can be no giant's strength without a giant's structure, although a giant's structure may, from adverse conditions, exhibit little more than an infant's strength.

The *duplex* structure of the brain—the fact that we have *two brains*—has been treated of in a former chapter.

The vast importance of this structure as affording a simple and obvious solution of some of the most obscure of the hitherto insoluble problems of mind and brain will presently be shown. The marvel is that it has not already received more attention from the Physiologists of mind and of body. The only cause for this strange neglect appears to be the ingrained prejudice by which Mental Philosophers have refused even to contemplate mind and its organ as having, like the body, distinct parts, with distinct functions, and their obstinate adherence to the notion that mind is a substantial entity distinct from structure, and that the whole mind is employed in every mental act; or, as Dr. CARPENTER more clearly puts it, that our thoughts and emotions are only different states of consciousness of the *whole* brain and not distinct operations of distinct parts of the brain.

This brings us directly to the question to be considered in this chapter. Are the various operations of Mind distinct operations, or are they merely modifications of one operation? Whether we are loving or reasoning, is the whole Mind equally employed, each process being only a different state of the one whole? Or does the Mind possess various faculties or capacities, with machinery specially dedicated to such mental condition, each mental faculty being competent to act alone or in combination with any or all of the other faculties?

Here, too, the question comes, whether the brain, being the organ of Mind, also works as a whole in every mental operation, or if it has a structure corresponding with the undisputed mental faculties, each faculty having its own site in the brain, capable of acting alone or in concert with any one or more of its fellows.

The Mental Philosophers and Physiologists (notably Dr. CARPENTER) maintain that the brain acts as one whole and consequently that mind does the like. They contend that when an emotion or a thought arises the *whole mind* is occupied, the *whole brain* is moving and working in correspondence; that the brain has no parts and, therefore, that the mind has no special faculties.

I venture to challenge this theory and to assert, not only that there are no facts by which it is to be supported, but, on the contrary, that all the facts point directly to the opposite conclusion.

If the mind has no separate faculties, but every mental act is only a condition of the whole mind, and the whole brain works with every successive state of the mind, how can Dr. CARPENTER account for the infinite varieties of mental character? One brain may be larger than another and therefore the whole mind the more powerful. One brain may have its nerve organisation more sensitive than another and therefore more rapid in action and more readily excited. In such cases the only differences between various minds would be differences in degree of capacity for performance of *all* mental operations. If the whole brain is employed in every mental act, the same characteristics would attach equally to all its acts. Some brains would be in all directions powerful, others weak in all. But that is not the *actual* condition of minds. No one *fact* supports Dr. CARPENTER's theory, while a thousand facts go to disprove it. No mind *is* structured as mind must be if his theory is to be sustained. We find, in fact, that mind is *never* equally powerful, or equally weak, or equal in capacity, in *all* its faculties. In some there is a large development of *one* faculty, in others of another. Some have great intelligence but weak emotions; others have strong passions and weak intellect. The diversities of character as seen in action are endless, proving that there is an extraordinary combination of distinct and often conflicting faculties and not one uniform exercise of the whole mind. How is it possible to account for monomania, or indeed for in-



sanity in any shape, on this theory of mind working as a whole in all its operations? How can the whole mind become *partially* insane, that is to say, act healthily at one moment and unhealthily the next? Can this theory explain the possession of what are called special "talents"—as a capacity for music, almost amounting to intuition, such as was exhibited by MOZART and others; or for arithmetic, as shown by BIDDER and the "calculating boys;" or for art, as displayed by LANDSEER and WILKIE?—All the early exhibitions of natural genius were mental operations, and if with them the whole mind was working, whether they composed a tune, or solved a problem, or painted a dog, how came it that MOZART did not also rival BIDDER and LANDSEER, BIDDER compose an opera and LANDSEER answer an arithmetical puzzle? Further, if the whole brain works together for each act, how can we account for faculties inherited, some from one parent, some from the other? Unless some *part* of the brain is specially constructed so as to produce these resemblances and differences, how do they come? If there be such differences of structure, the theory of unity is at once exploded. If differences in brain structure modify mind, the mind must have distinct faculties to be so modified. If the action of parts only of the brain shapes mental action, the brain must work by segments, not as a whole. If it so works it must possess the parts by which to work.

Dr. CARPENTER does not so expressly assert, but from the course of his argument it is apparent that he attributes all the variances of mental character to the combined influences of congenital structure and habit. He would say, with reference to the instances of MOZART, BIDDER, and LANDSEER, that they derived from their parents a natural tendency of the mind, by reason of some peculiarity of structure, not merely to be directed to the particular manner of its action required for their several arts, but also that the often repetition of the action thus induced had caused an extraordinary development in degree and rapidity of action that to

us of slower brains has the aspect rather of an intuition than of a process of mental labour. But the reply to this argument is obvious. If the whole mind is employed in every composition and calculation, the whole mind has an equal amount of practice and consequently *every* act of the mind ought to be more perfectly performed, even if it were developed like the special faculty. But the facts directly contradict this conclusion. Persons distinguished by certain special capacities rarely possess other mental powers having equal activity. For the most part these are both lesser in degree and slower in action than is commonly found in persons who have no such exceptional genius.

But the phenomena of insanity do not even admit of the explanation, lame as it is, that has been suggested for the phenomena of that we call "genius." Insanity will be admitted by Dr. CARPENTER to be a disease of the brain. If the whole of the brain works with each mental action, how comes it that disease affects, not every mental action, but only certain mental actions? According to Dr. CARPENTER'S theory, a man mad at all must be mad altogether. Monomania is impossible and inexplicable, according to him. But allow that the brain, and consequently mind, works by parts, every distinct mental function having its distinct brain organ, even though we may be—and perhaps are—wholly ignorant where that organ is situate or how it acts, we have at once a clear explanation of insanity generally and of monomania in particular, both being utterly inexplicable by any possible condition of unity of brain action. One part of the brain is diseased and the functions of that part, whatever they be, are performed irregularly or not at all. The result is seen in this, *that* the mind in one particular is disordered—but in that one particular only, and to the extent only of the lesion or pressure upon that one part of the substance of the brain. The *Soul* is not mad, but only the *mind*, and the mind is only mad in the direction and to the degree corresponding with the injury suffered by the brain.



The result of this outline sketch of the molecular *Mechanism of Mind* may be thus stated.

That Mechanism is set in motion by a self-generated force—meaning by this term a force (*vital* or *nerve* force) produced *within* the organism—the producing organs being the ganglia; the distributing medium the nerve cords.

This vital (or nerve) force is produced and distributed through the whole structure independently of the control of the Will.

A force flows from the brain and is controlled and directed by Intelligence. The Will is the agent through which this control is exercised.

*The Will is the expression of the Conscious Self and the force it works with is the PSYCHIC (or Soul) Force.*

The corporeal seat of this Conscious Intelligence is the brain, which receives from the various nerves the impressions made upon them and impresses the Will of the Conscious Self upon the external world through the medium of the nerves that act in obedience to it.

The brain is certainly not one whole. It has at least three parts having distinct functions. It is also divided into two hemispheres, so that, precisely as we have two sides of the body and two sides of the face (these two sides being in no case precisely alike), the brain is structured of two distinct halves, doubtless as dissimilar as are the two halves of the body.

The *cerebrum* is the largest section of the brain and unanimously accepted as being the organ and seat of the Intelligence.

By the term “the *Intelligence*” I desire to designate *all the sensations of which we are conscious.*

The received doctrine of Metaphysicians, until comparatively recent times, has been that mind is a homogeneous whole, without parts, and that every mental act is an operation of the whole mind. They did not know of brain as the corporeal organ of mind.

GALL and SPURZHEIM first suggested that brain is the organ of mind, and that mind having many faculties,

the brain would probably be structured in accordance with those faculties—therefore that for the performance of its functions the brain would act by parts dedicated to the work of the several functions. As the brain of a living person could neither be dissected nor inspected, they were unable to determine anatomically the precise position of the parts of the brain devoted to the various faculties. They proposed another method, whose accuracy could be determined only by a vast accumulation of observations of the forms of brains, as shown by the shape and size of the skulls in which they were enclosed, comparing these with the known characters of individuals. In this manner they constructed a map of the brain, which they asserted to represent with tolerable accuracy the sites of the brain-organs of the various mental faculties. But it is doubtful if they succeeded in doing more than indicate the position of some of the most prominent, and it is yet debateable if their scheme of the mental constitution is strictly accurate. This, however, is beside the important fact which they established, and on which so much of mental philosophy depends, that the mind and its organ, the brain, do not act as one whole in all mental operations, but that the various mental faculties operate through various parts of the brain, each one having there its special site; all of which may be perfectly true and yet we may be in entire ignorance of the precise sites of these organs.

Some Mental Physiologists adhere to the old doctrine of the oneness of mind and brain and the unity of their action. Dr. CARPENTER is the most conspicuous of these adherents of the old school. He boasts that he has killed Phrenology and his book on “the *Principles of Mental Physiology*” is manifestly written to maintain his theory, which he does with considerable ingenuity. He contends that when we feel an emotion or think a thought the whole *cerebrum* works together. To quote his own expression:—

Having thus pointed out what may be considered the most elementary forms of Mental action, we shall pass briefly in review



those more complex operations which may be regarded as in great part compounded of them. The capacity for forming these is known as the *Intellect* or the *reasoning power*; and the capacities for those various forms of intellectual activity, which it is convenient to distinguish for the sake of making ourselves more fully acquainted with them, are termed "intellectual faculties." It appears to the Writer, however, to be a fundamental error to suppose, that the entire Intellect can be split up into a certain number of faculties; for each faculty that is distinguished by the Psychologists expresses nothing else than a *mode of activity* in which the whole power of the mind may be engaged at once,—just as the whole power of the locomotive steam-engine may be employed in carrying its load forwards or backwards, according to the *direction* given to its action. It is the direction of the attention to *external* objects, for example, that constitutes the "faculty" of *observation*; which is simply that form of activity, in which the Mind is occupied by the Sense-impressions it is receiving, either from a number of sources at once, or from a more limited area, the impressions in the latter case being proportionately intensified (§ 123). On the other hand, it is the direction of our attention to what is passing *within* us,—not merely intensifying the Mental state, but separating and bringing it forward as an object of contemplation,—which is designated as *reflection*, but is more appropriately termed *introspection*. In each of these the *whole Mind* may be so completely engaged, that the two activities cannot go on simultaneously. So, again, in that reproduction of past states of consciousness which we term *memory*, and, still more in that volitional recall of them which constitutes *recollection*, we have the *whole mind* at work in certain definite sequences expressed by the "laws of association."

Upon the various Ideational states, which are either directly excited by Sense-impressions, or are reproduced by Memory, and are sequentially connected in "trains of thought" by suggestions arising out of pre-formed associations, all acts of *Reasoning* are founded. These consist, for the most part, in the aggregation and collocation of ideas, the decomposition of complex ideas into more simple ones, and the combination of simple ideas into general expressions; in which processes are exercised the faculty of *comparison*, by which the relations and connections of ideas are perceived,—that of *abstraction*, by which we mentally isolate from the rest any particular quality of the object of our thought, and that of *generalization*, by which we recognise the common properties we have abstracted, as of composing a distinct notion, that some *genus* in which the objects are comprehended: (Pp. 260, 261.)

The reply to this argument is that it is purely conjectural; it is not supported by a single fact. But all the facts support the hypothesis of separate faculties and

distinct parts of brain devoted to distinct functions. This is shown in the phenomena of dream, delirium, insanity, monomania and in every phase of human character. These are utterly insoluble by Dr. CARPENTER'S theory, but are perfectly, clearly and convincingly explained by the theory of distinct parts of the brain being appropriated to distinct mental functions.

Neither habit nor heredity supplies the slightest solution of the problem. Dr. CARPENTER rightly attributes to them the infinite diversities of character. But the question is, *how* they produce this result? The answer is obvious; by modifying the brain *in parts*, not as a whole. If the *whole brain* were affected by a habit or by heredity, the *whole character* would be changed and not merely one or more features of it.

---



## CHAPTER XIII.

## CLASSIFICATION OF THE MENTAL POWERS.

AFTER careful consideration and comparison of the various divisions of the Mental Powers advanced by the greatest of those who have treated of the Philosophy of Mind, I have preferred to adopt the classification proposed by GALL and completed by COMBE, as that which, although far from perfect, and by no means free from reasonable objection in parts, is yet, upon the whole, vastly superior to any other. It has the great merit of an arrangement so natural that it commends itself instantly to the judgment, carves itself upon the memory of the most careless reader, once learned is never forgotten, but is ever prompt to present itself for the solution of the many problems of human character that daily offer themselves to the observer. If these men had done nothing more than give to the world this admirable classification of the Mental Faculties, they would have a claim upon the gratitude of all who endeavour after that knowledge of themselves which has been truly called the most valuable of all knowledge. Viewed by the light thus thrown upon it, the study of the Human Mind ceases to be the dim and perplexing metaphysical speculation it has been hitherto. *Mental Philosophy* has been removed from the region where it could be contemplated only by transcendental Philosophers, and in the more tangible shape of *Mental Physiology* is brought within the reach of the common understanding. It is converted from being little more than a dream of the study to subserve the practical uses of everyday life.

For these reasons, without accepting the doctrine of *Cranioscopy* (a), that the whole Mind may be read upon the skull, which is assumed to be moulded to the shape of the brain, I gratefully adopt the phrenological classification of the Mental Faculties and Feelings, with some trifling alterations which will be indicated in their proper places.

According to this scheme of the Mental Powers, if the Mechanism of the Mind be closely scrutinised, it will be found to arrange itself in two well-marked divisions (1) The INTELLECTUAL FACULTIES; (2) The FEELINGS.

The *Intellectual Faculties*, alike in degree and in number, distinguish MAN from the lower animals. Formerly it was asserted, and general assent was given to the assertion, that there is an entire absence of these faculties in the animal world. Intelligence was declared, by a sort of unthinking unanimity of assent, to be peculiar to Man, and INSTINCT was the unmeaning name given by thoughtless ignorance to *all* the voluntary acts of the brute. More extensive and accurate observation has disturbed this doctrine, and it is now admitted that the lower animals possess many, if not all, of the *Intellectual Faculties* of which Man has arrogated to himself the sole possession, in this particular differing from ourselves in degree rather than in kind. But certainly some mental faculties of animals appear to be so limited and incapable of improvement that, in despite of general similarity, the differences between the Human Mind and the Animal Mind are such that the lowest Man enjoys a degree of intellectual life higher than that of which the

---

(a) *Cranioscopy* is open to the obvious difficulty that the skull can show the shape of the *surface* only of the brain, and the supposed sites of some of the organs are so small that no measurement of them is possible. The real difference in size of the various organs is more probably to be found below the surface. Craniology has not yet proved more than that general bulk of brain in height and breadth in certain parts indicates a certain class of mind—the intellectual, the sentimental, the passionate, and such like.



highest animal is capable. It seems to me to be doubtful whether the *Intellectual* faculties of animals do not to some extent differ from those of Man in kind as well as in degree. Time has not been permitted to me for investigation of this great and difficult question by a sufficiently extensive observation of the ways and works of animals; but I am strongly inclined to the conclusion that they possess some mental faculties which we have not, or which are developed in us only under rare and abnormal circumstances. However this may be, it is by his *Intellectual Faculties* that Man maintains his place as the sovereign of the world he inhabits. Other animals seem to acknowledge that supremacy by submission to his service or retreat from his approach.

In the following description of the *Mechanism of the Mind*, it will be convenient to trace the various faculties and feelings upwards from the lowest to the highest. Thus arranged, they form two great classes or orders.

### I. The FEELINGS.

### II. The INTELLECTUAL FACULTIES.

Each of these two Orders may be further sub-divided.

#### I. The FEELINGS may be ranged under three classes :

1. The PROPENSITIES, common to man with the lower animals.
2. The SENTIMENTS, common to man with the lower animals.
3. The SENTIMENTS, peculiar to man.

#### II. The INTELLECTUAL FACULTIES may be ranged under four classes :

1. The EXTERNAL SENSES.
2. The KNOWING FACULTIES, which perceive the *existence* and *qualities* of external objects.
3. The KNOWING FACULTIES, which perceive the *relations* of external objects.
4. The REFLECTING FACULTIES, which compare, judge, and discriminate.

A brief sketch of the various Faculties ranged in each of these classes will be instructive and interesting. No more details will be given than are necessary for a clear comprehension of the functions of each, without a knowledge of which it would be impossible to understand the principles of *Psychology*. In the first place the distinction between the *Feelings* and the *Intellectual Powers* must be accurately observed. Note with care the operations of your own mind. Observe the distinction between an *emotion* and an operation of *thought*. The *emotions* are called into involuntary action by the presentation to the mind of an object for their exercise. They are very imperfectly subjected to the presiding Will. They cannot be kindled at command, although the Will may to some extent control, and in rare cases subdue, them.

But it must be well understood that this and all like classifications are merely convenient contrivances to assist the memory. They have no existence in fact. Nature knows nothing of species, of genera, of orders, of classes—all of which are inventions of human ingenuity to assist the human intelligence, whose perceptions are subjected to conditions with which compliance is requisite if it would range beyond the circle of the senses. It is in obedience to this necessity that Phrenology has arranged the *Mental Powers* into the seven divisions named above, a classification now generally acknowledged to be as correct as it is convenient. Whether each of these various faculties, or powers, has or has not a site in the brain and an indication on the skull is of no importance. That Man's mind possesses them is indisputable.

---



## CHAPTER XIV.

## THE PROPENSITIES.

THE *first* of the seven classes comprises the *Propensities* common to MAN with the lower animals.

All of these will, upon examination, be found to be necessary to the maintenance of the existence of the individual and of the race. There are *nine* of these Propensities, namely :—

1. Sexual love.
2. Love of children.
3. Attachment to persons and places.
4. Combativeness.
5. Destructiveness.
6. Secretiveness.
7. Acquisitiveness.
8. Constructiveness.
9. The Faculty of Concentration.

I preserve the names given to them by the Phrenologists as being eminently descriptive; none better have been suggested. A full exposition of the scope and action of each of the mental powers, an exhaustive account of its uses and abuses, together with necessary illustrations of its practical operation, as experienced in ourselves or exhibited in the actions of others, would fill a very large volume. In this endeavour to present merely *an outline* of Psychology, nothing more can be attempted than a rude sketch of the structure of the mental machine. Description must be limited to such a definition of each of the feelings and faculties as may enable the Reader to commit to memory the most

important of the functions performed by each of his mental powers. I take them in their order.

1. SEXUAL LOVE.—This emotion is too well known to need definition or description. It is the foundation of the family, which is the unit of Society. It possesses the mind for a very considerable portion of the lives of both sexes, although in unequal degree.

Man's love is of man's life a thing apart,  
'Tis woman's whole existence.—BYRON.

It is the primary theme of all fiction, and it has ever played a most important part in the world's history. Its uses are obvious. Its abuses are in the absorption of the mind in one passion, to the more or less exclusion of other feelings and thoughts, leading to neglect of the duties which all of us owe to others as well as to ourselves.

2. THE LOVE OF CHILDREN.—This has been treated by some writers on Mental Physiology as being a faculty specially and exclusively devoted to the love of a parent for its offspring. Perhaps they are right, if it be contemplated only as developed in the lower animals. I say *perhaps*, because I am not sure that in the animal world there is not to be found, as among ourselves, a love for young creatures, as such, although not the offspring, or mistaken for the offspring, of the animal exhibiting the emotion. I have certainly seen, in dogs especially, signs of affection for puppies not their own and a tenderness of treatment very different from the regard shown for acquaintances of larger growth. But however this may be with animals, with Man unquestionably and with him everywhere, whether civilized or savage, a love is felt for children, *as such*, independently altogether of the relationship of the child to him. Children appear instinctively to recognise those in whom this propensity prevails. The primary purpose of the faculty is to secure for the helpless the protection of the strong, not by a slow process of reasoning, but by an *emotion* that impels to immediate action.



Although one of the animal propensities, it is of incalculable service to humanity. The universal diffusion of it among the people of all countries, among all classes and both sexes, is a bond of harmony that goes far to counteract the force of some of the unsocial emotions, and almost more than any other reminds us continually "that we have all of us one human heart."

The Love of Parents for their offspring is only this propensity concentrated more powerfully upon their own children, not because they are theirs, but because they see more of them and are more often reminded of that dependence which pleads so powerfully to the heart and makes the mother love best her sickliest child—a beautiful provision of Nature that they who most want care should find the most of it and be the more loved for their very helplessness.

But there is a difference of *kind* as well as of degree in the parental love of the two sexes. The love of the father is his natural love for children generally, strengthened, in the case of his own child, by the constant presence of its object and the interest and pride he feels by reason of its near connection with himself. The mother's love is for *her* offspring, an attachment bordering closely upon instinct and entirely independent of external or extraneous circumstances. It is found to prevail with equal strength throughout the greater portion of the animal world, but with them differing from the love of the human mother in this, that it ends when the offspring has ceased to require a mother's care, while the human mother's love is life-long and hopes to be eternal. By this propensity of the mother, acting after the manner of an instinct, the care of the infant is made to depend, not upon the mere dictates of virtue, or the recommendation of reason, but upon an immediate and irresistible impulse. "Were it not for this," says BROWN, "how many thousands would be left to perish ere they could ask pity and aid. Mark the helplessness of the infant, and think what care, what toil, what watching the little being requires. It is wonderful that all these

troubles should be endured. But Nature has placed him above the dangers of human feebleness. She has given to him the strength of his parents, and even in the pride of his manhood he is not more strong to effect his wishes than when, by a few tears and murmurs, he commands the ready aid of parental love."

The abuses of this beautiful emotion are too often seen in excessive indulgence and in the pampering of its objects. The unfortunate victims of that excess are the pests emphatically called "spoiled children."

3. Next in order is the important faculty which makes man a *social* being, and which may be defined as the feeling of ATTACHMENT to persons and things about us, known in its various modifications as Friendship, Love of Country, Love of Home, Love of Society. Who has not experienced the pleasure proceeding from some or all of these emotions? Who has never known what it is to have a friend or to be a friend? Whose heart has never thrilled and whose eye has never flashed, at the name of his own, his native land?

That Man is endowed with an original faculty for *attachment to persons and places*, a natural susceptibility for friendship, can be doubted by none who consult their own feelings or look abroad into the world. "If we are gay, we love to share our happiness with another; if sad, it is a consolation that the miserable only can appreciate, to confide our woes to the sympathy of an acquaintance. In doubt, in trouble, we fly to some one for advice and aid. We cannot enjoy the simplest pleasures of life alone. Beautiful or sublime objects are thrice delightful if there be by our side one to whom we can express our admiration:" (BROWN.) "The very excess of our emotions," says the same eloquent philosopher, "leads them to pour themselves out to some other breast and the stronger the emotion the more ardent the propensity. We must make some one know why we are glad or our gladness will be an oppression almost as much as a delight. If we are in wrath, our anger seems to us incomplete till not one



only, but many, share our resentment. The sovereign would feel little pleasure in all the splendour of his throne if he were to sit upon it for ever with subjects around him to whom he was to be always a sovereign and only a sovereign; and the very misanthrope, who abandons mankind in his detestation of their iniquity, must still have some one with whom he may give vent to his indignation by describing the happiness he feels in having left the wicked to that universal wickedness which is worthy of them, and which he almost loves because it enables him to hate them the more thoroughly."

The *Love* we have for our *Parents* and *Brotherly love* are other forms of this emotion. These are attachments from intercourse and not, as is commonly supposed, the natural impulse of a blind instinct, like that of a mother for a child. If you believed a person to be your parent, although in fact a stranger in blood, you would not love him or her the less while ignorant of the error. But so long as the belief exists, that belief serves to strengthen the bond of attachment which is really forged by the sense of dependence on the one side and the memory of acts of love and kindness on the other.

The *Love of Country* and the *Love of Home* are products of the same propensity of attachment directed to things instead of persons. These emotions are evoked by the memories of places and persons awakened by the presentment to the mind of names that suggest a whole world of past pleasures and distant dear ones for ever associated with the localities where they were enjoyed.

4, 5. Next in order are the propensities to which the names of COMBATIVENESS and DESTRUCTIVENESS have been given by the phrenologists, and which, though somewhat misleading, must be adopted for lack of some more accurate designations. The uses of these propensities are plain. Primitive Man had to struggle for his existence against the opposing forces alike of animate and inanimate nature. Even civilized Man, although employing ingenuity and cunning more

frequently than muscular power, is continually compelled to meet force by force. Hence the uses of a faculty that impels him to the combat by giving to him a certain sense of pleasure in the indulgence of it, and which, like all the propensities, is kindled instantaneously and involuntarily by the presence of the exciting cause, prompting to action on the moment without waiting for the slower commands of the Intelligence. But it would not have sufficed for Man's needs to possess merely a spirit of *Combativeness*, unless attended with an impulse to extinguish the objects of hostility. It would often be of little use merely to conquer a mortal foe. When the life of the Man is staked against the life of the wild beast it is necessary that he should kill as well as subdue. This, it must be remembered, is the original and primary purpose of the faculty of *Destructiveness*. Both of these propensities were equally requisite to Man in the pre-historic ages, not only for the procuring of his food, but for the possession of the earth against the animals who contested it with him. Primitive Man was mainly a flesh eater, his choice lying between eating or being eaten. However that may be, the uses of these propensities are manifest. Their abuses are equally obvious, for are they not written in letters of blood in the annals of all the peoples of the world? The highest form in which these propensities present themselves is in that spirit we recognise as COURAGE—a virtue difficult to define in words, but readily recognised, as it is universally held in just admiration. It is seen in boldness to confront danger, to overcome difficulties, to resist attacks. But for the propensities of *Combativeness* and *Destructiveness*, Man would long ago have become extinct, a prey to other animals. Without them, society would be impossible, for wrongs would be perpetrated with impunity and the weak would be the victims of the strong. It is the sudden kindling of these emotions, when ourselves or others are wronged, that rouses the passions of *anger* and *revenge*; passions which, when in



excess, are noxious and terrible; but in their normal expression, when provoked by an honest indignation at the sight of oppressed innocence, or the tale of successful vice, are not only laudable in themselves but of the utmost advantage to mankind. These emotions are thus graphically described by Dr. BROWN: "There is a principle in our mind which is to us like a constant protector; which may slumber, indeed, but which slumbers only at seasons when its vigilance would be useless, and which, waking at the first unjust intention, becomes more watchful and more vigorous in proportion to the violence of the attack which it has to dread. What should we think of the providence of Nature if, when aggression was threatened against the weak and unarmed, at a distance from the aid of others, there were instantly and uniformly, by the intervention of some wonder-working power, to rush into the hands of the defenceless a sword or other weapon of defence? And yet this would be but a feeble assistance if compared with that we receive from those simple emotions which Heaven has caused to rush, as it were, into our minds for repelling every attack. The instant *anger* which arises does more than many such weapons. It gives a spirit which knows how to make a weapon of everything, and which of itself does, without a weapon, what even a thunderbolt would be powerless to do in the shuddering grasp of the coward. When anger arises fear is gone; there is no coward, for all are brave. Even bodily infirmity seems to yield to it, like the very infirmities of the mind. This effect the emotion of anger produces at the very time of aggression, and though no other effect were to arise from it even this would be most salutary. But if the momentary feeling were all, the contest would be a contest of mere degrees of force. It is the long remaining resentment which outlasts, not the momentary violence of emotion only, but all the evil consequences of the crime itself, which renders the anger of the weakest formidable, because it enables them to avail themselves, even at the most distant period, of aid before which all the strength

of the strongest individual must sink into nothing. There is a community to the whole force of which the injured may appeal, and there is an emotion in his breast which will never leave him till that appeal be made. Time and space, which might have afforded impunity to the aggressor, are thus no shelter for delinquency, because resentment is of every place and every time, and the just resentment of a single individual may become the wrath and vengeance of a nation. . . . It is necessary, therefore, for deterring unjust provocation, that a man should not feel anger merely, but should be capable of retaining the resentment till he can borrow the general aid of the community, to which on the instant of any well planned villany it would probably be in vain to look. The wrath of a single person—of the weakest and most defenceless individual—may thus carry with it as much terror as the wrath of the strongest, or even of a whole army of the strong.”

The abuses of these propensities are angry passions of extreme violence, excited upon trifling occasions and by fancied offences. They are exhibited also in a love of contention and a tendency to provoke and assault others. They are especially remarkable in the persons commonly called “passionate,” “tetchy,” or “quarrelsome.” *Destructiveness* in excess is often shewn in a reckless disregard of life for an insufficient motive. It probably lies at the foundation of that love of sporting, characteristic of certain races of men, and which was doubtless inherited from far off ancestors with whom the chase was almost the sole source of food.

6. The next propensity, common to Man with the Lower Animals, is an impulse to conceal that which we do not desire to be known to others, and therefore the Phrenologists have given to it the appropriate name of *SECRETIVENESS*. In the animal world it has the same important uses which it performed for Man in the earlier stages of his civilization. It is the faculty that enables the weak to avoid by stratagem the dangers they would incur from foes physically stronger than themselves. It



also incites the creatures to whom the earth does not yield a sufficiency of food at all seasons to lay up a store for future use in secret places where it may escape the eyes of the plunderer. "When wild in woods the noble savage ran," to him also was this propensity a protection against the stronger than he. In civilized society it has its uses. Constructed as man is with many passions and propensities that are designed mainly for self-preservation, and therefore purely selfish in their direction and expression, Society could not hold together for a week if each individual member of it were to express by word or action every passing wave of feeling and every recurring thought. It is this faculty of *Secretiveness* that enables us to conceal the *expression* of our emotions, although unable to stifle the emotions themselves. By this unconscious adaptation of ourselves to the moods of others and suppression of the discordant elements that exist more or less in the character of every human being the harmony of social life is sustained and indulgence in the gregarious propensity (due to the influence of the faculty of *attachment*), is rendered possible, which but for this propensity would be impossible. It is also a principal ingredient in the virtue of *Prudence*. Combined with *Cautiousness*, it produces the *reserve* which is always so justly lauded as a feature in the character of public men. It teaches them to be chary of talk. It is appealed to when we are charged "to keep a secret." It is expressed in the proverb, "Speech is silver, but silence is golden."

Moreover, *Secretiveness* is a faculty essential to certain forms of genius. It is the foundation of the dramatic capacity. A person in whom it is deficient never can become a great or even a tolerable Actor. For eminence on the stage this propensity must be very powerful. The reason will be apparent at a glance. A great Actor needs not only to assume the character he represents but as entirely to suppress his own. He must cease to be Irving and become Hamlet. His success will be measured by the extent to which he can accomplish this double effort,

and the mental faculties that specially qualify him for the task are *Secretiveness*, enabling him to conceal his own character, and *Imitation*, enabling him to assume the character of the play. (a)

Its abuses are exhibited in *Cunning*, which is calculated deception for a wrongful purpose; in *Duplicity*, which is the pretence of one purpose while designing another,—a character assumed and acts done with intent to deceive; and in *Lying*, which is duplicity practised by asserting, with purpose to mislead, that which the speaker knows to be untrue. A lie, being a deception practised upon another, may be acted as well as uttered. The pointed finger may lie as effectually as the lips.

7. The next in order is the propensity to Acquire, which has been aptly termed ACQUISITIVENESS. Its purpose, alike in animals and in Man, is to stimulate to the toil more or less necessary for both in order to obtain the objects of their wants or desires. Nature has given us many wants. Besides the food and clothing necessary to our existence, Man thirsts for pleasures and *must* have them in moderation or mind and body will be alike sufferers. Such innocent gratifications would be unattainable if we had not also a desire to procure the means of enjoyment. The propensity is so universal and is shown in so many shapes that no doubt can exist of its being a special mental faculty. Its advantages are patent. Without it we should not trouble ourselves to procure anything to which we were not immediately prompted by present appetite; we should hunt only when hungry; we should enjoy that which was before us, but seek nothing more; we should not trouble ourselves to acquire knowledge; we should pay no regard to the future; the gains of the day would be dissipated before night; no man would accumulate that wealth which is the mainspring of civilization and the nucleus of still more wealth and still more improvement; we

---

(a) The most perfect illustration of this faculty within my memory was the impersonation of the part of Rip Van Winkle by Mr. Jefferson.



should still be but hordes of roving savages. This propensity is not limited, as is commonly supposed, to the acquisition of the materials we call "wealth"; *it prompts to the acquirement of whatever the individual desires to possess*, and thus it is the foundation of many virtues and of many vices. In some it is shown in a thirst for knowledge; in others it takes the form of ambition. It is the largest ingredient in the desire for fame. Its primary purpose is to induce us to make provision against want in the future. This is the most frequent form it takes and the most useful.

Its abuses are shown in the vice of *avarice*, in the fault of *selfishness*, in the crime of *theft* and its allied offences. Hence its abuses are more frequent and more familiar to us than are the abuses of any of the other propensities. By the construction of modern society everything from early youth tends to foster this feeling, which, frequently, so fostered, becomes in mature years an uncontrollable passion. The greatest attention should therefore be paid, in the first years of childhood, to check as much as possible improper excitement of this propensity. *How it grows* has been graphically described by Dr. THOMAS BROWN, whom I have already quoted. "Before," he says, "the boy lays out his penny in the purchase of an apple or orange, it appears to him valuable chiefly as the means of obtaining the apple or orange. But the fruit is soon devoured, its value with respect to him has wholly ceased, and the penny he knows is still in existence and would have been still his own if the fruit had not been purchased. He thinks of the penny, therefore, as existing now, and existing without anything which he can oppose to it as equivalent; and the feeling of regret arises—the wish that he had not made the purchase and that the penny, as still existing, had continued in his pocket. A feeling of regret thus associated with the loss of his penny will, by frequent repetition, be still more intimately combined with the very conception of those little purchases to which his appetite otherwise might have led him. It will seem a serious evil to part

with that the pain of having parted with which was a serious evil before. If he has purchased anything which retains a permanent value the regret will be less likely to arise. It will be the same if he has given it away in the relief of distress, since in this case the pleasure of the thought itself, as often as the thought occurs, may almost be considered a something permanent. Our first expenses then, like all the subsequent expenses of our mature years, may be attended, according to the circumstances, either with regret or satisfaction; and it is not easy to say how much of the future avarice of the man may depend on the nature of a few purchases made by the boy."

This is a truthful description of the manner in which character may be formed, or, I should rather say, moulded by education. But the emotion that prompted both the selfish and the benevolent expenditure was the *impulse to acquire* the something that was supposed to give pleasure; in the one, the pleasure of eating, in the other, the pleasure of giving.

8. CONSTRUCTIVENESS is undoubtedly an original propensity common to animals with man. Its uses are indicated by its name. Its primary function is to prompt to the formation of the structures required for breeding, or residence, or the storing of food. It is as yet an unsolved problem whether in the animal world this faculty suggests the manner of the structure, or only the impulse to construct something, the structure itself being contrived by other faculties of the mind. In Man there are certainly but few traces of an instinct to adopt fixed forms of structure. Animals for the most part do so and the processes they pursue are attributed to *Instinct*—that convenient term for concealing our ignorance from ourselves. But, although the animal world usually adopts stereotyped forms, it moulds those forms to the special requirements of circumstances. It can modify, though it cannot invent. In civilized Man this faculty shows itself in many shapes; in the construction, not of edifices alone, but of anything required for use or pleasure, as in



the constructing of plots for the drama or the novel, the production of a statue or a picture. The persons in whom it largely exists are known to fame as Inventors, and WATT was indebted for his greatness to the same faculty that distinguishes the beaver and the bee.

I venture the suggestion that the reason why Man does not construct in uniform pattern, as do the lower animals, is not, as commonly supposed, a difference in the nature or even the degree of this faculty of *Constructiveness*, which is common to both, but that man has also a faculty of *Imagination*, which is not developed in the lower animals, or only to much less extent, and that it is the influence of the faculty of *Imagination* that directs his *Constructiveness* to other forms which are conceived in the mind. The animal, having no *Imagination*, is unable to devise any change in the structure beyond that which is directly suggested by the circumstances apparent to its senses, as when the bird builds its nest of materials resembling in aspect the bough on which it is placed. Man adapts his structure to the locality, like the bird; but he does more, he changes shapes and other conditions according to his *Imagination*. If he had not this faculty, would he not, as animals do, construct with very limited deviation under the unaided prompting of *Constructiveness* alone—or with a very limited reasoning power that extends only to objects patent to the senses?

9. The Phrenologists have introduced among the propensities a faculty which they call CONCENTRATIVENESS. They intend by it the power, very unequally possessed by different persons, of concentrating the mind on one subject or purpose. The mind, they say, is composed of a great number of distinct faculties, of which more or less are actively engaged in every mental operation. The uses of this faculty are to concentrate into a focus, as it were, the various faculties called into action, and so to bring them to bear together on the object upon which the mind is engaged. Another secondary purpose of this faculty is to enable the mind to pass rapidly from one subject to another, which would be impracticable if

one set of faculties were left to subside of themselves before another set could be called into play. But the very existence of such a faculty seems to me problematical. Is not the power of passing from one subject to another dependent on the rapidity with which each of the faculties can be called into action and left to subside? And is not the WILL, rather than a special faculty, the controller under whose influence the one theme is banished and the other brought to the front? I place it among the rest because of the great authorities who have recognised it; but I cannot see my way clearly to its positive adoption. Is it to this faculty that the power is due of what is termed "fixing the attention"? This is a power possessed by different persons in very different degrees, and it appears to be a special and independent faculty, and not merely a quality of other faculties—like memory, for instance.

---



## CHAPTER XV.

THE SENTIMENTS COMMON TO MAN WITH  
THE LOWER ANIMALS.

LET us turn now to the SENTIMENTS common to man with the Lower Animals.

These are *Four* in number, viz.,

10. Self-esteem ;
11. Love of Approbation ;
12. Cautiousness ;
13. Benevolence.

10. SELF-ESTEEM.—In its best form this faculty is shown in what is termed *Self-respect*. Its uses are to prompt that regard for our own dignity which so often restrains from the commission of crime or the doing of unworthy if not wrongful acts and stays indulgence in vice even after conscience has pleaded in vain. By causing every man to set a higher value upon himself than probably would be awarded to him by others, *Self-esteem* serves to maintain a loftier standard of reputation. The abuses of this Faculty are seen when in excess it assumes the form of *Pride*—giving a ridiculously exaggerated self-importance to the individual and to all that appertains to him. It is well embodied in the proverbial description of such a man, “All his geese are swans.” His own estimate of himself is extended to whatever is his. *Self-esteem* differs from *Vanity* in this, that *Self-esteem* is satisfied with its own valuation of itself and cares little for the applause of others ; *Vanity* desires to attract

the attention and applause of others and is not satisfied by any amount of self-laudation. Self-esteem is an ingredient in *obstinacy*—for it cannot confess an error humiliating to pride. It is probably an ingredient also in another powerful sentiment, which, like the rest, is a virtue or a vice according to its degree and the direction of its energies. The Phrenologists assign no place to *Ambition* as a distinct mental faculty, but say that it is the product of an association of other faculties. It is, they contend, the result of a combination of *Self-esteem* and *Love of Approbation*. The latter alone, at any degree of excess, would produce only *Vanity*; a very different vice from *Ambition*, if indeed *Ambition* be a vice. Desire for the notice of others—and to be distinguished in the world, as the best means to secure that notice—combined with great *Self-esteem* constitutes *Ambition*. In itself, it is neither a vice nor a virtue, but it readily becomes either according to the object of its aims and the means taken to secure them. *Ambition* for the sake of fame is generous and noble; but it may easily degenerate into a vice, if fame be sought by unworthy means, or if mere notoriety be striven for without much care for *honourable* mention. So it is if *Ambition* gratifies itself without due regard for the well being or even for the feelings of others, and, worst of all, where it seeks the reputation for which it thirsts, as so many magnates of the earth have done, in the pomp and circumstance of war, to the sacrifice of uncounted lives, and at the price of untold miseries to millions. The abuse of this sentiment has been the fruitful parent of the many tyrants who have afflicted mankind. It is seen, also, in the petty tyranny of those despicable despots to be found in so many homes, “who lord it over the unfortunate wives,” children, or whosoever may be subject to them, “with the same insolence of power which, if fortune had placed them upon a throne, would have made them Neros or Napoleons.”

11. The next in order is LOVE OF APPROBATION. The primary expression of this Sentiment is a desire for the



approval and esteem of others, a sentiment of the utmost value and indeed almost essential to the existence of society. Man is a social being and therefore craves the good opinion of those with whom he associates. As was said in treating of self-esteem, *Love of Approbation* is a large ingredient in the thirst for *fame*, which is a desire for the praise, not of those alone with whom we live, but of those also whom we have never seen and never shall see and even of generations unborn. The benefits that flow from this faculty are innumerable. The wish to please restrains the promptings of selfishness, puts a bridle upon the passions, induces the cultivation of the art of pleasing and therefore prompts to the good manners which are the charm of social life. If all indulged their propensities, or even their higher sentiments, at all times, without regard for the opinions of their associates, the intercourse of individuals would be restricted to the mere necessities of existence and society would be an arena for perpetual strife. It is *Love of Approbation* that induces us to repress our personal feelings and opinions when they threaten to be obnoxious to others or to be the causes of contention. The very habit of restraining the exhibition of a fault often results in the extinction of the fault itself. The endeavour to please others that we may have their approbation is the parent of that true politeness which makes society delightful; which, by wearing the face of joy, even though the heart be heavy, insensibly restores the joy itself to the bosom from which anxiety had banished it and which, by careful avoidance of whatever can by possibility inflict a moment's pain upon those about us, not merely banishes discord but creates happiness.

The abuse of this Sentiment is seen in *Vanity*, whose weakness it is to seek the applause, or even the mere notice, of others by any means, worthy or unworthy. The vain man is ever fishing for notoriety and would be ill spoken of rather than unnamed. *Vanity* is exhibited in dress, in gait, in the bearing of the head and even in the lineaments of the face. *Self-esteem* wraps itself in

its own pride; content with self-approbation, it cares little what the world it despises may be pleased to say. But *vanity* is ever being wounded and feels its wounds poignantly. Thus, as with all the sentiments when in excess, this may become a source of continual pain. In its uses, *Love of Approbation* prompts to actions that deserve approval and is gratified by receiving the approval it has deserved. But when abnormally in excess, or stimulated into inordinate activity by indulgence, it takes the form of *vanity*, there is no more fertile source of misery; none is more wretched than its victim.

It is a "favourite debating" society problem, to what mental faculty we may trace the sentiment of *ambition*, which has been called the infirmity of noble minds. This can only be solved by inquiring, What is *the object* of ambition? Is it an intense desire to be great and powerful, to rise to a higher place in the world for the gratification of self-applause? This form of ambition would be the product of *self-esteem*. Is it a thirst for position and power for the sake of the applause that usually attends upon them? Ambition in this shape has *Love of Approbation* for its parent. Or is it an eager greed for the good things that ever flow to the centre of power and greatness—a desire, in fact, for the material profits to be reaped from them? Such an ambition would be the offspring of *acquisitiveness*. Ambition is not one special mental faculty but the product of a combination of faculties. It is frequently commended by moralists and we are accustomed to speak of it with a sense of pride, as a feature in the character of a man to be held in honour. In some aspects it is good, as being the prompter of goodness. More often it is noxious to others as well as to the subject of it and it is always selfish. Even where it seeks its gratification in works of benevolence, its bounty or its exertions are not always proper subjects for admiration and applause, for they are too often bestowed, not for the sake of charity, but for the glory that is to accrue from the public laudation expected to be lavished upon the public benefactor.



12. The next in order of the Sentiments is CAUTIOUSNESS. The primary purpose of this faculty is to prompt us to the avoidance of danger. The phrenologists attribute to this sentiment the too familiar emotion of *fear*. I am rather inclined to think that fear is more commonly the exciting cause of caution. No part of the mechanism of mind has more marked characteristics. It shows itself in so many forms that there is no difficulty in discovering, after a short acquaintance, the various degrees of *cautiousness* possessed by various persons. It may be profitably studied by observation of children, in whom the emotions exhibit themselves with less of the restraint that is one of the earliest lessons of experience. Watch them in some position of real or fancied danger or terror. The boldest, that is, the one having the most *combateness* and the least *cautiousness*, is instinctively accepted as the leader. The others follow, at distances almost precisely proportioned to the degree of fear felt by each. The most timid of all, that is, the child having the greatest amount of *cautiousness*, brings up the rear. In its use, *cautiousness* tempers *courage*, and a due combination of these qualities is a rare and admirable feature of the mental character. It is the parent of the virtue of *prudence*, which is the combination of *cautiousness* with *causality*—of firmness with forethought.

Too much *cautiousness* in the presence of real or imaginary danger is exhibited in the displeasing form of *cowardice*. The whole mind seems to be paralyzed. The voice of reason and even of prudence is hushed. *Fear* is in this condition singularly contagious. The panics which occasionally seize crowds of men (and are common to all gregarious animals) are the excitement of this faculty by a species of unconscious sympathy communicated with extraordinary rapidity—a phenomenon which has not been sufficiently investigated, seeing what light it is calculated to throw upon some obscure problems in psychology.

But the excess of *Cautiousness* is not so often exhibited

in physical as in *moral* cowardice. No character is more frequently to be found than the Man lacking *moral* courage. Many a man, who would face a mortal danger without trembling or hesitation, shrinks with terror from a criticism in a newspaper and is even held in awe by dread of what an obscure neighbour may say of him. He dares not whisper an unpalatable truth. He conceals his sincerest convictions if they are unpopular at the moment. This lamentable condition of mind results from the combination of excessive *Love of Approbation* with excessive *Cautiousness*. It is a cowardly fear to be ill spoken of by others and its victim is willing to sacrifice even his self-respect if he can thereby save himself from the censure, not of the good and sensible, but of the ignorant and silly, whose opinions he would despise if offered to him privately. To this evil combination of two sentiments, each of the highest utility in itself, must be ascribed the popular submission to the tyranny of fashion and of custom. Thence, too, comes that slavery of the mind which in modern democracies seems to be substituted for the scarcely less tolerable slavery of the body that prevailed in the ancient autocracies.

This is the faculty which, when diseased, gives rise to unfounded apprehensions and melancholy. When combined with a disordered and depressed condition of the sentiment of *Hope*, it is the most frequent cause of suicide.

13. The next in order of the sentiments is BENEVOLENCE. Essayists and poets have exhausted language in praise of this faculty. And rightly so, for the possession of it in full measure is not only a source of self-satisfaction, but a sure passport to the affection of friends and the loving admiration of all who come within the sphere of its influence. I must again borrow an eloquently descriptive passage from BROWN: "The benevolent spirit, as its object is the happiness of all who are capable of feeling happiness, is as universal in its efforts as the miseries which are capable of being relieved or the enjoyment which it is possible to extend to a single human



being within the reach of its efforts, or almost of its wishes. When we speak of benefactions, indeed, we think only of one species of good action, and Charity itself, so comprehensive in its meaning, is used as if it were nearly synonymous with the mere opening of the purse. But it is not money only which the unfortunate need, 'and they are but sluggish in well doing,' as Rousseau strikingly expresses the character of this indolent benevolence, 'who know to do good only when they have a purse in their hands.' Consultations, counsels, cares, friendship, protection, are so many resources which pity leaves us for the assistance of the indigent, even though wealth should be wanting. The oppressed often continue to be oppressed merely because they are without an organ to render their complaints known to those who have the power of succour. It requires sometimes but a word which they cannot say, a reason which they know not how to state, the opening of a single door of a great man through which they are not permitted to pass, to obtain for them all of which they are in need. The intrepid support of disinterested virtue is, in such cases, able to remove an infinity of obstructions and the eloquence of a single good man in the cause of the injured can appal tyranny itself in the midst of its power."

The mental Faculty to which the significant name of *Benevolence* has been given has a wide range for its exercise. It is not limited, as in the popular understanding of it, to merely *giving*: it is something more than the possession of "a hand open as day to melting charity." In its general feature, it is a desire for the happiness of others, prompting to the actions by which their well-being may be promoted. Where this faculty is largely found, there is the charity, not alone of the purse, but the more rare and admirable charity felt and expressed always and everywhere in relation to all other persons. True *Benevolence* is charity of the mind, seeking always for the good that is in its fellow men and putting the kindest construction upon their

motives and acts. It is, indeed, perfectly summed up by the Apostle in that passage of unrivalled terseness and exquisite eloquence: "Charity suffereth long and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Charity never faileth. But whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away. . . . And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three, but the greatest of these is CHARITY." This is the virtue that is the function of the sentiment of *Benevolence* implanted in the mind for the noblest uses and the exercise of which is inculcated by the same powerful eloquence: "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy and understand all mysteries and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing:" (1 Cor. xiii.)

To this faculty is to be referred that mildness of disposition which is a marked feature in many characters, showing itself in slowness to take offence, readiness to forgive and leniency to the faults and failings of others. Nor are its regards limited to humanity. They extend to all animated beings. *Benevolence* is exhibited towards the horse and the dog equally as to Man, and to all men alike, without regard for class or country.

Its abuses, for even the virtues may become vices by excess, are seen in thoughtless extravagance of bounty irrespective of the title of the receiver or the means of the giver; in incapacity to say "No," to strongly urged persuasions; in weak indulgence to the fancies



and frivolities of those under its charge; in that general easiness of disposition which cannot bear to cause annoyance to another by thwarting even noxious desires, and which culminates in the contemptible character expressively described as being "no man's enemy but his own."

---

## CHAPTER XVI.

## THE SENTIMENTS PROPER TO MAN.

THESE are eight in number, namely :

14. Veneration.
15. Firmness.
16. Conscientiousness.
17. Hope.
18. Wonder.
19. Ideality.
20. Wit.
21. Imitation.

14. The next in the catalogue of the mental faculties is VENERATION. That the mind possesses such a sentiment is admitted by all Mental Philosophers who acknowledge the existence of separate and distinct mental faculties. But considerable difference of opinion has prevailed, and still prevails, as to the precise province and manifestations of this sentiment. It is undoubtedly that to which we owe our *sense* of Religion, by which I mean that *impulse to worship* which exists, apart from any teaching of theology or of reason. The presence of such a mental faculty has supplied a powerful argument for the existence of an object of worship, or wherefore such a provision? Close examination of the operation of this sentiment does not quite confirm the too hasty assumption as to its office. *Simpliciter*, its function is to make us regard with respect whatever is—or rather *what we deem to be*—great and good. Contemplation of Divinity, as being to our conceptions the perfection of greatness



and goodness, excites that emotion the most powerfully. Hence *worship* of that Divinity—worship being the highest expression of the emotion of veneration. But this sentiment is not directed to Divinity alone. It is excited by the contemplation of whatever is great and good. We use the term freely to express our sense of exceptional virtue. We are content to say of a good man, “I respect him”; but when a more powerful emotion is excited by some special excellence only, goodness that rises to greatness, we say, “I venerate him.” That *Veneration* is a special faculty, and not merely a product of conviction or of faith, is proved by the fact, familiar to all observers of society and which many readers will recognise in themselves, that the sentiment may be strongly excited by religious exercises, solemn ceremonies, sacred music, or by the mere aspect of a grand cathedral aisle, even in minds whose reason rejects the doctrines so embodied. Veneration is thus the faculty that inspires the sense of *Religion*, from which no efforts of reason can quite emancipate even the sceptre. Religion with the vast majority is essentially an *emotion*, not a conviction the result of positive *proof*. To this emotion all forms of faith appeal. Hence the impossibility of successful combat by an argument of a faith that is emotional. “I *feel* God although I do not *know* Him, and my feelings prompt me to adoration of Him.” That is the answer of religion to scepticism. That is why *religion* in some form has ever been, and will ever be, while Man continues what he is.

This sentiment in excess often exhibits itself in abject prostration of the Intellectual faculties before its overpowering influence. It is shown in an irrational reverence for things that have no intrinsic merit, because of their accidental association with persons or places that are revered. In minds thus constituted the mere antiquity of an object, although it has nothing but age to recommend it, excites the sentiment of *Veneration*. It is the fruitful parent of superstition. The peculiar emotion called “*awe*,” which every reader will recognise,

although unable to define it, but which differs from the nearly allied emotions of *reverence* and *respect*, is the product of this faculty when existing in excess. *Awe* is a sensation felt only in the presence of something that impresses the mind with the notion of *power*. We unconsciously compare our own littleness with that greatness and the emotion of *awe* is the consequence. The expressive term by which it is known is to be "awe-stricken." There are few who do not sometimes feel this emotion of awe, consequent upon their surroundings by the mighty forces of Nature that are manifested to us occasionally, but which are ever about us. We are conscious that we are encompassed with mysteries we strive in vain to penetrate. The emotion of *awe* is felt when we see them or think of them. Where *Veneration* is in excess, the emotion of *awe* is excited by things altogether wanting in *real* greatness and power. It is kindled by shows and shams and indulges itself in reverence for objects which reason rejects as being unworthy of respect.

I doubt much if this faculty is possessed by Man exclusively. Dogs show towards their masters something very like the expression of it. They look at us with an aspect of *awe* and obey us as with a consciousness of command by a superior being. This prompted the saying that "Man is the dog's god." If there be a truth in this, the dog has the faculty of veneration, as we have. May it not thence be argued that, as the dog finds a god in Man, for whom *his* sentiment of veneration is adapted, there is a GOD for Man to whom Man's sentiment of *Veneration* is directed and that it was bestowed upon him for this purpose?

15. The next is FIRMNESS, a faculty more readily observed when defective or in excess than in its normal condition. We can recognise in a moment the vacillating persons in whom it is wanting and the obstinate persons who possess it in overflowing measure. It is not easy to gauge the precise degree of *firmness* that constitutes true manliness. It is plainly to be seen when it takes



the form of *perseverance*, than which there is no virtue more conducive to a prosperous life. The possession of a full measure of *firmness* constitutes what is known as the determined character which carries out its resolves in defiance of difficulties. It differs from *perseverance* in this—that *perseverance* is persistency in the pursuit of an end; *determination* is the resolve to secure that end and to remove whatever obstructions may stand in the way. A man may be determined without having *perseverance* and *persevering* without *determination*.

The lack of *firmness* is but too familiar to us. In excess, it becomes *obstinacy*, which is an impulse to do or not to do because the mind has so resolved, without reference to the right or wrong, the fitness or the unfitness, of the course adopted. Its use or abuse mainly depends upon the other mental powers with which it is combined. If the good faculties predominate, *firmness*, even if a little in excess, confirms the good and gives to it the force of its alliance. But, if the other faculties are not well balanced, the *firmness* that strengthens the good strengthens the evil also.

The Phrenologists have erroneously classed this as among the sentiments proper to Man. It needs very slight acquaintance with animals to satisfy the observer that it is a faculty possessed by them also. Who has not witnessed its presence in horses and dogs; its excess shown in obstinacy, its deficiency in a lack of *perseverance* and a shirking of obstacles and difficulties?

16. The next is CONSCIENTIOUSNESS. It is the faculty that gives us the sense of justice, which is the substantial foundation of morality. Philosophers have been disputing, from the earliest recorded time to this hour, whether we have in us a natural sense of right and wrong and what that sense is, if we possess it. The true foundation of morals is as hotly debated now as ever and the contest must continue, so long as the argument is conducted by the antiquated process of the disputants drawing their facts from their own inner consciousness. It is the great merit of the Phrenologists (even if they

have too hastily assigned special functions to particular parts of the brain, or rather, I should say, professed to have discovered the special portions of the brain devoted to the special functions), that they have lifted the philosophy of mind out of the endless and hopeless conflict that had been raging round it, into a position in which it can at least be treated, like other subjects of science, by experiment, by observation, and by argument based on *facts* capable of proof or disproof. Viewing the mental faculties as a branch of physiology and admitting the existence of *conscientiousness* as one of these faculties, the consideration of its uses and objects goes far to solve the problems about which the Metaphysicians have been disputing for centuries.

The action of this faculty requires to be carefully considered, for unless it be rightly understood the most erroneous conclusions may be formed. The function of the sentiment is to give us a sense of satisfaction on contemplation of that which we deem to be right and of pain on contemplation of that we deem to be wrong. But does it teach us what is right or what is wrong? True it is, that although all men in all ages and countries have some notions of right and wrong, there have been and are endless diversities in the definition of right and wrong, as associated with actions and thoughts. That which whole nations hold to be wrong other nations esteem as right, and the contrary. *Conscientiousness* gives to both peoples alike the pleasure and the pain; but the self-same action that is the cause of pleasure to the one is the cause of pain to the other. This has been held to prove that the function of *conscientiousness* is not to determine what is right or wrong, but only to prompt to the doing or not doing of that which is right or wrong in our contemplation. This, they say, is effected by the sense of pleasure that attends the doing of what we believe to be right and the sense of pain that attends the doing of what we believe to be wrong.

Doubtless the Reader will ask, if mind has *no* sense of right and wrong, apart from that which it is educated



to recognize as being the one or other, that is to say, have we no *natural* sense that certain actions are right and certain others wrong? Is there no universal mental test of justice and injustice? Are these terms descriptive only of the estimation in which certain acts are held at certain times and in certain places varying from time to time and recognizing no fixed natural standard? It is the contention of many philosophers that no such natural sense of right and wrong, of justice and injustice, is to be found in the constitution of Man, but only a sense that approves or disapproves actions, not as being right or wrong in themselves, but as having a certain character which we have been educated to look upon as right and wrong. I venture to question this conclusion. It appears to me that there is a *natural* sense of *justice*, and that it is the function of the faculty of *conscientiousness*. I very much doubt if the mind goes through the elaborate and slow process of trial by the Reason in the Court of Conscience of any particular act done or contemplated, before it is presented to the tribunal of *conscientiousness*. True it is that the notion of *what is just* varies in various countries and changes even among the same people in the lapse of years and in changed circumstances. But I am satisfied that a sense of *what is just* or unjust is common to the race, however hidden by an overgrowth of conventional impressions. In despite of appearances to the contrary, I think all men would be found to agree that *certain* acts approve themselves naturally to the mind and certain others excite a natural sense of disapproval. To take a single instance. Possession gives a notion of property.

The good old rule, the ancient plan,  
That he should take who has the power,  
And he should keep who can,

only expresses what Men *will* do, not what they would avow they *ought* to do. A sense of *wrong* implies a sense of *right*. The Man who robs another without remorse would yet feel that a *wrong* had been done to himself if *he* were robbed. Nor would that sense

of a wrong done be the less keen if he were robbed of the goods he had himself stolen. This is not a sense of indignation, as some have supposed, but a consciousness that *a wrong* has been done to him and the indignation that follows is the emotion of anger kindled by the presence of *a wrong*. *Conscientiousness* may be so blunted by habit as not to prick the thief in the pursuit of his calling; but it is promptly heard when he is himself the victim. If then he *feels* that he has been wronged, it is because somebody has done to him something which he feels not to be right. From this we may conclude that there is in us a faculty that gives us *a sense of justice and injustice*, and that in at least one important particular—the depriving another by force or fraud of that which he possesses—we instinctively, and as a part of our mental constitution, recognize *a right* and *a wrong*. Whether our natural sense of justice extends beyond this elementary stage, or if, indeed (as I am inclined from an imperfect consideration of them to conclude), our *natural* notions of justice and injustice are limited to the deprivation of property, or of life, limb or liberty, which are in fact property, is a question too large to be treated here as its importance demands.

As with all the emotions and sentiments, this faculty of *Conscientiousness* operates immediately on the presentation of the object. Its verdict is not governed by the slow processes of reason. It is pronounced instantly and instinctively. It is this universal sense of wrong which, more powerfully than the strength of laws, conduces to the security of life and property. "When we reflect," says BROWN, "on the temptations which would lead men, but for this monitor, to gratify their passions without restraint, when they could obtain wealth without the toil of industry, and when we yet see a thousand enjoyments laid within the reach of others which it requires, perhaps, but the stretching forth of the hand, a falsehood, or a fraud, to obtain, it is astonishing to think of the simple means by which security is produced. Grosser crimes may be prevented by punishments which



make the attempt to commit them too perilous. But how many actions are there over which the laws cannot extend. They may, indeed, check open violence, but there are secret crimes which they cannot control—those frauds, for instance, of mere persuasion, which can only be known to be crimes to the conscience of the deceiver. It is in these circumstances that He who formed and protects us has provided a check for that injustice which is beyond the restraining power of man, and has produced what the whole united strength of nations could not produce, by a few simple feelings, a check and control as mighty as it is silent and invisible, which He has placed within the mind of the criminal himself when it would be most needed; or within the mind of him who, but for these feelings, would have been a criminal, and who with them is virtuous and happy. The voice within, which approves or disapproves, long before action and even before the wish that would lead to action can be said to be fully formed—has in it a restraining force more powerful than a thousand gibbets: and it is accompanied with a certainty that in every breast there is a similar voice that would join its dreadful award to that which would be far more felt within. The feelings of moral approbation and disapprobation are at once the security of virtue and its avengers; its security in the happiness that is felt and the happiness that is promised to every future year and hour of virtuous remembrance; its avengers in that long period of earthly punishment when its guilty injurer is to read in every eye that gazes on him the reproach which is to be for ever sounding in his heart.”

Childhood, that speaks the language of nature, emphatically proclaims the existence of this sentiment. If we have no memory of our own feelings, who of us is there who has not witnessed the emotions of the child to whom some tale of *wrong* is told. With what fixed gaze and motionless limbs he listens to the story of oppressed virtue and prosperous crime. Is the theme the familiar tale of “The Babes in the Wood?” With breathless anxiety he hearkens to the devilish designs—he traces

the steps of the innocent children to the wood : his young imagination sees their terrors, hears their sobs, feels their agony. His eyes flash indignation ; his cheeks glow with a virtuous rage ; he longs for the strength of a man that he may hurl immediate vengeance on the murderer. As the tale proceeds and he learns how Heaven had punished the wretch with the loss of home and wealth—then, and not till then, does the little champion of virtue become calm and resume his sport, satisfied that a deed which seemed to him so horrible was not permitted to escape unavenged. What is this but the eloquent voice of Nature uttered in the flashing eye and flushed face, proclaiming that there is within us, not only a tribunal that judges between right and wrong, but an impulse that prompts us to assist the injured and punish the evil doer. This voiceless eloquence must have been noted often by the Reader. Can it be doubted that a provision so wise has been made for the express purpose of directing our thoughts and actions and showing us what is our duty, as defined in a strict adherence to the dictates of *conscientiousness* ? All effective human law is based upon these natural sentiments of right and wrong, and no law which opposed itself directly to the common sense of justice and right, or which openly commanded what *conscientiousness* whispered to be wrong, has ever survived the tyranny that constructed and enforced it.

Another shape in which *conscientiousness* exhibits itself is *truthfulness* and love of truth. Deception, which is only a meaner form of lying, is hateful to the mind that enjoys the possession in a large degree of this fine faculty. Openness to conviction and the courage of its convictions is a marked feature in such a mental structure. It is more easy to form opinions than to avow them when formed, if they are unpopular or unprofitable. The moral cowardice of so many persons, who conceal their true convictions through fear of petty personal inconvenience, is a sorry sight. The picture is happily relieved by the spectacle of the few good and honest men who are found to



face calumny and even to endure persecution in the assertion of that which they believe to be true.

The painful emotion known as *remorse* is the expression of outraged *conscientiousness*. In excess, even this virtue may become a fault, when it prompts to scruples so refined that they paralyse decision of thought and firmness in action.

17. HOPE next follows. The emotion is familiar to most of us and there are few so fortunate as never to have tasted the bitterness of its absence. Ingenious endeavours have been made to dispute the claim of this emotion to be an original and distinct mental faculty. It has been proposed to assign it to other faculties or combinations of faculties, denying to it a place of its own in the anatomy (if I may so term it) of the Mind. But the more closely we examine the emotion to which the name of Hope has been given, whether as felt by ourselves or expressed by others, the more we shall be assured that not merely is it not a state of the whole mind under certain circumstances, but that it is implanted in the mental organisation as a distinct and definite faculty, having special functions adapted to the conditions to which existence in this world is subjected.

The immediate function of *Hope* is to give us confidence in the future. We are hedged round by the unknown, possibly by the unknowable. We *know* little of the present, less of the past, nothing of the future. We are ignorant what the next moment may bring forth. We are subject to tremendous *forces* ever passing through us and about us, permeating our bodily structures, keeping in perpetual motion every particle of the matter of which our bodies are builded—forces which we cannot control and of which we are in truth the passive slaves. Of all the mighty questions, whence we come, why we are here, what the world is in which we live, what relationship it has to the Universe in which it is but as a grain of sand in an African desert, to what end we exist, whither we go—these and such like mysteries that “clip us round about” would speedily plunge us into

the inaction of despair had there not been implanted in the mind an emotion that gilds, if it does not penetrate, the darkness that surrounds us, converting the gloom into glory and giving even to the clouds that hang upon the path into which we are journeying tints that convert them into the very portals of heaven. No more sinking of heart. No more darkness. No more dread. The future is ours. Onward! Upward! *Excelsior!* It is the voice of *Hope* that whispers confidence and courage. It is the beam of *Hope* that lights the prospect and converts gloom into glory. Onward. But whither? To what goal? Ah, we know not. But no matter. *Hope* impels us forward. *Hope* illumines the present. *Hope* gilds the future. "Sorrow may endure for the night, but joy cometh in the morning." What care we for the darkness now; we shall live in light hereafter. *Hope* throws the beams of her lamp upon to-morrow and with the reflections of those beams lights up to-day.

*Hope* is so often associated with Imagination that they are not infrequently mistaken for each other. But *Hope* is simply the emotion that causes us to look to the future and the distant for whatever we cannot find in the present and the near. *Hope* does not conjure before us specific objects of anticipation; that is the province of *Imagination*. Fancy builds airy castles and when they topple down *Hope* incites to the building of others. *Hope* is a faculty which adds vastly to human happiness. Without it life would be intolerable.

And we can see how intolerable it would be by noting instances where *Hope* is defective or diseased. When the brain is prostrated by long and severe illness, as after fever, has the Reader never felt the terrible sense of depression during which, for no assignable cause, all the present seems dark and the future without a gleam of light—when there is for him no to-morrow—when he sheds tears for any cause or no cause? This is the faculty of *Hope* under temporary prostration. This condition would be ours always if the emotion of *Hope* had not been bestowed upon us. Despondency, which



is the paralysis of the faculty of *Hope*, is not an infrequent form of insanity and a frequent cause of suicide. *Despair* is, in common phrase, an emotion the opposite to *Hope*. It is, in fact, only the death of *Hope*.

In excess, *Hope*, beneficent as it is, may be a source of mischief. In that condition it incites to extravagant expectations and unfounded confidence. It is the parent of that credulity, so often witnessed where advantages are anticipated and upon which frailty rascaldom relies as offering so wide and wealthy a field for cultivation by fraud. The ready victims of bubble schemes are persons by whom the faculty of *Hope* is possessed in undue degree, surrounding every promise with a halo that blinds them alike to the lessons of experience and the warnings of reason. It is a large ingredient in the character of the gambler.

18. WONDER is another of the contested sentiments. The existence of such an emotion is not denied, but it is questioned by many of those who have treated of the Science of Mind if "wonder" be an original faculty or merely a special phase of some other faculty. It has been by some assigned to the imagination, which is said to be excited by the presentation of anything very grand or strange, on the perception of which we feel the sensation to which the name of *wonder* has been given. But this, as it appears to me, is entirely to mistake the course of our mental operations. There is a marked and unmistakeable difference in our own consciousness between a *Sentiment* and an *Idea*. A *Sentiment* is a mere *emotion* excited by the presence of the object and the various emotions are distinctly perceptible to ourselves. No sane man ever mistakes one emotion for another. For instance, no man says "I wonder," when he means "I hope;" nor does he say "I am angry," when he means "I am imagining." The sentiment of *wonder* is, like all others of the emotions, indefinable, although clearly recognised by all who have ever felt it.

But if the emotion cannot be described in words, there is no difficulty in defining the objects that excite

them. *Wonder* is awakened by the presence of whatever is grand and mysterious. Consequently it is a marked feature in the character of the religious. It has a language of its own. "Marvellous! Wonderful! Strange! Mysterious! Awful!" Thus does the sentiment of *wonder* express itself. It is a necessary ingredient in the mental structure of the poet and the novelist, for without it no effectual appeal can be made to the sentiment as it exists in the Reader. Indeed, the larger part of the poetry the world possesses is inspired by this faculty. Combined with *veneration*, it produces religious enthusiasm. The founders of faiths, at all times and in all countries, have addressed themselves to this sentiment of *wonder*, seldom without success whose extent is usually to be measured by the degree to which they were enabled to excite this emotion.

Its excesses are seen in the abasement of the reasoning faculties and their subjection to dreamy visions and unsubstantial fancies; in the substitution of superstition for religion, of faith for conviction, of fancy for knowledge. Combined with excessive *Benevolence* and excessive *Hope* it is the parent of *fanaticism*. Ignorance is the surest promoter of its abuses. Knowledge is the most certain cure for them.

19. IDEALITY is a more correct term for that faculty usually called and known as the *Imagination*, for its function is to draw mental pictures and thus to produce what we call *ideas*. It is the great *creative* faculty of mind, the foundation of all art and the constructor of all knowledge. To this faculty we are primarily indebted for the greatest productions of the Poet, the Painter, the Sculptor, the Architect, and for much of the wealth bestowed upon the world by Philosophy and Science, to the progress of which, according to the high authority of Dr. TYNDALL, the Imagination largely contributes by the power it possesses of presenting to the mental vision distinct pictures of things, as they may be conceived to exist under conditions not yet realized in practice. The immediate function of Ideality is, as Shakespeare has



expressed it, "to body forth the forms of things unknown." But when we speak of its *creations*, we must be careful to remember the limit of this creative power. Indeed, the term does not convey a strictly accurate description of the faculty itself. Imagination really *creates* nothing. It operates wholly upon the materials provided by the senses and by its consciousness of the emotions of the mind of which it is a part. It does not by itself *create* a single idea. If it could be severed from all communication with the world without and the other mental faculties, *Ideality* would be a blank, never transmitting a picture to the Conscious Self. This great faculty of the human mind operates by seizing the ideas that have been from time to time conveyed to it by the senses, and which it has stored up by the marvellous power of its memory, and these ideas, or pictures of objects, it reproduces and recombines and presents to the Conscious Self in new shapes, which we mistake for new *creations* because their forms are new.

*Ideality* is perhaps the most potent of the mental powers of Man. We are accustomed to look upon the reasoning faculty as that which especially distinguishes Man from the lower animals. But naturalists justly question if this conclusion has not been assumed too hastily. With the great stores of anecdotes of animals that have been collected by competent observers, and even with the memories of our own experiences before us, it seems almost impossible to deny to some portion, at least, of what we are pleased to term "the brute creation" the possession of a certain amount of capacity for reasoning, limited in *degree* as compared with our own, but the action of a similar mental organization. Undoubtedly animals act often as we act when we know that reason directs our action. It may be fairly asked of us why we should attribute to creatures whose brains are substantially structured like our own some mental movement other than that which our consciousness informs us is operating in ourselves? True that we have invented for the sensible actions of animals a name that may serve

conveniently to conceal our ignorance. *Instinct* is the title we have given to the seemingly rational doings of the elephant, the monkey and the dog. But they who cannot or will not be blindfolded by words without meaning must reject such a solution of the problem. They are compelled to the conclusion that many of the lower animals possess limited reasoning power.

But is it not otherwise with *Ideality*? Is there *any* evidence that the lower animals possess the faculty of *Imagination*? Can they reproduce the ideas they receive and recombine them so as to construct a new mental picture—the process which is the proper function of this faculty? Is not the real difference between the human mind and the animal mind to be found in this, that, although both receive and retain the impressions made upon them by the senses and both are enabled by the power of *Memory* to recal those impressions, they are, by the animal mind, restored and entertained precisely as they were received, but in the human mind they are not only reproduced but also actively and incessantly subjected, by the faculty of *Imagination*, to a process of *recombination*? It is indisputable that, by this power of recombining his stored-up ideas, Man is enabled to produce *new* ideas. Hence it has been called the *creative* faculty, although it is not such in the proper sense of the term; it *does not create, it only recombines*. It is by virtue of this power of recombination that Man is progressive. He derives from it his capacity for civilization and advancement in knowledge. Its total absence or extreme feebleness in the lower animals forbids their advancement, save with exceeding slowness, by a gradual process of evolution.

May it not be that, as suggested in the previous description of the faculty of *constructiveness*, it is by reason of the absence of this faculty of *Ideality* that birds build the same nests, generation after generation, with very slight variation of form, because they are unable to *idealize* other forms, and that Man varies



and improves *his* structures because he can invoke the aid of *Imagination* and construct in his mind, by new combinations of the ideas stored in it, new and better dwellings?

May not many others of the differences between the apparent mental constitution of Man and animals be explained by the same suggestion? The theme is a tempting one for thought and pen. But it would be out of place here. I must content myself with offering the hint to others who may think sufficiently well of it to deem the inquiry worth pursuing.

No mental faculty yields such an abundant and perpetual source of enjoyment as that we are now contemplating. It clothes the external world with a beauty which, if it be only the reflection of our own emotions, is yet a reality to ourselves. It cheers us with visions of grandeur and of happiness which are not the less parents of present pleasure because they can never be realised. *Ideality* can convert the hovel into a palace; the beggar into a prince. Life would be dull indeed but for this cheerer of its sadness—this ray thrown upon its path by the lamp which Providence has kindly set in the mind itself—the precious gift bestowed upon it of creating its own world of light, and beauty, and happiness, and excluding, at least for a time, the real world of trouble and sorrow.

But, as with all the Mental faculties, *Ideality* in excess is a source of much mischief. It produces the personage so well known as *dreamy* and *unpractical*. Indulgence in the too familiar amusement of “building castles in the air” is the result of an *Imagination* so powerful or so active as to eclipse the other mental faculties, substituting fancy for fact, shadow for substance, dream for action. It is the parent of that frequent character—the *visionary*. Where, on the other hand, *Ideality* is deficient either in activity or in power, we have the hardness, the dryness, the coldness, that mark the mere *matter-of-fact* man, so admirably depicted by WORDSWORTH in his portrait of Peter Bell:

He roved along the vales and streams,  
 In the green wood and hollow dell,  
 They were his dwelling night and day;  
 But Nature ne'er could find a way  
 Into the heart of Peter Bell.

In vain through every changeful year  
 Did Nature lead him as before;  
 A primrose by the river's brim  
 A yellow primrose was to him,  
 And it was nothing more.

At noon, when by the forest's edge  
 He lay beneath the branches high,  
 The soft blue sky did never melt  
 Into his heart, he never felt  
 The witchery of the soft blue sky.

20. The next faculty placed upon the list by the Phrenologists is *Wit*, the function of which, according to them, is "to give us a sense of the ludicrous and to dispose us to mirth."

But if *Wit* be so defined, the name has been ill chosen. That the mind has a distinct faculty that produces in us a sensation of mirth, and that this emotion is especially provoked by objects of a peculiar class to which we have given the title of "ludicrous," it is impossible to doubt. But a close critical examination of the subject will compel us to the conclusion that *Wit* and *Humour* are not identical: that they appeal to distinct faculties and excite two distinct and differing sensations. In popular phrase, the terms "witty" and "humorous" are often used indiscriminately. The same man will be called a witty man by one person and a humourous man by another person. But bring a Wit and a Humourist together in any company and no listener would hold them to be inspired by the same faculty. Note them closely and you will observe at least this much, that while you admire the Wit you laugh with the Humourist. You are conscious that different mental senses are appealed to by each, and that different sensations are produced in yourself. Rarely is the same person found thoroughly to appreciate both *Wit* and *Humour*. Many have a keen



perception of the one and very imperfect apprehension of the other. *Wit* is often heartily enjoyed by a man who has no relish for *humour* and a sense of the *humourous* is frequently inaccessible to *wit*.

Examined more closely, it will be found that the apprehension and enjoyment of *wit* are the results of education. A cultivated taste is necessary to perception of its flavour. The untutored mind is rarely seen to recognise the aroma that marks true *wit*—while *humour* is as readily recognised, produces as vivid a sensation in, and is as keenly relished by, the untutored as by the most cultivated mind. The obvious inference from this is that *humour* is the fundamental faculty and that *wit* should be referred to some other faculty that has been educated to quick perception of it. If this be so, the faculty which the Phrenologists have called “*wit*,” is wrongly named. It should properly have been called *humour*. Many endeavours have been made to define them. “What is *wit*?” “What is *humour*?” are questions eagerly debated by critics and philosophers. But no disputant has declared them to be identical. More or less of alliance has been claimed for them, but no thinking man has ever fallen into the vulgar error of calling a merely humorous man “a *Wit*”; nor has he mistaken the fun that makes him laugh for the polished product of the intellect that makes him feel or express merely an intellectual gratification. The mind has a sense of pleasure in both; but the sensation is not the same. *Wit* is not recognised without reflection. We must perceive the point of it before we can enjoy it and then the enjoyment is not a special sense but arises from the approval of several faculties. It is otherwise with *humour* which, instantly on presentation of it to the mind, produces a peculiar and distinct sensation of pleasure. No education is required for the recognition or enjoyment of *humour* as of *wit*. It is an *instinctive* emotion—by which unsatisfactory term I intend only that it is a faculty acting without the direction of the Intellect, or the control of the Will, the sensation fol-

lowing immediately upon the presentation of the object of which it is constructed to take cognisance.

And what is that object? What is the difference in the *things* that we call respectively *wit* and *humour*? In what does humour differ from wit and wit from humour? Innumerable conjectures have been hazarded, and therefore I may be permitted to venture another. It is short, simple, and intelligible; but I leave it to others to say how far it may be approved.

*Wit* is the unexpected suggestion of *resemblance* in things that appear *unlike*.

*Humour* is the discovery of unexpected *difference* in things that appear to be *like*.

In other words,

*Wit* is the sense of *congruity*.

*Humour* is the sense of *incongruity*.

The effect of the presentation to the mind of incongruity is to provoke the sense of humour, or the sensation of the *ridiculous*, according to the degree and nature of the incongruity. In practice we use these terms almost indiscriminately. The natural expression of the sense of *humour* is laughter; a language peculiar to Man, from which it may be presumed that other animals have not the faculty of which it is the expression. (a) I cannot here enter upon the proofs of this proposition by the citation and comparison of instances of wit and of humour. But I would invite the Reader, as a curious and instructive exercise, to perform this task of comparison for himself. Let him extract from our best Humourists and Wits, or from any collection of wit and humour, a page of witticisms and a page of humorous pictures. Carefully analysing both, let him say if he does not find

---

(a) Observation of the chimpanzee at the Aquarium has induced some doubt as to the correctness of this universally accepted faith. After playing what, if done by a child, we should have termed "very humorous" tricks with the dog, his companion, he seated himself upon his chair with a cry that precisely resembled in sound, in pose of the head, and in the expression upon the lip the peculiar laugh of the negro.



that all the *wit* consists in the presentation in a striking form of unexpected resemblance in things apparently unlike, and all the *humour* in the presence of *incongruities* in things that have an apparent resemblance.

The uses of the faculty of *humour* are very much higher than those commonly assigned to it. Its province has been looked upon as merely the production of mirth and cheerfulness. But experience does not support this view of it. In fact *humour* and cheerfulness, so far from being always associates, are by no means constant companions. Humorous persons are not always cheerful persons. On the contrary, many men famous for their humour have been distinguished for melancholy dispositions. It is a proverb that a "funny" man, as a humorous man is popularly termed, is habitually morose and melancholy, which could not be if the faculty for *humour* were the faculty for cheerfulness and mirth. The province of humour is the perception of incongruity; its emotion is the sense of the ridiculous; its expression is laughter. Its primary purpose is to enable us to discern the true from the false, the reality from the sham. Truth is always consistent with itself, not in aspect merely, but in substance. Where incongruity is there is falsehood. The deep, rapid and vivid perception of incongruity imparted to us by the faculty now under consideration provides a security against imposture vastly more efficient than any reason can supply by its more tardy and tedious process. In this sense it is that *ridicule* has been called "the test of truth." Only the false is pervious to the shafts of ridicule. Perhaps the Reader, his memory full of instances of highest and holiest truths made themes for overwhelming ridicule, will ask how is this fact to be reconciled with the assertion that "ridicule is the test of truth?" The answer is clear. Closely examine all such instances and it will be seen that the caricaturist was compelled to *misrepresent* before he could ridicule and that which he presented as ridiculous was not the veritable subject, but some distorted image of it. Where

distortion is not employed, but incongruity is plainly in the subject itself and the ridicule applied to it makes it ridiculous, we may be assured that the subject so tried is an imposture and not a truth.

21. The next of the sentiments is IMITATION. The name describes the function. Its existence will be readily admitted. It is the earliest developed of all the mental powers, for it is the first to be called into requisition. It is the predominant faculty in childhood. It exercises an immense sway over us in after life, even when the development of the other faculties subdues somewhat of its activity. Its influence in our young days has been thus described by WORDSWORTH :

Behold the child among his new-born blisses,  
A six-years darling of a pigmy size !  
See where 'mid work of his own hand he lies,  
Fretted by sallies of his mother's kisses,  
With light upon him from his father's eyes !  
See, at his feet, some little plan or chart,  
Some fragment from his dream of human life,  
Shaped by himself with newly learned art ;  
    A wedding or a festival,  
    A mourning or a funeral,  
    And this hath now his heart,  
And unto this he frames his song :  
    Then will he fit his tongue  
To dialogues of business, love, or strife ;  
    But it will not be long  
Ere this be thrown aside,  
And with new joy and pride  
The little actor learns another part :  
Filling from time to time his humourous stage,  
With all the persons, down to palsied age,  
That Life brings with her in her equipage :  
    As if his sole vocation  
Were endless imitation.

This faculty is necessary to *progress*. We imitate what our fathers have done. We add to their teachings the accumulations of our own experience and the inventions of our own genius. Thus, slowly but surely, improvement is accomplished. Extraordinary power of imitation characterises whole nations, as the Chinese and



Hindoos, for instance. Among ourselves we may observe infinite varieties of this faculty, extending from an almost total incapacity to originate anything without servile imitation of others to an equal inability to copy anything correctly. It is to *Imitation* that we must refer the extraordinary influence of that capricious tyrant, *fashion*. But also we are indebted to it for much of the social order that exists, and which it would be impossible to maintain if each individual were striving to differ as much as possible from all others, instead of endeavouring, as under the unconscious influence of *Imitation* he does endeavour, to be as *like* his fellows as he can.

---

## CHAPTER XVII.

## THE INTELLECTUAL FACULTIES.

WE come now to the *Intellectual Faculties*, which are conveniently arranged into four classes.

I. The FACULTIES that are connected with the EXTERNAL organs of SENSE, and which are the immediate recipients of the impressions made upon those senses.

II. The FACULTIES that PERCEIVE the *existence* and *qualities* of *external objects*.

III. The FACULTIES that PERCEIVE the *relations* of *external objects*.

IV. The REFLECTING FACULTIES.

## I. THE EXTERNAL SENSES.

The external senses, *Feeling*, *Taste*, *Smell*, *Touch*, and *Sight*, have been already treated in previous chapters; therefore, I pass them here and proceed at once to consider

## II. THE PERCEPTIVE FACULTIES

whose function it is to perceive the *existence* and *qualities* of *External Objects*.

These are five in number, namely—

22. Individuality.

23. Form.

24. Size.

25. Weight.

26. Colour.

22. The first of these has been somewhat inaptly termed by the Phrenologists INDIVIDUALITY, a name which conveys but a very imperfect conception of its functions. Accord-



ing to them the office of this faculty is "to take cognizance of existence and simple facts." Its work is merely passive. It does not seek information; it only receives that which is presented to it by the external senses. But it seems to have been forgotten that every faculty has a perception of the facts that belong to itself. Humour perceives humorous facts, music musical facts, and so forth. May not *Individuality* be more properly defined to be the faculty by which we discern *difference* and so are enabled to recognize the distinct existence of two or more objects. If such be a correct view of it, this faculty ought to be largely possessed by scientific observers generally and by naturalists in particular, for it would be an essential assistant in the work of classification. It is said to be especially exhibited by those persons commonly known as "matter-of-fact people," whose minds are stored with *facts*, but who want the power to arrange those facts in orderly fashion, to reproduce them in any regular sequence of relationship or to make any logical application of them. Dame Quickly is often cited as a notable instance of the predominance of this faculty. Mrs. Nickleby is another illustration. This characteristic is indeed of frequent occurrence within the experience of all observers of society.

23. FORM; 24. SIZE; 25. WEIGHT; 26. COLOUR, are the other perceptive faculties by means of which we perceive the *qualities* of external objects. *Individuality* is said to recognize only the mere fact of existence. It appears to me that in this separation of the perceptive powers the Phrenologists have carried division too far. It might well be that all of the alleged perceptive powers are only different functions of one faculty of *Perception*. It is difficult to conclude that when we contemplate any solid body—an orange, for instance—separate mental organs are occupied in perception, one of its form, another of its size, a third of its weight, a fourth of its colour. There is no *à priori* reason why the entire perceptive faculty should not take cognizance of all the qualities that are capable of being perceived. The

answer of the Phrenologists to this objection is that experience shows the power to perceive these various qualities of an object as varying immensely, not only in various persons, but in the same person. One man possesses a fine perception of *colour* with almost entire incapacity to perceive *weight*. Another man has little sense of *colour* but a keen sense of *form*. Hence the conclusion that the perceptive faculty is not a whole, but is made up of distinct faculties having distinct functions. The perceptive faculty may itself be so imperfect as to exhibit deficiency of power in certain directions. I should have been content, therefore, with describing them as parts of one faculty but that it is desirable to have a clear conception of mental functions which undoubtedly exist and work together or separately, whether they are looked upon as different functions of one faculty or as having a separate existence. The definitions of these perceptive powers are strictly correct and equally applicable to either view of the structure.

*Form* is that which gives to us the perception of *shape*. *Size* enables us to discern and measure *magnitudes*.

*Weight* communicates the perception of *momentum*, *weight* and *resistance*. To this faculty, if such it be, is also assigned the important business of preserving perpendicularity. Its main function is to enable us to keep our balance when we stand or walk. It is contended that the partial paralysis of this faculty by alcohol causes the drunkard to stagger and fall. GEORGE COMBE maintained that sea-sickness is caused by the continual effort of the faculty of *Weight* to restore the equilibrium of the body, thus producing in the brain a disturbance in the nature of concussion which is always attended by vomiting. There is no doubt that some persons have much more delicate perceptions of *weight* than others, and the possession of this faculty in vigour and capacity is essential to success in practical mechanics and engineering.

To the faculty of *colour* we owe the perception of colour and a sense of pleasure in that perception. Here again



the Phrenologists point to *facts* in proof of the distinct existence of this faculty. They contend that the power to perceive the more delicate shades of colour, with their harmonies and discords, varies greatly in various persons and bears no relationship to the differences of perceptive power generally. Thus, a person having uncommon keenness of perception in all other matters is frequently found to possess very imperfect capacity for perception of colour. This is known as "colour blindness," the patient being unable to perceive some one or more colours, or they appear to him as other colours than they are. This defect is reasonably attributed, not to a default of the eye or of the optic nerve, but to imperfection of the mental faculty that is devoted to the perception of colour. It is said, with some reason, that if the perception of colour be nothing more than one action of a general faculty of perception, the degree of it would be in precise accordance with the general power of the faculty. Not merely can no such relative proportions be found, but frequently the contrary condition is seen, of great capacity for perception of colour combined with inferior general perceptive power and *vice versâ*. There is another argument in favour of the existence of the special faculty. *Colour* is probably a *sensation merely*. It is doubtful if it actually exists in the world without us. All that we really receive are impressions of waves of light which beat upon the optic nerve with inconceivable rapidity, certain combinations of which waves cause in the brain a *sensation* which we refer back to the reflecting surface as its source and call "colour." It is reasonably contended that a special faculty must be necessary for so distinct and delicate a process as perception of the many varieties of impressions made by the infinite combinations of the reflected rays that constitute the infinite varieties of colour.

The answer of the Phrenologists to the objection here made to their separation of the faculty of *Perception* into so many distinct faculties, is that we find these faculties to be possessed in very different degrees by the same

person. Some men, for instance, have a nice perception of *weight* and an imperfect perception of form and colour, and *vice versâ*, which could not be if both were the work of the same mental faculty. Admitting this difficulty, I hazard the suggestion that, if perception generally be the function of a single mental organ, may it not be that this organ possesses distinct branches for each class of perceptions, as we have five fingers that have distinct sensations, yet forming only one hand?

The same remarks apply to some of the mental faculties described in the next chapter.



## CHAPTER XVIII.

THE FACULTIES THAT PERCEIVE THE  
RELATIONS OF EXTERNAL OBJECTS.

THE next class of the *Intellectual Faculties* embraces all whose function it is *to perceive the relations of external objects*.

According to the Phrenologists these are *seven* in number. But it may be questioned if division has not in this been carried somewhat too far, and if the functions assigned to some of these faculties may not more properly be referred to other faculties. They are—

- 27. Locality.
- 28. Number.
- 29. Order.
- 30. Eventuality.
- 31. Time.
- 32. Tune.
- 33. Language.

27. LOCALITY is said to give the idea of relative position. Hence persons who possess the faculty largely find their way readily in places strange to them. Persons in whom the faculty is defective are continually losing their way in places known to them. Combined with the faculty of *Attachment* it is said to produce a love for *places* as distinct from persons. The same combination is the cause of that home sickness, sometimes a positive disease, that has been known to infect whole companies of soldiers, especially such as come from mountainous countries, whose inhabitants have an exceptional development of

this faculty, an inheritance from generations of freemen who had maintained their defensible position against all enemies and thus had learned to view with love and pride the land to which they were indebted for their independence. Something also is due to the profound impressions made upon memory by the distinct and varied character of the scenery amid which they are nursed and for which they find no equal in level lands.

28. Of NUMBER, as being a special mental faculty, there will be no serious question. It is an operation of the mind entirely distinct from any other and which no other recognised mental faculty could perform successfully. If any proof were wanting, it would be found in the frequent instances of persons called "Calculating Boys," who have early exhibited a power to perceive combinations of numbers by a special intuitive mental action that differs from the ordinary process of counting, not in degree but in kind. From careful inquiry as to the mental operation by which these feats are accomplished, it appears that the persons so gifted *perceive the results* of combinations of extensive series of figures, precisely as we see the result of a simple addition of two figures, that is to say, without going through the process of counting. Themselves describe it as an end arrived at without consciousness of the means. Probably it may be that the mind does perform the act of calculation, although with such rapidity as to be imperceptible even to the consciousness of the calculator. For assurance of the existence in the mechanism of the mind of a faculty for combining numbers, it will suffice to make research at the nearest school, where the Student of Psychology will find abundant indisputable instances in which the faculty of *number* is very powerful, and as many in which it is very defective.

29. ORDER is another faculty whose separate existence will not be disputed by any of those who hold that Mind possesses a variety of distinct faculties having distinct functions. The faculty of *Order* needs no description, for



it is familiar to all. Few are the households that cannot show its lovers of order and its victims of mess and muddle: the orderly who, having a place for everything, keep everything in its place, and the disorderly who, having nothing in place, never know where to find anything they want. That this is not a mere accident of training is proved by the fact that the opposite extremes of order and disorder will often be seen in members of the same family, educated alike. Moreover, it exhibits itself in very early childhood, long before the results could have been wrought by good or bad example.

30. More doubtful is the next in the catalogue. The function of *EVENTUALITY* is asserted to be to "take cognizance of occurrences or events." It is contended that in fact we find some persons possessing a keener perception than others of things about them and a better memory for *events*. But may not this be sufficiently explained without introducing a special mental faculty devoted to the one purpose? In the first place, the function of this faculty as defined so nearly resembles that assigned to *Individuality* (whose office is said to be "to take cognizance of existence and simple facts"), that the two functions might well be ascribed to the same faculty. Otherwise, it appears upon strict examination that the office of taking cognizance of *facts* is performed by the other faculties also, each one of which notes the facts for dealing with which its functions are designed. According to the Phrenologists, a good story-teller is a person having large *Eventuality*. To this faculty is said to be due the marvellous memory for dates shown by some persons. To a defect in it the difficulty other persons find in remembering any date whatever. So it is urged that some persons can note the order and relationship of facts with an accuracy utterly unattainable by other persons, who can recal nothing in orderly array. The observation is true enough. But these instances of excess and of defect do not affect the question, to the operation of *what* faculty

are they referable? I would suggest that they do not appertain to any one faculty, but that each class of fact is the subject of cognizance by the particular faculty to which it is related.

31. *TIME* is certainly an original mental faculty. Its office is to give the perception of duration. *Time*, even as presented to our own consciousness, varies vastly in its measurement, not as between different persons only, but by ourselves in different circumstances. The duration of *Time*, apart from some external evidence, varies in our perceptions of it according to conditions within and without. If we are waiting for a train, ten minutes appear to the mind as long as an hour passed in our usual occupations. If we are late in starting to catch a train, the minutes appear to fly as fast as seconds. In employments that absorb the thoughts, as in composition, hours speed along and we are not cognizant of their flight. If we are in pain or grief, the hours travel with lazy feet and the long day seems as it would never end. In profound sleep we lose all consciousness of time and the moment of waking seems to be the next after that of falling asleep. In sleep, although we are not informed as to time, the mind is conscious of its flight, for it must be a familiar fact to many readers that, if they have occasion to wake at a certain hour, even an unusual one, they do so wake, although they may have slept a sound sleep in the meanwhile.

The faculty of *Time* is exhibited also in another form. Music is sound falling upon the sense of hearing at certain regular intervals. The observance of these intervals is called by musicians "keeping time." Music played out of time is pain instead of pleasure to minds that have the faculty of *Time* fully developed. Such persons, if themselves performers of music, are distinguished as excellent "timists," a word invented to describe a person who has a sensitive ear for time. Dancing is motion at regulated intervals of time and the music that directs the dance requires to be played with that object; hence the frequent remark that such a person or such a band



“plays the music so well that it is pleasure to dance to it.” This means nothing more than that the player has a large faculty of *time*, and not only keeps time, but expresses his keen sense of time by a marked measure in the music.

32. TUNE has relation solely to *music*. It gives us the sense of *harmony* and *melody*. It is, in truth, the faculty by means of which music is both perceived and conceived. If we had it not, there would be no such thing as music, which is a purely mental sensation and probably not existing at all in external nature. If the mind were not possessed of a faculty by which it is enabled to perceive certain combinations of waves of sound and to feel a sense of pleasure in that perception, there would be no *music*. To creatures constructed with other perceptions of sound than such as we have, what we call harmony might be harsh discord and an air tuneful to them might be unpleasing notes to us. Be that as it may, the fact now for consideration is the possession by Man of a mental faculty specially constructed to perceive, and to derive a sense of pleasure from the perception of, impressions made upon the brain by waves of sound falling upon the sense of hearing in certain specific combinations and with more or less of rapidity, which sensations we have reduced to the art and science of “music.” The possessor of this faculty in large degree has what is termed “a fine ear” for tune and harmony. The mind deficient in it is unconscious of any discords save the harshest. Few faculties are more marked than this, alike in its presence and absence; therefore, it is an excellent subject for examination by the Student of Psychology and Mental Physiology.

33. LANGUAGE is no less manifestly a distinct and original faculty of the Intelligence than are *Time* and *Tune*. Every school boy can bear witness to the difference of capacity for acquiring languages shown by his schoolfellows. Every member of a household hears among its inmates different powers in expression of

thoughts. Every Lawyer knows how some men speak fluently without an effort and others are unable to find words for the simplest ideas. There are recognised diseases of this faculty, not unlike in their effects to those exhibited by the faculty that is framed for the perception of colour. As there is colour blindness, in which condition certain colours are not perceived by the Conscious Self, by reason of some defect in the molecular mechanism of the nerves or brain, so, in certain disordered conditions of the faculty of language, there is an inability to recal certain words or classes of words. True, that ideas come into the mind spontaneously, or, to be more accurate, from some source of whose origin we are ignorant. But when we make an effort to recal an idea, a thought, or a word, we do so only by association—that is to say, one idea suggests another with which it was associated, and by seizing any one link in the chain of associations we arrive at that we are seeking for. When the faculty of *Language* performs its functions imperfectly, some link in the chain is lost and thence the inability of the speaker to recal the word he wants. He knows, as it were, the direction in which it lies in his memory, but the thread that should guide his thought to it being broken, he is unable at once to grasp the word he wants, although he is upon its trail. Doubtless the same failing is common to all the faculties of the mind, for all are equally liable to disorder. In none is the effect so obvious, because so inconvenient, as with the faculty of *Language*, the constant exercise of which makes its defects more obvious than are those of any other part of the Mental Mechanism.

A familiar and painful instance of the disorder of this faculty, not by disease but by the stealthy growth of a bad habit, is the infirmity known as *Stuttering*. The Physiology of this malady is very simple. In their normal condition the organs of the body obey with astonishing ease and rapidity the commands of the Will. An instance of this obedience, so rapid as to appear to us as one act, is the precise adjustment of the muscles of



the arm to the desired direction of the billiard ball, although an infinitesimal difference in the pointing of the cue, or an immensurable change in the contraction of a fibre of the directing muscle, would send the ball far from its intended destination. The like process is performed when a gun is by a practised sportsman fired at an object in motion. He does not take aim, as does a rifleman; he sees the flying bird and the muscles of his arms following the direction of his eye, without conscious effort the gun is instantly and precisely pointed at the object. So, when we talk, the process that seems so simple is really very elaborate. The idea is formed by one mental faculty; it is clothed in words by another mental faculty. The organs of speech obey the Will and the sounds are expressed by those organs as they are conceived by the mind. The motions of the larynx, tongue, and lips usually follow without conscious effort the motions of the mind. But sometimes it happens that, the organs of speech being unable to keep pace with the words framed in the mind, a block ensues by reason of the unuttered words, which come, as it were, tumbling one over the other. In the effort to escape from the blockade and catch those unuttered words, the organs of speech attempt an impossible feat, and the nervousness thus produced is the immediate cause of *Stuttering*. Usually it is at first slight and occasional; but it rapidly grows into a confirmed habit through nervous excitement and the painful consciousness of the difficulty. The obvious cure for Stuttering is the removal of the cause—the rush of thoughts and words to the tongue too rapidly for the physical mechanism to express them. It is hopeless to attempt to educate the organs of speech to sufficient speed to keep pace with the mind. The rein must be placed upon the action of the latter. The remedy must be directed to the brain and not to the tongue.

This sketch of the cause of Stuttering at once explains the seeming paradox that has perplexed so many investigators—why persons who stutter terribly in talking frequently read, preach, make speeches and act plays

without the slightest perceptible impediment of speech. The explanation is that the words in such cases come slowly into the mind and are slowly delivered to the organs whose business it is to express them in sound. *There is then no block.* This fact proves also that *the true cause of stuttering is in the brain, and not in the organs of speech* (as seems to be almost universally assumed) *and consequently that the cure must be sought mentally and not bodily.* The larynx and tongue will do their work steadily enough if only the brain will adjust itself to *their capacities* and not try to spur them faster than they can go without stumbling. The cause indicates the cure. *Check the flow of words in the Mind, and forbid the tongue to make the vain effort to give expression to the words as fast as they flow.* It is difficult undoubtedly to restrain the mind or to control the struggling efforts of the organs of speech. But it is clearly not impossible; for in reading, when the utterance is of the thoughts and words of another person, and even in oratory, where both thoughts and words are the speaker's own, only that they are more slowly conceived and expressed than in talking, there is no stuttering. The patient, therefore, should assimilate, as nearly as by persevering endeavour he may, the relative action of the mind and speech-organs, when he is *talking*, to their condition and relationship when he is reading, speech-making or acting. What is the process of reading aloud? The mind receives the words from the book considerably in advance of the tongue's utterance of them. Eye and mind alike precede the tongue. The words are taken into the mind from the printed page more slowly than they would be self-produced by the action of the faculty of language. Hence there slower transmission to the tongue which, being enabled to keep even pace with the march of the words from the mind, proceeds, without stumbling or stuttering, to express them evenly as they come. The patient should teach himself slowness of thought as well as of speech by *making it a rule to think out in his mind the sentence he is going to speak before he begins to speak it*, precisely



as he mentally reads the sentence in a book in advance of the utterance of it by his lips. Thus he will place himself very much under the conditions that enable him to read without stuttering. In fact *he will mentally read the production of his own Mind instead of the printed characters of a book.* It is difficult to give a clear explanation of this in writing, but I hope the suggestion will be sufficiently intelligible to be tried by those who suffer from this very painful affection.

---

## CHAPTER XIX.

## THE REFLECTIVE FACULTIES.

WE come now to—

## IV. THE REFLECTIVE FACULTIES.

The function of these faculties is to compare, to judge, to deduce conclusions from premisses, to trace causes and to anticipate results. They are only two in number—

34. Comparison.

35. Causality.

34. COMPARISON is the first of these important faculties. Its name indicates its function. It is the faculty which enables us to perceive differences and resemblances between objects presented by the senses and ideas presented by the mind. Thus it is the basis of the act of *reasoning*. Possession of this faculty in various degrees by various persons is shown not only in imperfect capacity to recognize distinctions when mental comparison is appealed to in argument, but it is seen often in inability to discover differences in external objects presented to the eye. This faculty is exhibited in the characteristic known as "having a correct eye," the possessor of which discovers at a glance that an object which should be placed in a certain relationship to other objects is not so placed. To a spectator having a large faculty for *Comparison* the aspect of pictures hung awry—of lines not quite straight or parallel—of symmetry designed but not accomplished—is a positive pain, and the acumen of such an eye in its measurements and in its detections of minute irregularities is often amazing to those who, defective in the



faculty, can see nothing unsightly in the most careless defiance of straightness in lines and equality in spaces.

The functions of *Comparison* being simply the perception of resemblances and differences, its operations are seen most frequently in combination with other faculties, as for instance, with that which gives us the sense of *Humour*. Two objects are presented to the mind's eye—that is to say, two ideas or mentally formed images are pictured in the brain. The faculty of *comparison* instantly discovers in them certain similitudes and certain unlikenesses. If these differences appear where they had not been expected, and especially if they are in striking contrast, the sense of *humour* is provoked, and we feel the agreeable sensation that is expressed in laughter. Thus the faculty of *Comparison* is employed alike upon the ideas brought by the senses and those produced in the mind. As with most of the other mental faculties, its operations are rapid beyond anything of which the body is capable—the presentation of ideas, the comparison of them and the judgment upon them being apparently one act, although they are in truth three distinct and separate operations performed, not simultaneously, but in succession.

35. The last in the list, but highest and noblest of all, is the faculty to which phrenology has given the name of *Causality*, but which is better known by the familiar title of the *Reason* or the *Reasoning Faculty*. The popular phrase is incorrect and insufficient, and the Phrenologists have adopted a more philosophical definition by giving to this faculty a name that strictly indicates its function. In nothing is the misleading influence of words over ideas more noxiously exhibited than in the misuse of the word "*reason*." It has been called "God's great gift to Man," "the attribute of Man," "the faculty that distinguishes the Man from the brute;" and such like phrases, conveying to the unreflecting mind the notion of some definite sense or capacity for "*Reason*" (like sight or hearing) with which Man is specially endowed. This misconception of the

Reasoning Faculty has manifestly directed the entire current of thought in most of those who have treated of its operations and its relationship to the other mental faculties. "Reason" has consequently been contemplated as something different in *kind*, not in *degree* merely, from the other mental faculties and come to be viewed, not by Poets only, to whom exaggeration is permitted, but by sober Philosophers, condemned to the cold, hard region of fact, as being "sublime," and even "Godlike." What in truth is Reason? What action of the mental mechanism do we describe when we say of Man that he possesses the "Godlike" power of Reason?

We must begin by clearing the ground. There is no such one faculty as *the Reason*, nor is "Reason" a cognizable entity. What we have wrongly so termed is really nothing more than a power which the mind possesses of bringing together two or more ideas and from them deducing a third idea. Reduced to its simple elements, this and nothing more than this is the function of the faculty from the exercise of which such grand results have come that, dazzled by their brilliancy, we forget the simplicity of the process.

The process of "reasoning" is not a simple act of one faculty, like the sense of anger, or the sentiment of "hope;" it is effected by the combined action of several of the intellectual faculties. When two or more ideas are contemplated together, the reasoning faculty does not thereupon, without further aid, deduce from them inferences and conclusions by a special action called "reasoning." The aid of other mental faculties is first invoked to discover the *relationship of the ideas so associated*, that is, their resemblances and differences. It is with the materials thus supplied that *Causality* works.

It is unnecessary, in this place and when presenting an outline merely of the structure and functions of the machinery of mind, to dwell upon the debated question if that mind has innate ideas or only such as are brought to it by the senses. For all practical purposes it may be



assumed that the brain, which has grown from an invisible speck to be what it is, has received all its impressions from the senses, through which alone it can hold communication with the world without and even with the very structure of which it is a part. We know that the *reasoning faculties* can only exercise themselves with the materials supplied by the other faculties. Consequently the operation of reasoning is *conditioned*—that is to say, the conclusions are derived wholly from materials supplied by the other faculties and therefore true only in relation to those materials. We cannot possibly know whether those conclusions are absolutely or universally true, because we do not and cannot know if the impressions brought by the senses, and by a mental operation translated into *ideas*, do or do not in fact correspond precisely with the external objects they represent.

Remembering, then, that the results of the operations of the reasoning faculties are *only conditionally true* and cannot be assumed as absolutely true, let us now endeavour to trace the process by which the *act of reasoning* is performed.

The Phrenologists term the faculty that plays the principal part in the process of reasoning—*Causality*. They define its proper function to be to “trace the dependence of phenomena and the relation of cause and effect.” With all deference to them, I must demur to this definition, for the same cause that I object to the popular use of the term “Reason”—its vagueness. If by “dependence of phenomena,” they intend their likeness or unlikeness, that is not a function of *Causality* but of *Comparison*. If they design the conditions of being, that is simply the work of some or all of the *perceptive* faculties. If they refer to the connection of one phenomenon with another, either in respect of certain similarities or dissimilarities, or in point of time, or otherwise, then “the dependence of phenomena” is only another phrase for the relation of “cause and effect,” which term would better express it. But this very term, “the relation of cause and effect,” involves

an affirmation of one of the most disputable questions in philosophy. There is no such thing as "cause"—it is said. What we call "cause and effect" is only sequence. It seems to me that the dispute is a waste of time and ink. We *cannot* in this life attain to *absolute* truth. We exist under conditions and we can perceive and know only in accordance with those conditions. Our profoundest knowledge is and must be relative merely. It may or may not be real knowledge—the actual truth; but it is the best knowledge to which we can attain. It is therefore the truest wisdom to accept it and trouble ourselves no more with disputations whether that which we are constructed to perceive and know is real or illusory. We have at least this consolation, that we find so much of creation as we are acquainted with constructed with infinite skill and moving in obedience to some harmonious laws that work together for ultimate good. We know this, also, that the conditions to which our existence here is subjected are sufficient for all the purposes of that existence and, therefore, that knowledge of the *facts as they appear according to those conditions* will serve all our necessities.

This is the *Philosophy of Common Sense*, not to be mistaken for that much abused term so often invoked to hide ignorance, gratify conceit, confound intelligence and stifle investigation. The "Common Sense" of commonplace people is not that so designated here. The term is here used as meaning the utterance of the universal experience of mankind when opposed to the doubts of the Philosophers, who too often disdain facts, endeavour to find truth by consulting only their own consciousness, and who pronounce this to be true and that to be false, not by investigation of the asserted facts, but by the fallacious test of the accord or discord of these asserted facts with their own pre-conceptions and dominant ideas.

The *Common Sense* here referred to is that confidence, common to all mankind, in certain conditions of things as true which, because it is common, may be presumed to



have its foundation in some universal truth, or something which the human intelligence is constructed to recognize as truth, and the belief in which is not a mere intellectual acceptance, but the firm *conviction* upon which we *act* without hesitation or doubt. *That* Common Sense is the basis of our belief in the existence of an external world; of our confidence that the senses in their normal state convey accurate impressions of external objects, and that whether things are or are not actually as they appear to be, we must be content with relative truth and submit with cheerfulness to the conditions under which alone knowledge is permitted to us in this world.

The faculty of *Causality* is constructed to deal with that condition of things, to accept the evidence of the senses and from what is thus made known to it to arrive, by the process of *reasoning*, at the unknown.

And this is the process. Contemplating a number of facts, the faculty of *Comparison* discovers their relationships to one another. When certain resemblances and differences are found, it separates and groups them according to those resemblances or differences, and thenceforth the mind views and remembers the group and dismisses the individual. Where two or more facts are always found to bear a certain invariable relationship to each other, or are always immediately succeeding one to the other, they are said to be *cause and effect*. Consequently, when either of these related facts occurs, the presence of the allied fact is assumed. Seeing, for instance, by the faculty of *Comparison*, that there is no daylight in the absence of the sun, but when the sun rises daylight comes and when the sun departs daylight departs, *Causality* concludes that the sun is "the cause" of daylight. This is the starting point for the entire process of *reasoning*. When daylight is afterwards contemplated, the presence of the sun as its "cause" is assumed. Other facts are found to be connected inseparably with daylight, and consequently with the sun, and these facts are again associated with others, the circle continually enlarging, each linked with each, the

most remote being allied with the original association of sun and daylight, although many of the intermediate links may have escaped observation or have been but imperfectly remembered. The conduct of this process is the proper business of the Faculty of *Causality*—once believed to belong to Man alone,—but now generally admitted to be possessed also by many of the lower animals.

As indicated in a former chapter, when treating of the faculty of *Imagination*, it was, for reasons there stated, suggested that the primary distinction between the mental structure of Man and that of the Lower Animals, is to be found in the absence or very slight development in the latter of *Ideality*, which is the *imaginative* and therefore the *creative* faculty.

---



## CHAPTER XX.

## MEMORY AND RECOLLECTION.

MEMORY is not, as commonly believed, a distinct mental faculty, as will appear from this, that there is no universal Memory. We are accustomed to say of a man that "he has a good memory," as being equally good for storing up ideas of all kinds. In truth, memory is not a possession of the whole mind, as distinct from the particular faculties of the mind. Each faculty has its own memory and that memory is usually proportioned to the capacity of the faculty. Thus the memory of words is in the faculty of *Language*; of facts, in *Individuality*; of figures, in *Number*; of music, in *Tune*.

This is manifested upon the slightest observation of other minds or examination of our own. But we are almost wholly without knowledge of what memory is, how it is formed, how it works. An image, or idea, or picture, of an object brought by the eye, or a sound conveyed by the ear, or a flavour carried by the sense of taste, is impressed upon the brain, causes a sensation there, is perceived by the Intelligence and vanishes. Although the presence of that brain action may have been but momentary—although it has passed away from the direct contemplation of the Conscious Self—it has not passed out of existence. It is stored up in the brain, or in the Conscious Self (we know not which), and many years afterwards it may be recalled to the mental perception almost as vividly as when it was first presented.

How is this wonderful result produced? By what process is the idea stored away and in what shape?

Where is it preserved? How is it recalled? Tens of thousands of other ideas have been impressed since it was received; and yet it is found among them, brought out of its place, contemplated for the purpose of its recal and restored again to its proper site. Does it go back to its former place, or is it set in the order of succession as the latest impress? This is not ascertained; but there is some reason to conjecture that it is restored to its old home, because, when again required, it is brought again from the storehouse by the same suggestions of associated ideas which had recalled it before.

In contemplating the physiology of Memory, it is necessary to bear in mind what that is we so call. We speak of *pictures of the mind* as if it were our belief that a positive picture, drawn and coloured as it appears on the retina of the eye, is really painted upon the brain and packed up there somehow to be reproduced thereafter. But, in fact, no forms nor colours are really thrown upon the brain itself. The action of the brain is merely molecular motion. The various forms and hues on the retina cause various motions among the molecules of the optic nerve, which in its turn transmits those motions to the brain, where they present to the Conscious Self a certain combination of *sensations* we call an idea, or mental picture. We can conceive as possible the storing up of an actual picture in the mind; but the storing up of a *sensation*, which is only the result of a motion of molecules, is in our present state of knowledge wholly inconceivable. If this be not the true explanation, the most probable conjecture as to the process of brain action is that Memory is not the recal of a picture, or of an idea, but simply *the reproduction of the condition of the brain which produced the original sensation*. How it is reproduced is as yet a mystery. We only know that one path to it is by *suggestion*, that is, the tendency of the Mind to reproduce sensations by means of the reproduction by the brain of its past molecular conditions in the order of their occurrence, one setting up another until that sought for is found.



The vast multiplicity of the fibres of the brain, estimated roughly at two hundred millions in the square inch, is doubtless in some as yet unexplored manner connected with *memory*. If one fibre be exercised for one idea the longest life and the busiest mind could not exhaust the supply of these recipients and retainers of mental impressions.

It will be important for some subsequent inquiries to note that memory does not always require conscious effort. It is more than probable that *every* sensation brought to the brain (even such as is conveyed without consciousness) is impressed there and capable of reproduction, and that to this may be attributed much of what appears to come into the brain uncalled for and seemingly disconnected with any passing occurrence. The power to recal *at will* is limited to the ideas (or sensations) that have been brought to the brain consciously. All that comes unconsciously is reproduced only by accident and in a desultory manner. Hence it is that we can directly control only a fragment of the entire mass of sensations that have passed into the brain and are impressed there. Doubtless the strange and unaccountable ideas that so often come uncalled for are only revivals of impressions that have been made upon the brain *unconsciously*, when the attention has been distracted, or even during the seeming insensibility of sleep.

It will be seen hereafter how important is this fact as explaining some mental phenomena that will come to be considered in a future chapter.

It is the opinion of Dr. CARPENTER and others that there can be no memory unless *attention* be directed to the object. A multitude of facts appear not only to disprove this but to point to the conclusion that the memory preserves *every* impression, however slight, at any time made upon the brain. We know that a vast number of impressions are conveyed to the brain by the senses and still more are produced in the brain by the automatic exercise of its own functions. A mind-created

picture is remembered equally with one that is brought by the optic nerve. Imaginary sounds and scents are stored in the memory as perfectly as real ones and are recalled as readily. We remember our dreams and our reveries, although bred only of the fancy. Whether these brain impressions be facts or fancies, they are attended by precisely the same brain action. The sense nerve, when excited by an external impression, moves the molecules of the brain in a certain manner. When the brain is moved in like manner by self-excitation the same idea is presented to the consciousness. Hence the difficulty of distinguishing, by the consciousness merely, between an object perceived by the senses and a like object perceived by the mind alone. Memory is the reproduction of these motions or conditions of the brain, and there is no reason whatever to conclude that only those conditions of the brain are capable of being revived that are produced when we are *conscious* of their presence and fix our *attention* upon them. All the *facts* indeed negative such a conclusion. The recorded cases are many of the mind repeating long afterwards things of whose reception there was no consciousness at the moment and certainly to which no attention could have been given, such as the instance, so often cited, of the ignorant servant girl, who, in the delirium of fever, spoke Hebrew perfectly—a seeming miracle which was explained by the circumstance that she had lived at the house of a school-master who read Hebrew aloud in his study when she was cleaning the room. She did not know the meaning of a single word and could not have pronounced it properly if she had tried to do so. She had given no heed to the sounds her master was uttering, but they had vibrated on her ear and had been carried by the nerve to the brain and memory had retained the impression of them. She could not have recalled them at will; but on the occurrence of certain brain excitement the condition of the brain originally caused by the impressions of those sounds was reproduced and she gave utterance to them unconsciously and mechanically.



But we do not need instances of abnormal cases such as this to satisfy ourselves that there may be memory without consciousness of, or attention given to, the original impressions at the time of their introduction. We may find it in ourselves. *All our ideas are memories. The mind creates nothing*; it only makes new combinations of the ideas that have been already impressed upon the memory. Whether we examine our thoughts or our dreams we shall find them to be made up of many ingredients, all of which could not have come to us consciously or only when attention was given to them. Who does not in dream continually imagine that he sees and hears things that are strange to him, but which, in fact, were impressed upon his brain at some past time when he was not conscious of the impression?

The more rational conclusion is, that *every* impression upon the brain, however slight, is capable of being revived—in other words, is stored up in “the memory,” the organ of each mental faculty being the storehouse of its own memories.

This, in plain fact, means that whereas the whole brain is not called into action for every thought and feeling, but the fibres of certain parts of the brain only are moved, according to the character of that idea or emotion, the revival of that condition occurs in the fibres of that part only of the brain that was originally in action. If each mental faculty has its own set of fibres in the brain, this is obviously how it comes that each faculty has its own memory.

A common cause of error in thinking or speaking of *Memory* is the popular confusing of the two distinct mental processes of *Memory* with *Recollection*.

The office of *Memory* is to *receive* and preserve ideas and emotions. *Recollection* is the power to *recall* them. Memory is an *involuntary* act of the mind. Recollection is exercised by the power of *the Will*. True that memories sometimes come uncalled for, probably through the accident of unperceived suggestion, and as

consequent upon our having two brains and two perfect mental mechanisms; but we recall them, when desired, by an effort of the Will. The process by which this is done is very curious.

You cannot recall an idea or emotion by *merely* desiring or even willing its reappearance. It is invoked by *suggestion*. Some other idea or emotion, with which that you desired to revive was allied at the moment of its occurrence must first be contemplated by your mind. That being presented, *suggests* to you the ideas with which it was itself associated, of which that you are now seeking was one. Being thus *suggested* it returns. The brain action is reproduced, there is *recollection*.

Scientifically described, the process is thus performed. The brain (or some fibre of it) at some past time received certain impressions in a certain order, that is, it was thrown into certain states that succeeded each other and which states it is constructed to reproduce. If any link in the series of states comes to be *revived*, the intermediate links are revived also, with more or less of rapidity, until the particular state is reached which the mind has desired to recal. We are not always conscious of the revival of those intermediate links because of the extreme rapidity of mental action and the necessary concentration of *attention* upon the object of search; but it is probable that all the links in the chain of memories between that possessed and that sought are revived before we arrive at that we are seeking.

These links of recollection present some remarkable phenomena. The power, wrongly called "memory," but which is in fact only the power of *recollection*, varies immensely with various persons. Some have what are described as powerful, and some have weak, *memories*, so called. Some have a good memory for facts but not for words. Some remember music readily, so that they can play a long composition after once hearing it. These differences in memory for words and things are to be found in every family. Prodigious memories for words are upon record. I was acquainted with a clergyman



who could open a book in English, Latin, or Greek, read any page in it once, close it, and repeat that page verbatim. He explained to me that his memory was not of the words but of *the thing*—the printed page. "He saw the book in his mind's eye and read from it." I have a bad memory for words and a good one for objects of sight. My own power of recollection is exercised in the same manner. To repeat anything I have learned by rote, I am compelled to recall to my mind the book from which I learned it and in imagination to read from the printed page, which I see before me with every misprint and stain upon the leaf. This occurs even when recalling what I learned in childhood. I see the very blots upon the page I am now reading with my mind's eye, as then I read it with my bodily eye. The recently published memoirs of Count SEGUR report an astounding instance of memory which I take from the article on that work in the *Quarterly Review*, No. 227, p. 189. "M. DE LACEPEDE, the celebrated naturalist, composed his books while walking. He carried in his mind whole pages of his composition, which he committed to paper at his leisure, writing from memory alone. Count DE SEGUR records a conversation with him when at an advanced age, and was informed that he still continued his practice of composing without writing. 'Ah!' said I, 'probably verses?' 'No, prose.' 'What,' I rejoined jocularly, 'your work *Sur L'Homme* for example?' 'Precisely: and to prove it to you I will, if you have time to listen to me, repeat the whole of my first volume, and not only the original copy but all the corrections. *I have at this moment all the erasures in my mind's eye*, yet I have not written a word and I have almost finished the second volume in the same manner.'"

Doubtless this marvellous memory was not of words only. He wrote on an ideal page a sentence the picture of which was preserved in his memory, and from which ideal page he afterwards dictated for the printer. This is proved by the statement that he had all the *erasures* in *his mind's eye*.

A scarcely less marvellous memory for music is recorded of MOZART, BALFE, and some other great composers. BALFE, when a boy, was enabled to repeat the music of an entire opera after once hearing it at the theatre.

With such facts as these before him, and they are but some of thousands equally wonderful, exhibited in every art and science, it would appear to be impossible for any rational man to maintain that his *whole mind*, and therefore the *entire brain*, is employed in every mental act and that neither mind nor brain has distinct faculties having distinct offices and distinct memories.

We now come to the grave question, what is the *true seat of memory*? Is it the brain, or is it the Conscious Self, of which, in this treatise, the brain is asserted to be but the molecular mechanism for communication with the molecular world on which its present form of being is passed?

The process by which memory is wrought is undisputed. The brain receives certain impressions—that is to say, certain molecular motions occur in the brain—which possesses the power of reproducing these motions under certain conditions.

This the Materialists assert to be the whole process. Given the conditions, the motions are reproduced and that constitutes what we term *recollection* of them. This is what we mean by memory and the exercise of it. Memory may be weakened by sickness, annihilated by a blow; it always fails with advancing age.

To this I venture to submit an answer. As the brain is the mechanism through which the Soul expresses itself upon molecular being, the power to express itself must be proportioned to the capacity of the mechanism and must fail with it. But there is much of evidence and argument to show that there is some other seat of memory than the brain.

Many psychological *facts* will be adduced in the next volume from which this inference may be scientifically



drawn. At present I must ask the Reader to *assume* the existence of a Conscious Self (other than the brain), which takes cognizance of the action of the brain. If there be such a Conscious Self, *memory* is more probably a property of that Self than of the brain, which not only is subjected to continual change in the material of its structure, but has changed its very form and substance. The brain of the adult is very different from the brain he possessed when a child. Certainly no particle of it remains. But the man remembers incidents of his childhood; that is to say, his brain reproduces the precise motions or conditions that constituted the *memory* of the long past event. It is highly improbable that the brain of the man, having been thus entirely changed, should have retained the power of recalling the motions of the passed-away brain of the child, which must be the case if memory be the function of brain alone. But if the brain imparts its impressions to a Conscious Self, it can scarcely be questioned that memory is a faculty possessed by the Self—that the true storehouse of memory is THE SOUL. If so it be, the reasonable conclusion follows, that memory of all past impressions remains with the Soul after the molecular body has fallen from it.

One fact may be here referred to in support of this view. We know that the brain is comparatively slow of action. It can present to the Conscious Self but one idea at the same moment. Hence all sensations pass to the Conscious Self in *succession*. Brains vary in activity, like bodies. The most active are, however, subjected to the limitations that necessarily attend upon molecular movement. But the act of *recollection* is sometimes speedy beyond description or conception. It is a fact, abundantly proved by multiplied witnesses who have been recovered from apparent death, that in the moment of drowning the events of a long life pass before the patient. The material *brain* alone could not accomplish this in its healthiest condition, how much less when it is becoming comatose and insensible! The probability is, therefore,

that this panorama of a lifetime unrolled in a minute is *not* a succession of revivals of molecular motions of the dying brain, but is the act of Conscious Self partially severed from its alliance with the body and thus enabled to exercise to some extent its independent functions.

---

NOTE.—The question has presented itself to me, when thinking out the subject of this chapter, if what is supposed to be failure of Memory may not be in all cases defective power of *Recollection*. If, as there can be little doubt, the brain is constructed with a capacity to reproduce *every* impression made upon it (which is the *physical* process of "Memory"), is it not more reasonable to attribute what is called "defective memory" to incompetency to revive the impressions rather than to incapacity to receive them?

---



## CHAPTER XXI.

## HOW THE MENTAL MECHANISM WORKS.

SUCH are the *faculties*, so far as the investigation has yet been carried, which the mind appears to possess, each having functions distinct and definite. A larger collection of facts, or a more profound examination of those already collected, will probably prove hereafter that some of these faculties, which by Mental Physiologists have been deemed to be original, are in truth only the product of combinations of other faculties and thus their number may be considerably reduced. On the other hand, it is equally possible that further discoveries may be made of independent faculties which have hitherto escaped observation. But whatever the modifications to which they may be subjected in points of detail, it is improbable that any material change will be wrought in the main features of the anatomy of the mind above rapidly and imperfectly described. For this *map of the mind* (if the phrase may be permitted) has not been constructed, like the theories of the Metaphysicians and Mental Philosophers, out of self-consciousness and *à priori* argument. It was framed in strict accordance with the rules universally adopted by modern Science and to which her great progress is due—namely, by patient observation of phenomena, by laborious accumulation of facts, and by cautious deductions from those facts. We do not now say, as formerly we did, “this or that *cannot* be because it conflicts with some law or fact which we have already accepted as true,” and on this childish plea closing the eye and the mind and refusing to inquire. We

more wisely now ask, first of all, "Is the fact asserted by any credible witnesses?" "Is the fact as asserted?" We set ourselves to ascertain by experiment and test if it be a *fact*. Then we proceed to assign to it its proper value in science, and to find, as always we *do* find upon sufficient investigation, that this new fact is not antagonistic, as we had supposed, to other facts, but is in strictest harmony with all other scientific truth. There is the less probability of any material change being made in this catalogue of the mental powers, because it has been based upon the common characteristics of humanity as exhibited in action and not upon the self-reading of an individual consciousness.

These faculties, however, are not the *Intelligence* itself. They are only the mental organs of the Conscious Self, as the various parts of the fleshly structure are the organs of the body. As the body is one whole, although composed of a variety of parts, so the individual Intelligence is one whole, although operating through many parts. Whether it be feeling fear, or anger, or reasoning, or imagining, it is the entire Intelligence that fears, angers, reasons or imagines. But the Intelligence (and, *for the present*, I use that term simply as synonymous with the Conscious Self) can only carry on communication with the world without through the medium of a molecular organ. It is cognizable to others by the action of its *faculties* alone. It can take no cognizance of external things but through the interposition of these faculties and, as the consequence, both what it receives and what it conveys is coloured by the medium through which it passes. For instance, a mind having a very powerful imagination will be perceived by others with the hues of fancy more or less tinging every expression of itself in thought or speech; and, in like manner, the communications that come to that mind from the world outside will be unconsciously tinted by the touches of its own too vigorous fancy.

The material bodily organ of the Intelligence is undoubtedly *the brain*. As is the brain so is the mind.



I must repeat, that I make no assertion (for we are not yet sufficiently informed upon the subject) if the shape of the brain does or does not bear relationship to the character of the mind, or if special portions of the brain are specially devoted to the several mental faculties. Many Mental Physiologists confidently assert, not only that so it is, but that they can lay their fingers upon the precise locality in the brain occupied by each of the faculties, and they adduce an extensive array of facts in proof of their contention. Anatomists, on the other hand, assert that the most careful dissection has not enabled these to trace any lines or signs of division in the shape or in the substance of the brain that would indicate distinct functions for distinct parts of it, beyond this, that there are unquestionably *two distinct brains*. That there is a dedication of distinct portions of the brain to some distinct operations of mind may be looked upon as certain. But whether they have been as yet correctly traced must be deemed very doubtful. It is still more doubtful if some of the subdivisions described in the preceding map of the mind are not rather modifications or branches of one faculty than definitely distinct faculties. This, however, in no way affects the accuracy of the general description of a MAN designed to be here presented. The material fact to be clearly apprehended by the Psychologist in answering the question, "WHAT AM I?" is that the mind actually possesses these various faculties, or a considerable proportion of them, although the precise seat of them in the molecular organ, the brain, may not yet have been, and may never be, discovered.

The existence of molecular organs, through which alone mind operates, implies a modification of the mental powers in accordance with the structure of those organs. As with other parts of the body, size is the measure of power, the attendant conditions being the same. A large organ will be more powerful to feel, to think and to act than a small one. But this rule is subject to so many limitations that it would be an unsafe guide for estimating

mental power in individual instances. Some brains are endowed physically with more *activity*—which probably means more vital force—than others and do more work in less time. By persons ignorant of mental physiology *activity* is commonly mistaken for *power*. A keen observer will readily discern the difference between them—a difference difficult to define in words but intelligible to every witness. So, likewise, some brains are more refined than others, more sensitive, more prompt to action and excited by lesser stimulus. All of these qualities more or less modify the effect of *size*. Their presence frequently misleads the observer, who cannot understand why, if the brain be the organ of mind, B., with a big brain is less clever than A. with a smaller brain. That is precisely the difference. A. is rapid in thought, energetic in action, delicate in feeling; while B. is slow in apprehension, in reflection and in action. But B.'s big brain is seen in a conscious power to advise, to command, to construct, to reason, which, when the occasion occurs, throws A.'s cleverness completely into the shade.

We can now readily understand the difficulty of reading character, composed as it is of combinations of many mental faculties, each the subject of infinite variations. It is probable that among all the countless millions of men who have lived and died during the millions of years that have elapsed from the prehistoric ages to our own time no two have ever precisely resembled each other in the construction of his mind. Who then may presume to pass a positive and hasty judgment on the characters of his fellow men? But who of us does *not* too often, upon the most superficial acquaintance, presume this man to be a fool, that man to be a rogue, a third to be a sage, a fourth to be virtuous, a fifth to be depraved, in entire forgetfulness of the infinite combinations of elements that must be taken into the calculation before a fair estimate can be formed of the true character of any living man. This consideration should at least teach us that *Charity* is wisdom as well as virtue.



A most profitable method of studying the physiology of the mind is by practical application of the above anatomical sketch of its various faculties to the analysis of the characters of distinguished personages in history or in fiction. The creations of genius are as real and true as the creations of Nature and the experiment is more easily tried with them because more of mental features and motives of action are revealed to us in the pages of the dramatist or novelist than in the volumes of the historian. This instructive exercise consists in taking some personage of a great master of fiction and deducing from a close scrutiny of the thoughts and acts presented the construction of the mind of that personage. Read a dialogue attentively twice or thrice. Then say what mental faculty or combination of faculties inspired this or that speech; by what *intellectual* organs were at work to produce this reflection or that observation, and so forth. Thus you what *sentiment* or *propensity* such an action was prompted; may map out, as it were, the character of the *mind* which (according to your judgment based upon these expressions of it) that personage, had he lived, must have possessed. Half-a-dozen of such exercises will teach more of the *mechanism and physiology of mind* than would the perusal of all the treatises on mental philosophy that have been evolved from the inner-consciousness of all the Metaphysicians who have ever lived.

The *mechanism of mind* appears to work somewhat in this manner.

Suppose a sudden awakening from a profound and dreamless sleep, if such can be. *Consciousness* returns. The senses resume their functions. The opening eye conveys to the brain, through the nerve of the sense of *sight*, the forms and colours of surrounding objects. Let there be a window encircled by climbing plants and giving glimpses of a garden without. The ear sends to the brain through the sense of hearing the strains of a blackbird perched on a near bough "singing of summer in full-throated ease." The sense of *smell* is gratified by

the odour of the honeysuckle that is wafted into the chamber by the breeze that seems so soft to the sense of *touch*. These sensations, borne to the brain by the nerves, instantly, by *suggestion*, call up the memories of other delicious mornings such as this. These in their turn waken innumerable recollections of persons and events associated with those times. Each of these memories suggests other memories, until the attention is diverted by accident or by the power of the Will. Some of these memories are sad and by their presence excite the faculty of *attachment* to the loved and lost, and there is the sense of sorrow; or of *benevolence* in the contemplation of the success of some friends who have fought the battle of life and come out conquerors. Then the *intellectual faculties* compare the sorrows with the joys, and seeing, by the aid of *comparison*, their resemblances and differences, *causality* traces the causes that had produced these effects and applies them to other circumstances to which they bear a similitude, deducing conclusions for guidance of the student in other like conditions. In this manner more or less of the mental faculties are called into action at every moment of our waking lives and in dream during a portion of the time of sleep. While health continues and the machine works smoothly and perfectly, these operations are conducted so easily and rapidly that we are not conscious of the complicated action that is going on in ourselves, nor do we perceive it in others. But if disease intervenes and the motions of the mechanism are stopped, or even partially impeded, the variety of the mental functions called into play and the many combinations of them imperceptible during the healthy action of the mechanism become painfully apparent. When these amount to positive Insanity, the intricacy and variety of the marvellous machinery I have described become palpable to the most careless observer.

---



## CHAPTER XXII.

## THE WILL.

THE mechanism of mind is not self-moved. It is set in motion by some *force*, as any machine of human construction is moved by steam or other force not its own. That force is the *vital* (or *nerve*) *force*. But the *vital* force does no more than impart motion. It does not direct nor determine the motions it imparts. Those motions are not automatic. If the vital force ceases to flow, the motion ceases. Nor are they involuntary motions, like the actions of the heart and of the apparatus for digestion. They are subject to control by some power other than vital force or any force self-generated. They obey commands. Although often acting without conscious volition, they recognise a director.

The WILL is the name we have given to that controlling power. What is the WILL?

Definitions innumerable have been attempted. Philosophers have wearied themselves with endeavours to describe the nature and operation of *the Will*. But, although its existence is not disputed, there is endless diversity of opinion as to its source, its seat and the manner of its action. Recognition of it is especially inconvenient to the Materialists, who hold mind to be nothing more than a secretion from matter, precisely as gastric juice is a secretion of the stomach. The philosophy of Materialism offers a not impossible theory of the action of the various mental faculties and there are phenomena, to be described hereafter, which certainly point to such a conclusion. But Materialism fails to account for the control that is exercised over these

various faculties of the mind by the *Something* whose existence all agree in recognising. The brain is manifestly a servant, not a master. In the condition of health it *obeys* commands and is kept in a certain state of discipline by a power out of itself and greater than its own. It is certain that this control is not that of one mental faculty ruling another. *Combativeness* is not commanded by *benevolence*, nor *music* by *mirth*. Our own consciousness informs us that the operations of the machinery of our minds are directed by some power other than the faculties that are directed. The faculties often act automatically, as in dreaming, when the power of the Will is for a time suspended. These are instances of *Unconscious Cerebration* (to be considered hereafter). It is named now as a portion of the evidence that will be brought to support the contention that the *Will*—that power which controls and commands the mechanism of mind—is *not* the action of the machine we call “the mind,” but of *something* other than the mind.

Cogent evidence of this *relationship* (which is not identity and must not be mistaken for it), is found in the fact that *mind* and *Will* do not always work together. Mind often acts without the *Will*. The *Will* in its turn often gives commands and mind fails to obey. The connection of mind and will is usually severed in sleep and often when we are awake. Some confusion has been created through failure to distinguish clearly between *the motive* and *the Will*. It is true that we are not masters of our *motives*. Thoughts arise in the mind, we know not whence coming nor why, and often prompt to action. But these motives are not *the Will*, as some have supposed. They may set the mental faculties in motion, the *Will* remaining perfectly passive. But if the object upon which the faculties are engaged kindles in the Conscious Self a resolve to act, the *Will* at once responds and commands them to work in some special direction or to some desired end. The nerve system obeys the brain and directs the action of the body as THE WILL had commanded.



FOR THE WILL controls both the mechanism of the mind and the actions of the body; it commands both brain and nerves. Therefore THE WILL is neither of the brain nor of the nerves. It is a power superior to both.

Where does it dwell?

Consciousness tells us that the molecular organ of THE WILL is in the brain. When we *Will* to do we know that the command does not come from the spinal cord. We *feel* that the operation is performed somewhere in the head. But the brain hemispheres, the organs of the mental faculties, are not the probable seat of the Will that commands them. May it not be a reasonable *suggestion* that the molecular mechanism by which the Will works is in the mass of ganglia lying at the base of the brain, situate precisely at the point of junction between the brain and the body on one side and the brain and its two hemispheres on the other side, a position which enables it instantly to command the operations of brain and body both, to receive at once the impressions that excite the *emotions* and the *intellect* and transmit the commands of the Common Self to the nerves with which it is in direct contact through the spinal cord.

But what is the WILL? Is it not the expression of OURSELVES? Is it not that which gives us the sense of *individuality*—of *personality*,—of that *oneness* which, for lack of some better English phrase, is termed *the Ego*—the entity we intend to describe when we say “I?” This WILL is *mine*. I exercise it. True, it is limited in its range, but within its kingdom it is sovereign.

In what manner does this WILL work?

To make the explanation of it clear, I must again pray pardon for repetitions which, however tedious, are unavoidable in such an inquiry as this, where every step is upon paths almost unexplored.

I hope the Reader has now formed a tolerably clear conception of the structure of the *molecular mechanism of mind*—as being a part of the nerve apparatus—a ganglion or a congeries of ganglia situate in the head, the nerves being an extension of the brain, the brain a

continuation of the nerves. Like the entire nerve system, the brain is not one whole but two halves united, so that in fact, as we have two eyes, and two arms, and two sets of nerves, so we have *two brains*. Although, when in a perfectly normal condition, these two brains act in perfect harmony, so as to convey to the Conscious Self a sense of one impression only, in point of fact the impression is always duplex. This is instantly made perceptible to us when anything arises to disturb the normal action of the two brains. It is found also to exist in many peculiar conditions even of healthy action of the brain, as will be fully described in the chapter that will hereafter treat of the phenomena of "Unconscious Cerebration."

The brain, as stated, consists of two hemispheres that rest upon another gland in which are concentrated the termini of the nerves that are dedicated to the service of the external senses. It is at this point that the intelligence they carry of external impressions is imparted to the Conscious Self, and consequently we may assume this ganglionic mass at the base of the brain to be the *sensorium* or seat of the connection between the Conscious Self and its molecular organ.

If this be the *sensorium* for the receipt of intelligence sent by the nerves, at what part of the mechanism do the intellect and the emotions convey their impressions to the Conscious Self? Their impressions, like those made by the senses, can be but the communication to the Conscious Self of certain conditions of the brain, certain molecular movements which the Conscious Self translates into objects of sense, ideas or emotions, as the case may be.

The hemispheres, that are the organs of the Intelligence and the emotions, rest upon the gland which, because we find there the termini of the nerves of the senses may be called the *sensorium*. From that base the organs of the Intelligence ascend. It may be reasonably presumed that all the parts of those two hemispheres communicate with that base by means of the nerve fibres of which they are composed. Every change in the condition of those glands, or of any part of them,



would thus be transmitted to the *sensorium*, and there would be communicated to the Conscious Self, precisely as are the impressions there made upon the nerves of the senses also. If the various ideas and emotions that make up what we call "the mind" are not the action of the entire brain but each the action of one hemisphere only, or of some part of the whole specifically appropriated to certain classes of ideas or emotions, each such part, as it is excited (that is to say, when the molecular motion of its fibres takes place), gives to the *sensorium* the impression of its own action. The *sensorium* communicates that action to the Conscious Self, which takes cognizance of it as "a thought" or "an emotion," as the case may be. The brain is a duplex organ. The two brains act simultaneously, as do the two organs of vision. *Two impressions* thus transmitted act together upon the *sensorium* and communicate but *one sensation*. If they do not work in perfect harmony, they transmit to the consciousness *two impressions*, as the sense of sight when disturbed transmits two impressions of one object. One hemisphere only may transmit the impression of its action, the other hemisphere failing from some obscure causes to transmit its action, and then we have the condition and the phenomena which Dr. Carpenter has so fitly termed "Unconscious Cerebration."

There is yet another condition in which the communication between the brain and the *sensorium*, or between the *sensorium* and the Conscious Self, is paralysed. Then the *cerebrum* acts, but there is entire unconsciousness of its action. This is the condition that presents the phenomena of profound sleep, of coma, of somnambulism and of trance.

Such being the molecular mechanism of mind—that is to say, a central *sensorium* upon which converge all the impressions made upon the external senses and all the motions, whether ideational or emotional, that occur in the *cerebrum*, that *sensorium* being the immediate medium of communication with the Conscious Self—we have a tolerably distinct view of the *mental machinery*.

For a right understanding of what *the Will* is, it is necessary to trace also the manner in which this mechanism works. It is difficult clearly to describe a subject so complex and from its nature so obscure, and I must ask the Reader to pursue slowly and with attention the following endeavour to present it in a form intelligible to minds not learned in the technicalities of the Scientists.

First, let us take the simple and familiar case of one of the external senses—say, the sight. A tree is presented to the eyes. The sense of sight does not perceive the tree itself, but the rays of light, reflected from the tree, paint upon the retina a tiny picture of the tree. The nerve of vision receives from this impression upon the retina certain motions of the molecules of which that nerve is constructed, and either this motion is transmitted along the entire nerve to the *sensorium*, as generally supposed, or, as I venture to suggest, the nerve is only an elongation of the *sensorium*, and the impression made by the retina is then instantly received by the *sensorium* through its extended arm. But it is immaterial to the remainder of the process how this may be. Arrived at the *sensorium*, the motion is received there and communicates to the Conscious Self the idea which it calls a “tree.”

So with ideas and emotions that are not external but have their birth in the brain. The brain conceives the idea of a house. For this purpose, part of the brain, whose function it is to produce ideas, is in a certain condition of its molecules. That condition is transmitted through the fibres of that part to the base of the brain, and there it is communicated to the *sensorium*, and thus the Conscious Self has cognizance of it. In the perfectly normal condition of the structure, the Conscious Self is enabled to distinguish the impression of the real object (or supposed to be real) sent to it by the sense from the ideal picture of an object sent to it by the brain. But the disturbance of this relationship is so frequent that every reader must have experienced innumerable instances in



For a right understanding of what *the Will* is, it is necessary to trace also the manner in which this mechanism works. It is difficult clearly to describe a subject so complex and from its nature so obscure, and I must ask the Reader to pursue slowly and with attention the following endeavour to present it in a form intelligible to minds not learned in the technicalities of the Scientists.

First, let us take the simple and familiar case of one of the external senses—say, the sight. A tree is presented to the eyes. The sense of sight does not perceive the tree itself, but the rays of light, reflected from the tree, paint upon the retina a tiny picture of the tree. The nerve of vision receives from this impression upon the retina certain motions of the molecules of which that nerve is constructed, and either this motion is transmitted along the entire nerve to the *sensorium*, as generally supposed, or, as I venture to suggest, the nerve is only an elongation of the *sensorium*, and the impression made by the retina is then instantly received by the *sensorium* through its extended arm. But it is immaterial to the remainder of the process how this may be. Arrived at the *sensorium*, the motion is received there and communicates to the Conscious Self the idea which it calls a “tree.”

So with ideas and emotions that are not external but have their birth in the brain. The brain conceives the idea of a house. For this purpose, part of the brain, whose function it is to produce ideas, is in a certain condition of its molecules. That condition is transmitted through the fibres of that part to the base of the brain, and there it is communicated to the *sensorium*, and thus the Conscious Self has cognizance of it. In the perfectly normal condition of the structure, the Conscious Self is enabled to distinguish the impression of the real object (or supposed to be real) sent to it by the sense from the ideal picture of an object sent to it by the brain. But the disturbance of this relationship is so frequent that every reader must have experienced innumerable instances in

which the brain idea has seemed to the Conscious Self more real than the real object. An ideal impression is continually being mistaken by the most healthy mind for a sense impression. In disease, this is a frequent condition. It is the normal condition of Insanity.

Thus far the mechanism of mind exhibits Man as a mere automaton—a machine, wound up to move in a certain manner for a certain time, in strict accordance with its structure, and incapable of any self-direction or control. If this material mechanism be all, Man is certainly the automaton he is asserted to be by Professor HUXLEY and the Materialists. Anatomically their doctrine is true. It is difficult to dispute it physiologically. By *psychology* alone can it be answered. And, happily, Psychology *can* give to it the most conclusive answer, as it is one of the objects of this little treatise to show.

The first great fact is that the Mechanism of Man is not moved automatically, like a steam engine, but that it is controlled by a WILL, which itself is directed by INTELLIGENCE.

The Conscious Self does something more than receive the impressions made upon the senses and the ideas and emotions arising in the brain. It controls and directs the actions of the brain, the action of the senses and the action of the bodily structure.

The body does not move evenly like a machine; it moves capriciously. Mind thinks when commanded to do so. The emotions are not under the same degree of control, but they can be commanded to a considerable extent. They may be kindled by ideal objects created by the brain under the direction of *the Will* and repressed at the command of *the Will*.

What is the motive power that thus distinguishes the mechanism of Man from the mechanism of an automaton? It is the WILL.

What is the WILL?

I will not attempt to define it. It will be better understood by description.



So much of the nerve structure as is necessary for the maintenance of the functions of life is to a very considerable extent, if not entirely, excepted from the control of the *Will*.

The rest of the mechanism is placed under the control of a power existing within itself, which can determine its action or the direction of its action. In the normal state of the mechanism, the *Will* can direct the legs to walk or to stand still; the eyes to see or not to see; the brain to think or not to think, or to think in one way and not in another way.

The Materialists cannot dispute this fact. But they assert that the *Will* is not a power at all, and that what we so call is merely the sum of the mental forces that chance to be in operation at the particular moment and of which the preponderating power propels the mental action in the special direction. For instance, if an object is set before us, and we hesitate whether to seek it or not to seek it, weighing hopes against fears, both emotions being in action, we are propelled in the direction of that which is at the moment the most active. This is not, they say, the work of an independent *WILL* that resolves so to act, but an irresistible impulse of the brain, which we flatter ourselves to be an act of choice—of *free will*.

But this is *not* the action of the *Will*. To understand this we must refer again to the operations of the *sensorium*, as above described.

The Materialists contend that the *Sensorium* is not merely the communicant of the impressions made upon it to the Conscious Self, but *is* the Conscious Self. How is that consistent with its operations?

There are many conditions in which the *sensorium* is manifestly in action and yet the Self has no consciousness of the impress made upon it. Thus it is in Dr. CARPENTER'S *Unconscious Cerebration*. One part of the brain is working in one way and another part in another way. Our attention is fixed upon the one and diverted from the other. But the action of both is transmitted to

the *sensorium*, which receives both, but cognizance of one of them is not taken by the Conscious Self. If the *sensorium* and the Conscious Self be identical, this unconsciousness could not occur. So in the phenomena of *Dream*, *Somnambulism* and *Trance*, treated of in the next volume, it will be seen that the brain is often in a very active condition, the *sensorium* manifestly receiving impressions and transmitting them, the Self remaining wholly unconscious of these impressions and actions, proving almost to demonstration that the Self is something other than the material mechanism of the brain.

We are now in a position to form a tolerably accurate conception of *the Will*. It is the power that directs and controls all the nerve organisation not removed from its jurisdiction for the purpose of maintaining the functions of animal life. It bids the brain and the nerves to do or not to do. It directs the actions of the body and the operations of mind.

*What* is this power? *What* is it of which I am conscious when I say "*I will*;" or command my mind to think on this or to cease to think on that; or my eyes to turn in a certain direction; or their lids to open or close; or my steps to be directed towards one locality or another?

In the first place, I know that the power is exercised by myself and not by some other. I know that *I* do it. I know also, that the brain that obeys or the leg that moves at my command, is not the *Self* that issues the command. Obviously one entity commands and another entity obeys.

In some mental conditions, as will be seen hereafter, the Conscious Self is found to be acting in one way while the entire brain organization is acting in another and very different way.

The *Will*—which is the expression of the Conscious Self—as that of the Intelligence, is expressed through the medium of a molecular organ. The Conscious Self does not move the molecular mechanism directly. It communicates its command (the *Will*) to the brain,



which transmits it to the nerve centre. Thence it is sent, like a telegram, through the nerve to the muscles, and the limb is moved in accordance with the dictate of the Self. This, at the first sight, is a complicated, and measured by muscular action, a slow process. But the *psychic force* of the Conscious Self acts within calculable rapidity, of which the best illustration is to be found in the action of the other imponderable forces. Consequently, there is no perceptible lapse of time between the issuing of the command by the Conscious Self and obedience to that command by the nerve centre.

The WILL, then, is the expression of the Conscious Self. It is the controlling force by which the Intelligence directs and determines the action of the machine. Constructed, as it is, of a most complicated and curious mechanism and endowed with *life*, it may well be that the molecular body may be capable of performing much by its own mechanism, as an automaton goes through a prescribed series of motions so long as the mechanical force is applied to the wheels within. Without the intervention of the *Will*-power the vital functions could be performed, and possibly some of the operations of Intelligence, for the brain would still work and the body obey its dictates. But they would be merely mechanical actions. They would take a certain fixed direction, from which no internal power could divert them. We should be, when awake, precisely what we are when we sleep and dream—for dream is the consequence of the suspension of the power of *the Will* over the action of the brain. We should be, as Somnambules are, deprived of self-direction or control and the slaves of any other influence that chance may throw in our way. In fact we should *be* the automata Professor HUXLEY says that we *are*. It is the presence of *the Will* that distinguishes us from automata. The *Will* enables us to control our actions and causes the very difference we see and feel between our dream condition and our waking intelligence. *The Will* makes us MEN instead of mere machines. *The Will* gives us the sense of

freedom, without which there could be no responsibility. The force of the *Will* is an intelligent and not a blind force. That force must proceed from *something*. It is not in the brain itself, for it commands and directs the brain. We are conscious that it is something that proceeds from ourselves—that *the Self* that commands is not the mechanism that is commanded—that *the Will* is the *Soul Force* expressing itself upon the body, not only setting it in motion but directing and determining its motions.

---



## CHAPTER XXIII.

## THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL.

THE Will commands the Mind, which directs and controls the body. This is scarcely disputed by the Materialists. Psychology advances another step and says that the Will is the expression, not of the brain that is commanded, but of something within us other than the brain—that which we recognize as the Conscious Self—the “I”—the “YOU.” But, accepting the existence of the power we call *the Will*, a controversy has raged among Philosophers from early time to the present, and is now as hotly conducted as ever, if this *Will* (whatever it may be) is a *free Will*—that is to say, does it really possess the power of choice in action, as we are accustomed to believe, or is that assumed freedom merely imaginary, *the Will* really acting under the absolute control of laws which compel it to take the particular direction, our notion that we have freedom of choice resulting in fact from our unconsciousness of the force by which *the Will* is directed?

The problem is as important as it must be admitted to be difficult. If there is no freedom of the Will—which means no liberty of choice what to think or to do—it is impossible to escape from the conclusion, not obscurely hinted by Professor HUXLEY and openly avowed by the late Professor CLIFFORD in a startling paper contributed to the *Fortnightly Review*, that we are merely automata, obeying irresistible impulses, rushing blindly forward into a dark future, having no moral responsibilities, the fools of time and fate

Is this true?—for, if it be true—but I will not ask the Reader to peer into the gulf that yawns before us.

Let us admit frankly the perplexities of the problem and the strength of the argument that shows us to be automata. Let us see if there be not more and better reasons to be adduced on the other side and if there be not some flaws in the arguments of the automatists.

We start with this important fact, that all of us, without exception, feel the most perfect conviction that we have a *Will*, that we can use that *Will*, and that *when we exercise our Will we have power to choose*. If it be not so, the Will itself is a worthless gift—a mockery, a delusion and a snare. Professor HUXLEY does not hesitate for a moment to exercise *his Will* upon occasion. When Professor CLIFFORD determined to write an essay proving himself to be an automaton, he did not entertain the slightest doubt that he could *determine by his own Will* whether he would write it, and how he would write it, and what he would do with it when it was written. While it was passing from his mind to the paper there can be no doubt that he hesitated often which of two or more expressions to employ; whether he should strike out this sentence or add that one. Nor was the Professor restrained by confidence in his own theory that he had no choice, from having two or more lines of action in his thoughts, then choosing between them, and then *by his Will* directing his fingers to perform the *selected* work.

Surely the universal conviction of all mankind, not merely felt but practically adopted in every action of the whole life of every individual, even by the Philosophers who deny its existence, must be allowed to count for a great deal in a controversy of opposing *probabilities*, for it must be clearly understood that the argument extends to nothing more than *probability*. The opponents of freedom of the Will do not pretend to prove by the evidence of facts that this freedom does not exist, but only that it is highly improbable, because it is, as they contend, inconsistent with some other accepted theories.



Coming to evidence and examining the facts, they prove a limited *free will*. As a *fact*, so far as proof of any fact is possible (that is, by the evidence of the senses in relation to others and of consciousness in ourselves) no fact in Nature is more completely affirmed. All of us believe that we possess freedom of the Will, all of us act confidently upon that belief, and, strange to say, never find ourselves deceived. If we use *the Will* and make the choice, the act so preferred, apart from physical obstacles, is always done. All human laws are framed upon the assumption that men are free to do or not to do certain things commanded or prohibited. If, passing beyond our own consciousness we observe the actions of others, we see in them invariably the exercise of the same freedom to choose of which we are conscious in ourselves.

The evidence, therefore, is entirely on the side of free-will. On the other side there is *no evidence* whatever.

The objection is argumentative merely. "If such a thing be," say these Philosophers, "it is inconsistent with some other thing which we hold to be true. If there be freedom of the Will in individuals, mind cannot be under the reign of law, for there must in such case be a clashing and conflicting with laws that would inevitably dislocate the entire order of so much of creation as comes within the range of human influence. Free-will on the part of individuals is, indeed, absolutely incompatible with general law."

The objection is formidable but not insuperable. In the first place, it is the old argument *à priori*, the employment of which in Science has stayed its progress for so many centuries and the partial banishment of which has brought about all her recent triumphs. It is expressed in the short formula: "This *is* not because it *cannot* be, and it *cannot* be because it is contrary to this fact or that principle, to *our* experience or *our* knowledge." This argument assumes much that is not yet proved. It assumes, not merely the reign (that is the universality and supremacy) of law but the character of that law, namely,

that it is a law in itself inconsistent with freedom of the Will. "But," the Automatists rejoin, "although this characteristic of the law is not entirely *proved*, is it not highly probable? What would be the worth of a law incessantly broken? Law is order. Law governs the orderly action of the universe. The frame of things would become disjoint if it were permitted to every man's *Will* to set that Law at defiance."

Good. But let us reverse the position. Suppose a new world to be created and its inhabitants gifted with freedom of Will. Would it be impossible to frame the general law so as to adapt it to this freedom of the individual Will? Even the Professors, with their mental keenness and ingenuity, would find no difficulty in constructing such a law. The GREAT CONSTRUCTOR of the laws that govern the Universe might be assumed to adapt His laws to the creation they are to govern. If HE had endowed Man with free-will, the other natural laws would be adapted to that.

The *Free Will* contended for is *not* unlimited. On the contrary, it is very limited indeed. Compared with this earth its range of action is infinitesimally small—compared with the Universe it is nothing. And what do we really *know* of the laws with which free-will is said to be inconsistent? We know something of the laws that govern the molecular part of the Universe, but of the vastly greater *non-molecular* portion of it, the *non-material* Creation by which we are encompassed and of which if Soul be it is a part, we are absolutely ignorant. There are laws of Nature other than the *physical* laws to which organic life is subject. The *psychic laws* differ from but do not conflict with the *physical* laws. The *psychic* laws govern special structures—special forms of being—and are fitted for the special functions assigned to them. It is impossible to maintain that the molecular world is all of Creation, that there *is* no locality in which *Soul*—(or *mind*, if you please so to call it;—I intend by it that entity, whatever it be, that is not body) could not be a dweller. The reasonable conclusion alike from evidence



and argument is, that we are not the automata we have been called, but responsible beings, having a choice of actions, with reason to govern our choice and a *Will* to command the execution of the chosen action.

Free-will is of necessity limited to freedom to choose between two or more presentations of ideas by our own minds. It is contended by the Automatists that the seeming choice is determined by laws of mind we are compelled to obey and that when we believe we are freely willing this or that, we are really following a blind impulse. From such an assertion the only appeal can be to our individual consciousness and this returns an unanimous verdict. On any theory of Man's origin, whether by creation or evolution, whence came this universal consciousness of a free-will to choose between our mental impulses, if there be in fact no foundation for that faith.

---

## CHAPTER XXIV.

## INSTINCT.

INSTINCT is a word conveniently invented, like so many other words, to hide our ignorance. In philosophical as in popular estimation, *Reason* was assumed to be the special attribute of Man and wholly denied to the lower animals.

But inasmuch as the greater part, if not all, of the lower animals are manifestly moved by an intelligence of some kind, and reason was held to be the attribute of Man alone, it was necessary to find some other name for the directing influence of animal action, and the name of *Instinct* was invented for it.

With nine-tenths of the world names are things. When a name is in the common mind it is content. The name stands for an idea. So it was with the term *Instinct*. "Man is governed by *reason*, animals by *instinct*. It is clear enough now to the meanest understanding." That was the teaching of every school book and of not a few books of higher pretensions. It was the popular belief. It has not yet entirely ceased to be so.

Ask what the word *Instinct* means and the imposture is discovered by the answer. "It is something animals have and man has not. It is an impulse by which animals are moved to all their actions. They do this or that *instinctively*—that is, because they cannot help it."

Ask those who thus answer how *they* do this or that ?



Do they say "Because I must ; because I am moved by a blind impulse," as they say that animals are moved ?

No. They say "my actions are directed by reason, which is the God-like faculty of Man alone of all the creatures upon the earth. God has given us reason for our guidance, with free-will to do or not to do, and made us responsible for our actions. God has given to the lower animals neither reason nor free-will, nor imposed upon them responsibility for their actions."

Such was the almost universal creed a hundred years ago. Modern research and thought have wrought an immense change. Formerly, instinct would not have been a subject for a chapter in the description of the mental mechanism of man, for it would have been deemed not in any way to concern man. *Now* it must form a not unimportant part of that description.

For we have thus far advanced in knowledge. We have learned that reason is not the exclusive property of man, nor instinct of animals.

Animals have *reason*. Man has *instinct*.

What then is *instinct*, viewed from the standpoint of Psychology not as a vague word but as something to which we attach a definite conception ? What *thing* do we intend to express when we use the term *instinct* ?

The popular notion of instinct is that it is a blind impulse to act in a certain manner without choice of means by which to attain the desired end. A creature moved by instinct alone would, in this view of it, be merely a machine—an automaton.

We may at once reject this vulgar conception of instinct. From the highest animal to the lowest no mere automaton is to be found. All exercise a choice to some extent, and hence something very like a *Will*. Animals may have impulses towards certain ends ; but all exercise selection of means by which the end is to be attained. A blind instinct is commonly said to compel the bird to build its nest as its ancestors had done, although it had never been present at the building of a nest. That this impulse is not wholly blind is proved by the one

fact out of many pointing to the same conclusion, that the external material and form of the nest are always modified so as to adapt them to the locality which choice or necessity has selected for the site of the nest. The general structure is undoubtedly dictated by that mental faculty we call *instinct*; but the special adaptation of the instinctive action to the desired end is the process which in ourselves we call *reason*.

Nevertheless, there is undoubtedly something which is *not* reason, and which we contemplate when we talk of *instinct*, although it is not instinct in the sense in which the term is commonly used.

The vulgar notion of instinct is that it is a blind impulse to act in a certain definite manner—in one word, *automatism*.

Psychology views instinct as being what I will venture to describe in a new formula—"untaught knowledge."

The Reader who has advanced thus far in the examination of the "Mechanism of Man" will, I hope, understand clearly the process of mental action. The brain being the material organ, the mental work of that organ consists in motions of the fibres of the brain, which motions the Conscious Self translates into what we call *ideas* or *emotions*. The *qualities*, however, of these ideas or emotions are determined by the structures through the movements of which they are transmitted. The conception of the *idea* and the *emotion* is by the Conscious Self, but its power or delicacy, capacity or incapacity, depend upon the character of the mental organ of communication between that Self and the external world.

Thus much of brain action may be accepted as proved. It may be permissible now to hazard a conjecture. We know that, other conditions being the same, *power* results from size and *refinement* from quality, of the brain structure, while *activity* comes of the capacity of the nerve centre to produce vital force. May it not be that these qualities of the Intelligence take their character from the molecular mechanism—the faculty itself belonging to the Conscious Self? To make this suggestion



more clear, let us contemplate the probable operation of such a structure. Assume that the Conscious Self (or Soul) possesses in itself all the mental faculties; that, according to the law of mundane existence, it can communicate with a molecular world only through the medium of the molecular mechanism of the brain. The mental faculties would not be *produced* by the brain through which they are expressed; but they would take the *character of their expression* from the mechanism that expresses them. The mental faculties would exhibit power when expressed through a powerful medium; energy through an active medium; delicacy and refinement through a delicate medium. It is in this sense only that the brain is the organ of the Intelligence. It is not the faculty, and it does not give the faculty; it only modifies the *expression* of the faculty.

There is no doubt whatever that the brain is cultivated by exercise, not into activity only, but into capacity. It is known to increase in size with use. Nor this alone. It acquires readiness of action, stimulated by the very slightest suggestion. At first, a conscious effort of the Will is required to prompt the performance of every voluntary act. After some practice, the brain works continuously without exercise of the Will and without consciousness, by mere force of habit, and such actions become what we wrongly call "*instinctive*." They are not the results of "*instinct*," properly so called. They are in truth acts of "*unconscious cerebration*." Nevertheless, these unconscious and unwilld actions approach so nearly to instinct that the recognition of them will make the true nature of instinct more intelligible.

*Instinct* is not necessarily involuntary. *Instinct* is simply an impulse to act in a certain way without that act being determined by a process of reasoning. If the question could be asked "Why did you so act?" the answer would be, "I do not know. I could not do otherwise." But the act is not done without *some* mental motive. The bird *intends* to build her nest in the special form of her race,—the bee thus to construct her cells and so forth.

But the nest and the cells are not constructed, as Man builds his houses, in pursuance of a plan which he has devised in his mind and for which he has assignable reasons. Man exercises a great number of his mental faculties in *designing* the work before he commences it, and he changes the plan at pleasure. *He pictures in his mind the structure as it is to be.* That is to say—he exercises his *imagination*, and afterwards realizes his ideal. The bird and the bee do not plan previously, nor have they reasons for what they do. Their incapacity results from a defective faculty of *imagination*, which is essential to the designing of a new structure. Hence the mind's eye of the bird pictures only the particular form of habitation which the constructive faculty, as evolved by heredity, presents to it. As with ourselves, the bird and the bee can execute only what the mind prompts. Their constructive faculty can direct them only in one fashion, with a very narrow limitation of variance. This and this only is properly called *Instinct*.

But how does this Instinct come? By *Heredity*. The bird and bee inherit from their parents a brain structure that wants the faculty of Imagination to give them new conceptions of habitations, and the capacity of whose constructive faculty is limited to the reproduction of that form upon which alone it has been exercised through countless generations.

In what manner this faculty, although so limited in extent, has grown to be so perfect within its limits, is a problem which Mr. DARWIN is supposed to have solved in his great theory of *evolution*—which it would be impossible to enter upon here. Enough for the purpose of this treatise if the Reader should acquire a more definite comprehension of what it is he intends when he uses that misunderstood and much abused term *Instinct*.

Man has many *instincts* as the lower animals have much *reason*. A large proportion of our own actions are as instinctive as are those of animals. The difference between the instinct of Man and of animals is in this—



that Man can, if he pleases to exercise his *Will*, to some extent control his instincts or substitute reason for them. In practice we do not so habitually, and as a rule we obey the instinctive impulse. And we do so rightly, for instinct is the product of ages of experience, while reason is only the result of our individual effort.

We are not, therefore, entitled to despise *instinct* as something lower in the scale of created Intelligence than reason. In many particulars it is superior to reason. Each is excellent in its way. Both are the gifts of the same Providence. Both are to be employed in their proper places. The possession of both by Man and the lower animals is a question of degree, not of kind. This lesson learned should teach us the duty of *humanity* to animals and *charity* to Men.

---

## BOOK III. SOUL.

## CHAPTER I.

## INTRODUCTORY.

## LIFE—MIND.

None seriously question the existence of these as *forces* by which the Mechanism of Man is moved. *Life* sets the machine in motion—*Mind* directs and controls its motions.

Thus far all are in agreement. There are widely divergent views of what life is and what mind is, but there are no differences about the fact that life and mind *are*. In some form, either as actual things, or as conditions or states of things, *life* and *mind* are accepted, not only by all Psychologists, but by all Physiologists.

Life and mind are not perceptible to any sense. Their existence and characteristics are to be discovered only by the presence of the energy they exercise upon the molecular organic structure and upon the external world.

*Vital force* is the action and expression of LIFE. *Intelligence* is the action and expression of MIND.

These forces may be the same forces exhibited under different forms, as some have contended. The names given to them may be rejected, as others have disputed them. But, by whatever names they may be called, there is little or no difference among the disputants as to the *things*—the entities—intended to be so named. We can conceive of no motion of “matter” without the pre-



sence of a *force* proceeding from the one and communicated to the other by which the motion is caused. Throughout this treatise by the term "a force" is designed *the thing*, whatever it be, that immediately produces motion (or whose presence is always followed by motion), in molecular structure.

The existence of LIFE and MIND, or, if the terms be preferred, of *vital force* and *mind force*, needs no laboured proof. They are not seriously denied even by the Materialists.

It is otherwise with the *third* of the forces which Psychology asserts as being associated with the Mechanism of Man.

It asserts that there is a *force* proceeding from SOUL. This force may be fitly termed the *Psychic* (or Soul) *force*.

The existence of a *Psychic Force* depends upon the answer given to the question, "Is Soul a myth or a reality?" If *Soul* be not, we can look for no other force in the Mechanism of Man than the forces of *life* and *mind*. If that mechanism comprises *Soul* also, that Soul must exercise a *force* or energy of some kind, and that force may be aptly designated as the *Psychic Force*.

Materialists deny the being of Soul. Some base their contention upon *à priori* argument that it *cannot* be. Others say only that there is no *proof* of its being—that there are no *facts* from which its existence can be reasonably inferred, and that it is, on the admission of its advocates, imperceptible by any sense. Further they say that not only is there no evidence to support the being of Soul, but that there is abundant evidence conducting to the conclusion that the conception of Soul is but the embodiment of man's desire not to die. The argument is condensed by Professor TYNDALL in a short sentence, "I see in matter the promise and the potency of every form of being."

They say further, that, as Soul is imperceptible to any sense, its existence is not only incapable of being proved

by such evidence as Science can accept, but that it is therefore absolutely unknown, unknowable and unthinkable. We cannot even conceive of it mentally, much less accept it as a definite *fact*, to be received into the lists of things known and upon which science can be based. All physical science, they truly add, must be founded upon *facts* and facts alone; it must deal with *things*, not with abstractions. "All that we can discover in the Mechanism of Man is a visible and tangible organic structure, marvellously compounded—his *body*. We note the expression of intelligence proceeding from this body and we find it to be entirely dependent upon the structure and condition of a part of that body—the brain. We find that the brain shares the frailties of the body and perishes with it, and that when this brain sickens and dies the Intelligence sickens and dies also. We conclude, therefore, that this Intelligence is a function of that brain."

This argument of the Materialists is indisputable—so far as it goes. But Psychology advances another step. It says, "Admitting that our senses can *perceive* nothing but the molecular structure—that the Intelligence that controls the structure is obviously so associated with that structure that it partakes of all its conditions in life and seems to perish with it at death—nevertheless, we assert confidently, that the MAN is something other than that molecular structure—an entity, a thing that is *himself*—of which the body is merely the molecular mechanism, conditioned for existence in a world structured of molecules. What is called "mind" is merely the expression of that individual entity, the Conscious Self, conveyed through the mechanism of the brain."

The Materialist inquires upon what evidence Psychology bases this assertion, seeing that, according to its own admission, this asserted entity is wholly imperceptible by any sense.

Psychology answers, "We know of the presence of this imperceptible entity by precisely the same evidence as that by which you recognise the presence of Elec-



tricity, or Magnetism, or any other imperceptible physical existence—*by its operation upon the matter that is perceptible*. You Physicists are thus enabled to determine, not the existence only, but also the qualities and capacities, of these imperceptible existences. In like manner Psychology is enabled to discover the presence of an imperceptible Soul in Man. True that Psychology cannot see it nor feel it. But it *can* and *does* witness the operations of that imperceptible entity upon the expressions of mind and the actions of the body. Thence it reasonably and scientifically concludes the existence of that non-corporeal entity. Thus also it is enabled to learn something of its nature, capacities and characteristics.”

True, that the mechanism of the brain is the mechanism of the mind and that, as the brain is, so is the *expression* of the mind. But the actual mind—the Intelligence—the Conscious Self—may be very different from the expression of it as conveyed by the mechanism, which, if indeed Soul exists as a distinct entity, must work after some such manner as this.

The intelligence is not that of the brain, for the brain is made of molecules which are not intelligent. The same molecules that form the senseless stone recombine to form the brain. The Intelligence is in the *Conscious Self*—the SOUL—which can express itself to external molecular existence only through a molecular mechanism, and can receive impressions of external existence only through the same medium. The *consciousness* we call ideas, thoughts, emotions, is not in the brain but in the Conscious Self. But the *expression* of sensations is of necessity modified by the mechanism through which they are transmitted. They take their characteristics from the character of the medium through which they are presented. It is with the Conscious Self as it is with one of its sense-organs, the eye. An object presented to the sense of sight is changed in its expression of size, colour, and even of shape by the medium through which it is presented—as by a coloured glass or a lens. But the object of vision is still the real object, although

the Self receives the impression as modified by the medium through which it passes. The Conscious Self in normal conditions receives only the impression as conveyed to it from without. According to the structure of the brain so must that impression be moulded. But it is only *moulded*, it is not created, by the brain. All that the brain does, in the conveyance of *impressions* to the Conscious Self, or the conveyance of *expressions* from the Conscious Self, is to give to them certain qualities which attach to certain structural characters of the brain, as power, energy, refinement, and such like. It is the Conscious Self that *thinks* the thought and *feels* the emotion. The brain, from which the impression is received, gives to it certain characteristics, the necessary consequences of the process by which its work is performed, namely, by motions of the molecules of which its fibres are made—fibrous action which, transmitted to the muscles through the nerves, makes the tongue to speak or the hand to write.

This is probably the manner in which the mental mechanism conducts its operations. This, the Materialist will urge, is at the best but a conjecture more or less probable. "You do not *prove*," he will say, "that so it is, nor that there is a Conscious Self or a Soul so to work. Your conception of the method by which mind and Soul *may* work together is nothing more than an ingenious theory showing how the mechanism *may* possibly be constructed. You do not *prove* by any *evidence of facts* that so *it is*. All you have done is to answer the objection of the Materialists that, *à priori*, the existence of Soul distinct from body as a part of the Mechanism of Man is not merely unproved, but improbable and scientifically impossible."

"Granted," returns Psychology; "it is *not* proof and it is not designed for *proof*. It is intended only to show the *possibility*, if not the probability, of Soul. It is argument *à priori*, like yours, and it is adduced to answer your *à priori* arguments. It proposes nothing more than to clear the ground of objections which,



whether you so intended them or not, practically operate to impede, if not to prevent, inquiry after evidence and the reception of proofs when found. You *do* thus deter many from investigation of alleged facts. It is as if you had designed to say, "Such things *cannot* be; therefore why waste time and thought in making inquiry about them."

But the Psychologist is not content to leave the argument at this point. He advances yet another step, and confidently asserts that not only is there no *à priori* objection to the reality of alleged psychical facts and phenomena, but that there is cogent *à priori* argument in their favour. He denies that they are either impossible or improbable. He avers that they are both possible and probable. He goes yet further and affirms, with the confidence of most sincere conviction, that such psychical facts and phenomena actually *are*. He declares that there is *positive scientific proof, by scientific evidence*, of the *fact* that there is something in the Mechanism of Man other than the material molecular structure; something which constitutes his intelligent and *Conscious Self*, and which something exists distinct from his corporeal organism, although intimately associated with it.

He challenges the Materialist to the investigation of those *Facts and Phenomena*, either to disprove their existence, or to give to them some explanation other than that Psychology has put upon them.

But the Psychologist does not as positively affirm what that *Something* is—its nature, its structure, its qualities, its physiology, its relationship to the material mechanism whose motions it directs, its manner of being and its destinies—for these are as yet in great part conjectural. They have but recently become the subjects of *scientific* examination and knowledge of them is therefore of necessity very imperfect. They have been but lately recognised as belonging at all to the domain of Science. They have been hitherto held as being solely within the dominion of Theology. Vulgar superstition has attached

to the treating of them by any scientific methods as being almost a species of sacrilege—as if Soul was a mystery too sacred or too profound for secular research. Having been preached as a *faith*, the notion of infidelity has unfortunately been sought to be affixed to endeavours to attain conviction of it as a *fact*.

It is, however, as a *fact*, like all other facts recognised by Science, and as a fact only, that Psychology proposes to pursue it. This it claims to do by precisely the same methods as are adopted for the ascertaining of all other truths in science—by the evidence of *facts* and *phenomena*, duly observed, examined and attested. The gathering together of these is now the first duty of Psychologists everywhere. The number of such phenomena is already vast and every day adds to them. But they are scattered among a multitude of books of all times and countries, whence they must be extracted and collected. Many cases are of daily occurrence, within the observation of the Doctors especially, but often witnessed by private persons, which ought to be placed on record and only are not preserved because there is no central storehouse to which they may be sent, with assurance that they will receive such attention as their value may determine. No greater service can any Psychologist now render to his science than to aid such a collection by the contributions of his experience or his reading.

What is the nature of the *evidence* by which Psychology claims to *prove* the existence of this non-molecular being in molecular Man will be learned in the next volume, when we come to examine the Mechanism of Man in action. For the purpose of this part of the treatise, I must assume the existence of that non-molecular *Something* we call the *Conscious Self* or *Soul*, as one of the three motive forces in the mechanism. Should this proof be found to fail, all that is now to follow must be rejected as being without foundation. But if there be that *SOMETHING* and this *force*, it becomes an inquiry of the most profound interest to every human being what are its probable characteristics? To this



we now proceed, again reminding the Reader that as yet they are not *proved*, but must be accepted by him as being only more or less *probable conclusions* from the assumed facts, or, we should rather say, of the fact we assert that Psychology is prepared to prove—the great *fact* of the existence of SOUL as a distinct and definite entity in the complicated Mechanism of Man—or rather, as is the contention of this treatise—the MAN (of whom the molecular structure is merely the envelope at the surface of contact with the molecular world to which the present stage of his being is allotted) is the SOUL—the SOUL is the MAN.

---

## CHAPTER II.

## SOUL—SPIRIT—PSYCHE—ANIMA. (a)

WE have positive knowledge of *body* and *mind* in Man. We are as certain as we can be of anything that Man has a body, admirably constructed, moved by a nerve system that obeys a power we call the WILL and which power is directed by INTELLIGENCE.

Here, then, we have a perfect machine—a *body* of wonderful structure moved by a central WILL and controlled by an intelligent MIND. Before our eyes stands this body. We can see and measure the mechanism by which this mind controls this body. We see and know that this mechanism of mind lives, grows, declines, and perishes with the body.

Is this *all*? Have we here the *whole* Man? Is what we thus see and measure *everything*? Is there nothing more of us than muscle, bone, nerve and brain? Is the *thing that controls and directs* the mechanism the product of the machine?

---

(a) In treating a subject upon which there is so little knowledge and so much prejudice, where almost every term that can be used conveys to each reader a different conception of its meaning, it is necessary, however tedious, to avoid misunderstanding or misrepresentation by repeating what is the precise sense in which the word SOUL is used throughout this book.

It is designed to express *only* that SOMETHING (whatever it be) that is supposed to exist in Man, not as a mere force, nor as a product of organization, nor as a quality or condition of organization (like Life, for instance), but as a distinct and definite *entity*—a *being* having an existence apart from molecular organization, capable of severance from that organization and of continuing its distinct being when so parted.



WHAT AM I?

*Must* we say, "A material mortal structure merely, that grows to maturity, lives for a brief time, dies and is dissipated?"

PHYSIOLOGY answers "Aye!"

PSYCHOLOGY answers "No!"

Psychology says there is something more in Man than this material structure—something we cannot perceive by our senses or grasp with our instruments, but the proof of whose existence must be sought in *manifestation*.

The task upon which we are now to enter is to inquire if Psychology has any and what *evidence* to support its assertion; if there be any and what *scientific proof* of the existence in Man of SOMETHING OTHER THAN MIND AND BODY; for, without a full examination of this important subject, very imperfect would be any answer to the question, "WHAT AM I?"

What *name* shall be given to that which is the subject of this chapter? What one word will convey to the Reader a distinct conception of *the thing* intended to be brought under his consideration in the following pages? The choice of a designation is not unimportant, for already in the majority of minds some ideas, more or less vague, are associated with each of the above names. Each suggests to the Reader some conception which his own mind has already formed and which is probably very unlike the idea the writer had designed to convey. Few words are more frequent in conversation and in books than "SOUL." But ask the most intelligent and reflecting of those who use it to describe in plain words *what it is* they call "SOUL"—what *definite idea* of "a SOUL" they have—what *form, material, qualities*, they have in their minds and intend to express by that name—they will be compelled to confess that, in very truth, the word "SOUL" is to them little more than an unmeaning phrase and that they have a very vague notion indeed—if any at all—of the *thing* they are talking about.

If it be so with the most intelligent and thoughtful,

what must be the blankness of conception of Soul in the minds of the ignorant and unreflecting?

Not so, however. As always, the unthinking and the uninformed find no difficulty in attaching an idea to the word. "Of course," they say, "I know what the Soul is; everybody knows *that* who knows anything. The Soul is—is—is something in us that lives after we die."

But what definite *idea* have they of the nature of this something, of its structure, its dwelling place in the body, in what manner it is connected with the body and what is their precise relationship, its functions there, its material, its shape, by what process it is severed from the flesh, where it goes? What do they *imagine* to be the manner of its existence in its new life, what are the new conditions and new natural laws to which it *must* be subjected when disembodied, what are its capacities and its occupations, where is its abode and what its ultimate destiny? Not the unreflecting only, but the vast majority of those who are accustomed to think, will admit that these questions, of overwhelming interest to all of them, had never or rarely occurred to their minds, although not doubting in the least the fact that they *have* Souls.

It is a startling truth that few of these momentous questions have ever been seriously considered even by the most educated. Why? Because their attention has not been directed to them as questions to be *practically* and *scientifically* examined. Stranger still it is that such an inquiry should not have been eagerly courted and energetically pursued. Who is there, knowing that next year he may go to dwell in a distant land, who would not make anxious inquiry for information concerning the country, the climate, the conditions of existence and the nature of his abode there, and if there be any and what means of communication with the friends he will leave behind him. Nevertheless, there is scarcely one among us who, although *knowing* that his Soul *must* depart from its present dwelling in a few



years, and *may* be summoned to its new abode to-morrow, has ever given thought to the question what, viewed by the light of Science, must and will be the probable conditions of its existence without the body.

Is it that we fear to *think*, or that we do not firmly *believe*? Is it that with us it is *assent* only, not *conviction*? Do we *believe* in Soul and immortality confidently and clearly, as we believe in the rising of the sun to-morrow? Or is it only a dreamy hazy notion of something very far off and very doubtful?

In the olden time, when the existence of Soul was generally recognised, Imagination invented a futurity for it, every people painting that future according to its own notions of pleasure and pain. The differences in these pictures proved them to be productions of fancy, not founded on any fact. They were drawn in utter disregard alike of the known laws of nature and the teachings of reason and of science.

But this age is not an age of faith. We are not content to dream. We demand *facts*. We have learned many of Nature's laws and we require that all knowledge shall be pursued in accordance with those laws. The structure, qualities and functions of Soul and the conditions of its existence—that is to say,—its *Physiology*—must henceforth be investigated with the same reference to reason and science and the same examination of facts, as are those of body.

But *has* the question been so treated?

On the contrary, the diversities of individual conception of the conditions of a future state are as conflicting now as ever they have been. If any twenty educated persons who believe in the existence of Soul were required to write each his own ideas of its present and future dwelling-place, of its structure, of its qualities, its powers, pleasures and pains, it might be safely predicted that there would be as great a diversity of description as of persons. It would be found that each had depicted for it a future which was nothing more than the present amplified and beautified, its bliss and its woe

being precisely that which the speaker regards as pleasure or dreads as pain.

The conclusion from this is that the subject has not been examined with reference to *scientific* law.

Why this neglect of a matter of such surpassing interest? Years are expended in experiment and discussion upon the chemical composition of a stone; but the composition of ourselves is treated with contemptuous neglect, as a matter of no moment. The lips acknowledge the being of SOUL as well as of body; but, while the mortal body is laboriously studied, the immortal Soul is never examined. This treatment of it seems to betray a want of confidence in its actuality. The Physicists say that, from its nature, Soul is out of their province for they cannot subject it to the knife, the crucible, and the microscope. True; but is no other proof admissible in Science than that which instruments supply? Is our capacity for knowledge limited to things palpable to our senses? Nay, more; is it certain that the senses themselves supply *no* evidence of the existence of something in us other than that material structure which the Physiologist manipulates? May there not be found in Man something positive and substantial, from which we may fairly and reasonably arrive at the conclusion, or at the least form a probable anticipation, that we are not wholly material; that we are more than protoplasm; that Theology teaches a substantial truth, to be demonstrated by Science, and not merely a dogma that Science looks upon as a dream; that even in Science itself we may hope to find, scientifically shown, a reasonable probability that we possess Soul, or, I should rather say, that *we are Souls*.

I admit that nothing short of such reasonable and scientific proof should completely satisfy the inquiring Mind. But what truth should be so eagerly desired and sought? What other has so profound a personal interest for us as the question of questions

HAVE WE SOUL?

It is necessary to remind the reader that this inquiry



is designed to be purely *scientific*. It purposely avoids all reference to the question in its *theological* aspect. It is addressed mainly to those who reject the authority of the Theologian; to those who accept the existence of Soul as a dogma, but have not that firm and clear faith which never feels a qualm of doubt creeping over it, as well as to those who accept the theological assertion fully and sincerely, but who desire some probable knowledge of the *nature* of the Soul they firmly believe themselves to possess, some definite conception of its mode of existence here and the conditions of its existence hereafter, so far as Science can trace them by applying to the investigation the known laws of nature. Theology, which affirms the existence of Soul and proclaims its immortality, does not attempt to teach us anything whatever about its structure and qualities, save that it exists in the present and will live in the future. But of what it is, how it is, and what and how it is to be, it reveals almost nothing.

Is there any Reader who would not express himself after this fashion? "I have a passionate longing to know more of this immortal Soul of mine. I am not content with the vague conception I have of it. I desire something more definite and distinct. I cannot accept a mere phrase. A name does not satisfy me. I am not the wiser for authoritative assurance that I have a Soul, unless a definite idea is conveyed to me by that term. I turn that word over and over in my mind and try to comprehend its meaning. I ask myself what *definite image* that name summons before my mind's eye. I can discover none—neither shape, nor substance, nor qualities—no distinct idea which, when invoked by the word or coming involuntarily into thought, I can contemplate as clearly as I can think of my body. More eagerly still do I desire to be assured that I have a Soul, not as a matter of *faith* alone, but as positive *knowledge*, as certain and definite as is my knowledge that I have a body. I am impatient to ascertain what *evidence* founded on *fact*, and what argument based upon the

laws of Nature and Science, reason can produce to me of the probable future of that Soul—if it has an existence in that future—if it retains there a consciousness of its past existence here—and what, under the new conditions of its being, are its probable powers and capacities.”

Doubtless thousands of thinking men and women are at this moment experiencing this desire and thirsting for this knowledge ; not questioning the theological authority that affirms it, but anxious, in a matter of such supreme importance to themselves, to confirm assertion by *proof*, to convert a *name* into a *thing*, and to change a shapeless *shadow* into a cognizable *substance*. The number of such eager inquirers cannot be measured by outward expressions. Like children in a churchyard at night shouting, “Who’s afraid !” many try to assume a confidence they do not feel. The doubting and failing in faith, anxious to have doubt removed and faith confirmed, turn to Science and say, “Tell me, you whose lives have been devoted to the investigation of Nature’s facts and the laws of Divinity as exhibited in His works, tell me, *have I a Soul?*”

And what says MODERN SCIENCE in answer to this earnest question ?

“I have looked for Soul, but I cannot find it. All that I can discover with the most powerful microscope is, that your body is built of particles of matter, combined in various groupings and forming various organic structures requisite to the completeness of the human being. Life appears to be the product of organism, the result of a certain combination of matter ; for when that combination is severed life ceases and the structure is dissolved into its elements. Viewed scientifically, death is not the departure of something from the body, but simply the cessation of vitality by the ceasing of the conditions under which vitality exists. I discover no difference between the act of death in a man, a sheep, a fish, a flea, or a mollusc, and after death the same process restores the bodies of all alike to the same elements out



of which they were all constructed. You ask me if mind is not the Soul? I answer that there is no evidence of it, but, on the contrary, all the evidence points to the opposite conclusion. Mind is dependent upon structure of the brain. A diseased brain makes a diseased mind. A well-formed brain is attended with intellectual capacity in proportion to its size and quality. If you paralyse the brain with a blow, you for a time extinguish the mind. Destroy a part of the brain and you destroy an equivalent portion of the mind. Arrest the motion of the fibres of the brain by congestion of the blood vessels, as in drowning; there is temporary death and life may be restored by making the heart pump again, thus relieving the congested blood vessels and removing the obstruction to brain action; upon which the mind revives also. Mind, we Scientists say, is a secretion from matter and every act of mind uses up a portion of matter. When the mind is paralysed by concussion or congestion of the brain, there is absolute insensibility and no appearance in the senseless body of the presence of any other power. Only the ceasing of the heart's action marks the passage from life to death. There is no visible intimation of the severance of a Soul from the Body at the moment of death, and the act of death in a man differs in no discoverable particular from the act of death in the lower animals. Our foremost physiologist, HUXLEY, finds only 'protoplasm' as the ultimate base of the human structure and Dr. CARPENTER explains some of the most mysterious actions of the mind by a theory of 'Unconscious Cerebration.' TYNDALL alone faintly acknowledges the possibility of the existence of other laws than those which govern the molecular world; but even he can find no better basis for his conjecture than an operation of the Imagination, a faculty which he contends might be fairly enlisted in the service of Science. So far as his investigations into Nature have advanced, he can discover nothing but matter made perceptible to our senses by certain 'modes of motion' which those senses are con-

structed to perceive. Even he does not acknowledge that there may be other modes of motion which the senses cannot perceive in their normal condition, but which may be perceptible in abnormal conditions. Science can find no Soul; no place in the structure where a Soul could dwell; nothing in mind, in life, or in death, upon which to base even probability that there is anything in us other than organic structure performing organic functions and governed by organic laws."

Distracted between the divergent teachings of Science and of Authority; the one pointing to *fact*, and the other appealing to *faith*; the latter proclaiming the existence of Soul, the former as dogmatically asserting "I can find no trace of it," and even Authority itself adventuring no definition of a Soul, either as to form, substance, dwelling-place in the body, relationship to the material structure or the conditions of its existence in the future, it is not surprising that painful doubts should prevail, nor that thousands of thinking minds find their faith failing them. They try *not* to think; they strive to thrust out the intruding thought. Not a few take refuge in authority from the agony of uncertainty and surrender their liberty of judgment because its exercise is a toil and a pain. Multitudes, who endeavour to persuade themselves that they are believers still because they close their eyes and their ears, nevertheless are conscious that their faith in the Soul and its immortality is not so fixed as it was before the Materialists of Science had proclaimed doubts. Their confidence is not the same firm and perfect belief as that with which they accept the existence of the sun, their own bodily being, or the certainty of death. Hence in cultivated society, everywhere throughout Europe and America, there is a vast stratum of unbelief. If not openly confessed, it crops out continually, betrayed by insinuation and often by more expressive silence. It pervades the press, not indeed in the form of plain avowal of scepticism, but in a shape far more insidious, therefore the more dangerous. Every opportunity is eagerly seized to give publicity and prominence to facts



and arguments that appear to sustain the doctrines of Materialism and to laud its preachers and teachers. Whatever tends to *their* refutation is repressed or ridiculed. Books are misinterpreted, writers are abused, letters are refused a place even in answer to falsehood or misrepresentation, if the writer's argument goes to establish the existence of Soul. The disciples of the Materialistic creed use their great power in the press to extinguish, so far as the *suppressio veri* and the *suggestio falsi* can do it, any scientific discoveries that threaten the stability of their dogma. It is now, as it ever was; pride will not permit men to confess an error of opinion. They form hasty judgments on insufficient facts, or on no facts at all, and having asserted them positively it is a point of honour not to admit that they could have erred. They *will not* be convinced. They close their eyes and ears resolutely against proofs. They look to the evidence on one side alone. They are blind to the evidence on the other side. They shut their eyes and say they *cannot* see, and they endeavour to discredit the evidence of all who differ from them by declaring them to be deluded fools or impudent impostors.

It is to these and such as these that I address myself. They who, happily for themselves, have accepted with unswerving faith the teachings of Authority, who are satisfied to *believe* and have no desire to *know*, need no other assurance of Soul, its present and its future, and will doubtless hold the looking for scientific proofs of its existence as a superfluous labour. To them it is so and they are happy in that confidence. It is for the sick at heart—for the minds that cannot accept as sufficient the mere assertion of any authority, but who crave for *proofs* before they can embrace a creed—for the multitudes whose faith has been shaken by the teachings of modern Science and the prevalent opinions of our Scientists—openly proclaimed by many, privately acknowledged by more—that this investigation is invited. The province of Psychology is not to supersede Authority,

but to inquire if the *teachings* of Authority may not be supported by the *FACTS* of Science and if *proofs* of the Soul's existence are not to be found in Nature, the denial of the Scientists notwithstanding. I repeat that in this investigation I purposely avoid all theological references, not implying doubt of their authority, but because the very design of this treatise is to inquire if there be any and what *evidence* of the existence of Soul, other than theological, giving to those who deny Authority, or who do not entirely accept it, that for which they are yearning—*knowledge*—not *faith* merely—but *positive knowledge*—such as they have of the realities of the world about them. Let all who *can* do so be content to accept the assertions of Authority and in that happy confidence seek to know no further. But to all who are not and cannot be content with this—to all who doubt—to all whose faith is not firm—to all who desire to strengthen their confidence in the teachings of Religion by finding their confirmation in the truths of Science, I say with respectful earnestness, "Come and join us in a humble, but honest and patient, inquiry if the dark and degrading conclusions of our modern Materialists are right. Let us labour to learn if Science itself cannot give to us *proofs* of the existence of Soul in Man and presents some glimpses of its dwelling here and of the conditions of its existence hereafter."

---



## CHAPTER III.

## IS SOUL POSSIBLE AND PROBABLE?

WHEN the Anatomists and Physiologists have reached the end of their investigation—when the microscope can exhibit no further resolution of the particles that compose the mortal frame—what, after all, has been revealed to us? A structure admirably contrived for existence in a molecular dwelling-place. The Physiologist gives to us the most minute description of the various parts of which this structure is composed—of their several functions—what they are designed to do—what changes take place in the structure during the processes of growth, in health, in disease, in decay, in death.

But, so far as he can with his most powerful instruments discover, he finds nothing more than this molecular structure. He sees that it possesses what he calls *Life*—that is to say, it is maintained by some natural laws of which he is entirely ignorant, acting for the most part in direct opposition to the physical laws, its various organs performing their functions by a power of which he knows nothing whatever. It assimilates to its own substance other substances brought into certain relationships with it. It has *Intelligence* and a *Will*. It acts and moves in obedience to a directing *force* generated within itself, of which his most powerful lens fails to reveal to his eye the very slightest trace or even to reveal the manner of its action. This directing Intelligence and controlling Will he tries to account for by terming it “a secretion of brain.” This self-sustaining Life, also self-produced, that opposes and suspends the physical laws, is with him the result merely of a combination of

protoplasm. How miserably unsatisfactory is this! What a specious attempt to conceal ignorance under a show of science! In truth, these terms are phrases only, having no definite meaning attached to them by those who use them. They are designed to conceal the lack of knowledge. But too often they are accepted by the outside world as substantial verities.

What is this *thing* we call *life* that thus escapes the most searching examination of the Physiologist, that force whose presence he cannot deny and yet of whose nature he is so profoundly ignorant?

Is it a definite something that has a concrete existence, either as a part of the corporeal substance or as distinct from it? Is it an ingredient of the structure, or an appendage to it, or merely, as the Materialists assert, a condition of the organism? These are some of the problems which Physiology has not solved, and never can solve, because its methods of investigation, admirable for the discovery of whatever the senses, aided by instruments, can detect, are altogether incompetent to the exploration of that which is invisible, intangible, immeasurable, imponderable, and swayed by laws differing wholly from, and often antagonistic to, the physical laws which alone Physiology recognises. At the very point where *Physiology* ends the Science of *Psychology* begins. It is right that they should be recognised as two distinct Sciences, to be pursued by two different classes of Investigators, (a) for it is impossible to make any progress in Psychological Science without the most complete recognition of the fact that, in the study of Psychology, we shall deal with materials, with conditions, and with

---

(a) The Physicists rightly say that, their business being with Physical Science, they have neither time nor thought for the investigation of Psychological Science. But then they should refrain from pronouncing judgment upon that of which they confess they know nothing and want leisure to inquire into. They have no right even to an opinion on that of which they are wholly ignorant, much less are they justified in declaring psychological facts and phenomena to be delusions or impostures, and the Psychologists, who have devoted time and thought to their investigation, to be either rogues or fools.



laws altogether different from those that are the foundation of Physiology.

The Materialists acknowledge the existence of LIFE, although they can find it only in its effects. They cannot tell the time of its coming, but they can see its departure, and when it ends they know that the lifeless thing before them is not the same thing it was before. *Something* has ceased in it, and with the ceasing of that something the entire relationship of that body to the external world has changed. It has passed out of the dominion of one set of laws into the dominion of another set of laws. The dead structure is the same in substance as it was a minute since, when it was alive; but its character has changed altogether. What has wrought this tremendous change?

The Materialists acknowledge the existence of MIND. This, too, they look upon as a secretion from matter, or a condition of organization, or describe it by some other definition designed to express that it is not an entity in itself but a quality of something else. Nevertheless, whatever their scientific contemplation of it, they do, in fact, think of it and speak of it, for all practical purposes, as something distinct from the body, although intimately allied with the body and sharing its fortunes. "The mind," they say truly, "is what the body is. As is the structure of the brain, so is the structure of mind. A blow that paralyses the brain extinguishes mind. Stimulate the brain by increasing the flow of the blood through it, and you stimulate mind. [An imperfect brain exhibits a defective mind; a misformed brain a deformed mind; a feeble brain an imbecile mind. Structure and intelligence are in this so manifestly associated that it is impossible for any but the wilfully blind not to see, or the resolutely prejudiced not to acknowledge, that mind and brain are identical or so closely allied as to be inseparable. If you acknowledge the verity of Dr. CARPENTER's theory of "Unconscious Cerebration," and, however gullible in this respect he may be called by us, *you* accept his hallucination as a reality, it entirely confirms this assertion. The

brain, he says, in certain conditions, acts spontaneously and unconsciously, thinks, feels, remembers, reasons, while we are wide awake, without any consciousness on our own part of these its operations, even when we are thinking, speaking and writing in relation to some totally different subject. Here you have the operations of mind distinctly performed by the brain. That brain grows from an invisible speck, attains maturity, dies, decays, and is dissipated. Simultaneously with it mind grows, decays, ceases. The operations of this brain attend all the operations of this Mind. When the fibres of the brain-mass move, Mind works. *Thought* is action of the brain. "*Paradise Lost*" is the product of molecular motion. The molecules of a certain part of the brain bestir themselves, or are bestirred. Forms which the external senses have transmitted to the brain through the nerves of the sense are seized by these moving molecules, reproduced in new combinations, and a picture is constructed by the faculty of "*Imagination*"—the name we have given to that brain process.

Granting all this argument of the Materialists—which it is impossible to deny—admitting mind to be a product of the molecular structure, or even, if the Scientists please, a condition of organization—that it is mortal, like the body, and perishes with it;

Granting also, for the sake of argument, that life is only a condition of organization and not a distinct entity existing in certain organised bodies, and, Life passing away, that the body perishes and mind ceases with it, still there remains the vastly larger, more important and more interesting question—which Physiology cannot answer because it is beyond her province—*is there in us something other than life and mind, which exists distinct and apart from them*, closely allied with them, but not identical; bound to them by conditions as yet imperfectly understood because insufficiently explored; living with them, but not dying with them; to which mind is as the servant and the body as the garment; a distinct, definite existence that passes away and lives as an indi-



vidual being when the body dies, the brain decays, and mind ceases ; a *Something* to which the brain is but the shaping and communicating mechanism through which that *Something* expresses itself and is impressed—the necessary condition of an existence in a molecular world ?

That is the question of questions, of the utmost moment to every human being and of the highest interest to society.

What answer can be made to it ? Is Soul *possible* ?

Few, perhaps, will dispute the possibility. It *may* be. Is its existence *probable* ?

At this point there will be found an immediate divergence between the Materialists who deny, and the Psychologists who assert, the existence of *Soul*—or Conscious Self—as distinct from the molecular organization.

The next step in the argument, therefore, will be for Psychology to show the *probability* of Soul.

The first fact from which this conclusion may be reasonably drawn is the great fact of *Consciousness*.

## CHAPTER IV.

## CONSCIOUSNESS.

HAVE we *any* consciousness, however dim, that the body and the molecular mechanism of the Mind are not *ourselves*?

I venture to assert that there *is* such consciousness. It is felt in all our contemplations of self and expressed in all our language and actions. Does any man think of *himself* as being constituted only of a body directed by a molecular mind that is but a part of that body? Does not a *sense* of an individuality other than this cling to all his contemplations of *self*? Can he throw off this consciousness of a distinct personality even if he strives to do so? Is not his language inseparably moulded to this conception of himself? Does any sane man ever talk or write of his mind or his life as "Me?" Does he not always say "*my* mind," "*your* mind," "*my* life," "*your* life"—that is to say "the mind—the life—that belongs to *me*," "the life—the mind—that belongs to *you*." The "*me*"—the "*you*"—to which that mind and that life belong are thus contemplated as something other than the mind of which the brain is the organ. Even the insane exhibit the same consciousness of a substantive individuality. The lunatic who dreams that he is a king believes that "*he*" has become a monarch and not that "*he*" is other than *himself*. The mind may be diseased, so that its every idea shall be disordered and its every act irrational, but the patient's *self*-consciousness remains unimpaired; he recognises his



individuality ; he knows that it is *he* who is saying and doing ; he is unconscious only of the unfitness and absurdity of what he says and does.

Thus it is in dream. Wild and impossible as dreams are, even when they are most wild we never dream that we are not ourselves. The dreamer imagines himself to be something, but never to be somebody, other than he is. It is still *he* that is acting.

So far, then, as the evidence of our *consciousness* extends, it goes to prove that we have a sense of personality and that the individual being whom we intend when we think of self, or say "I," is something other than that thing, composed of parts and subject to aberrations, to decay and to extinction, which we think of and speak of as "*my mind*" or "*my life*."

But what do we learn from an investigation of the operations of mind, as recognised by Science ? Do we find there any confirmation of our own consciousness of an individuality distinct from mind, or from body, or from both ?

To answer this question perfectly it would be necessary to go into an exhaustive description of the process by which the Intelligence is informed and works, tracing its operations from the instant of an impression made upon the external sense, its passage through the nerve to the brain, its communication there to the Conscious Self, and then the action of the Conscious Self upon the brain when desiring to express itself to the external world. To do this in minute detail would fill a volume and therefore it is impracticable here. For the purposes of the present argument it will suffice to view the process at the point of contact with the brain on receipt of an impression—say, of a star—sent to it by the sense of sight. Is that the end of its journey ? Is this delivery of the sense impression to the brain the delivery of the message to *me* ? Am "*I*" the brain ? Is the brain "*me*" and is what the brain so receives of itself and without more a receipt by "*me* ?"

To answer this it is necessary to call in aid the authority of Materialism itself. Dr. CARPENTER's theory

of "UNCONSCIOUS CEREBRATION" was invented to explain by brain action many phenomena, the existence of which it is impossible to deny, but which certainly appear to point to conclusions extremely inconvenient to the votary of materialism. The weapon is really a boomerang in his hand; it recoils upon himself. It has been freely used by the Materialists to extinguish what is called by them the "superstition" of Soul. I venture to adopt it and propose to *use* it to prove the existence of Soul, and for challenging Materialism in its stronghold.

It is, perhaps, necessary to explain to the unlearned reader that by the phrase "*Unconscious Cerebration*" Dr. CARPENTER intends to assert that the brain often acts *quite unconsciously to ourselves*, even when we are wide awake and in full possession of our senses. That the brain operates frequently without the Will is known to everybody, as in the familiar instances of reverie and dream. *Unconscious Cerebration* is more than that. We are conscious of our dreams, although the Will is powerless to control them. But in the condition asserted by Dr. CARPENTER, *the existence of which I entirely admit*, the brain works, not only without the Will, but without consciousness. There is another important difference between the two conditions. When the Will alone is suspended, as in dream, the brain is but partially at work, probably in one only of its two hemispheres. Some of its faculties are at rest and thence the incongruities of dreams and the strange unconsciousness by the dreaming mind of their absurdity or impossibility. In *Unconscious Cerebration*, according to Dr. CARPENTER, the whole brain works precisely as in our waking and most conscious condition—reasons, compares, numbers, and so forth—the only difference being that we have no *consciousness* of what it is doing. But the phenomena attending this condition of brain will come for more elaborate consideration hereafter. I only refer to the subject now as it affords one of the strongest proofs of the existence of something in Man other than *Life* and the material mechanism of *Mind*.



This theory of "*Unconscious Cerebration*" has been advanced triumphantly, not only as the solution of the strange phenomena of somnambulism, trance and other allied abnormal mental states, but as being subversive of what is termed the superstition of Soul. Certain remarkable perceptive powers exhibited in special physiological conditions, and supposed by many to indicate the existence in us of an intelligence other than that of the slumbering brain, senseless nerves and paralysed Will, according to this theory are action of brain, awake and at work while the external senses are severed from it and consciousness suspended.

Granting, for the sake of the argument, that Dr. CARPENTER is right in this; that his theory of *Unconscious Cerebration* explains the phenomena. I venture to claim his theory as cogent evidence for the existence of Soul, rather than a confirmation of the theory of Materialism. The very name given to it supports the contention. "*UNCONSCIOUS Cerebration*"—that is to say, the brain is performing the functions of mind unconsciously. Granted. But to whom or to what is the brain *unconscious*? Not *unconscious to itself*, of course; *that* could not well be. If the brain alone is actually performing the functions of mind, recalling ideas formerly impressed upon it, recombining them, reasoning upon them and directing speech and action rightly and sensibly, the brain itself, if it be the one seat of consciousness (as the Materialist contends) cannot be unconscious of its own acts. But, if not the brain, *what* is it that is asserted to be unconscious of the action of the brain? *To what* or *to whom* is the "*cerebration*" unconscious? Do not the explanation given of the phenomenon and the very term employed to express it admit *that there is something other than the self-acting brain which is without consciousness of that action*—something which, in the normal state, *does* take cognizance of the action of *the brain*, but which, in certain abnormal conditions, is so far unhinged that the usual channel of communication between itself and the busy brain is for a time suspended. Then the brain goes on

working as before, but works unconsciously to that *something which is not the brain*.

This is all that at the present stage of the inquiry I desire to establish. It suffices, for the purpose of the argument, that we deduce from the materialistic theory itself the *probable* existence of something in us other than brain or the brain action we call "mind"—something which we cannot see nor feel, but which believers in Unconscious Cerebration must recognise in fact although they disclaim it in words. What that something is will be for consideration presently.

In this fact of consciousness the most candid of the Materialists acknowledge a stumbling-block. Professors TYNDALL and HUXLEY confess themselves baffled at this point. It is inexplicable by any theory of materialism. Professor CLIFFORD's ingenious attempt to trace by the process of evolution the individuality and the intelligence of the Philosopher from the cells of a monad was beyond the power of even his great intellect. How consciousness could come at all out of any conceivable combination of unconscious molecules, is a question to which no answer has been returned. But how does that consciousness become identity? And how is that consciousness of identity preserved through a lifetime if the molecules whose combination is the cause of that identity are changing daily, hourly, momentarily? If consciousness be merely a product of unconscious molecular arrangement it must change with every change in the molecules that make it. How then is Professor TYNDALL's individuality preserved? How does he know himself to be the same Conscious Self now as he was when a boy?

There is but one possible explanation of the great fact of conscious individuality—that the conscious Being is something other than the structure formed of the unconscious molecules—which are the clothing merely and not the substance of that Being.

---



## CHAPTER V.

## PRESUMPTIVE EVIDENCE OF SOUL.

CONTEMPLATING a Man as he appears to the *senses* ; taking to pieces the curious mechanism of which he is constructed ; noting how his life begins and ends ; marking the growth, decline and cessation of his Intelligence, it must be frankly admitted, not only that his molecular structure presents no evidence of the existence of anything in him other than that which so lives, grows, decays and dies, but that the reasonable presumption, from all we can learn of him by examination of structure alone, is that nothing more appertains to a Man than that which perishes in our very presence.

If, therefore, we would seek for proofs of the existence of Soul, we must look for them in some other direction than *structure*. Anatomy will not disclose Soul, even if it exists, for the obvious reason that, from its structure, it must be imperceptible to our senses and intangible by our instruments. The failure of Physiology to find it is therefore *no* proof of its non-existence. Nor is such failure any reproach to Physiologists, whose business it is to describe the mechanism of the molecular structure alone and to deal only with that which is ponderable, mensurable, visible, tangible ;—that can be carved, weighed, decomposed and recomposed.

But if Soul exists in the body and cannot be discovered by our senses, how is its presence to be *proved* ? Does the very nature of Soul render it incapable of proof ? Is it and must it ever be merely a matter of faith and hope rather than of conviction ? Can no

knowledge of it *as a proved fact* ever be attainable by Science?

Or, taking into account the necessary conditions of Soul life, can we look in any direction with reasonable hope to find some *scientific evidence* that we are not wholly molecular and that death is not annihilation?

We must seek for such proofs, not in the *structure* but in the *action* of the Mechanism of Man. If Soul is ever to be found, it will be by a sagacious and laborious investigation, not of the motionless machinery, but as it is seen in action, and by careful examination of the forces by which it is directed. If we discover the presence of some *force* directing and determining the action of the mental mechanism, especially if that force should appear to be independent of and uncontrolled by any known physical force, to that we must look for the explanation Physiology is incompetent to give. It is not contended for a moment that, if such a force be found, it is *conclusive* evidence of the existence of something in us other than the structure that is subject to the *physical* forces. The present contention is only that they who are inquiring if there be Soul within them should dedicate themselves to the study of the *Intelligent forces* by the same process of patient examination, ingenious experiment and careful test as are employed by the Physiologists in exploring the phenomena of the molecular organization and the action of the physical forces. They must pursue that inquiry with the same unswerving adhesion to the recognised principles of Science as is needful for research in other portions of her domain, modified only in accordance with the difference in the conditions imposed by differences in the nature of the subject under examination.

The inquiry will properly commence with the arguments arising from beliefs and mental conditions common to all mankind. Admitting frankly that such arguments are but of small value in themselves, they are adduced because they assume importance by combination with others of more weight.



The *first* contention is already familiar to the Reader, but it must be repeated. Although trite, there is a truth in it. The general belief of all, or nearly all, of mankind that there is a future existence for them of some sort is a fact not unimportant. However the conception may have come in the first instance, even if it be the result of inherited impressions, as the Darwinian would probably contend, we have it as a *fact* that, with rare exceptions, if any, peoples of all recorded times and countries—however separated from others—savage as well as civilized—have believed that there was for them a life after death. Infinite have been the fancies with respect to the nature and conditions of that future life. The majority of conceptions of it have been to the last degree absurd or impossible. Very few indeed have in them a shadow of reason or of probability. But be the notions of that life to come wise or foolish, the truth remains, that there is, and in all recorded time has been, among all peoples, an almost universal belief in a future existence of some kind. That common consent may be accepted as an item in the sum of evidence supporting the argument that Soul is a part of the Mechanism of Man.

It is said, with some force, that this prevalent belief cannot trace its foundation to any *facts*; that it is the product rather of aspiration than of inspiration; that it is more the child of *Hope*, born of an eager *desire* for immortality, than a positive conviction of the *Reason* that a Soul is ours. But then comes the second question. Whence that desire? There is not the slightest cause to believe that such a sense exists in the lower animals. If the hope of immortality be peculiar to Man, is it not because Man possesses some special characteristic of which that hope and longing are the expression? May not the fact of an universally implanted desire for a certain object be reasonably deemed to imply the existence of that object? In all other parts of our mental as well as bodily frame, and indeed throughout Creation, we find structure and function invariably adapted to positive wants and realities. *All* our senses, emotions, sentiments and in-

tellectual faculties appear to be given to us because there are surrounding conditions to which we are subject, for our adaptation to which it is that these various faculties, mental and bodily, are constructed. If we find any faculty possessing powers apparently useless, or acting in a manner seemingly without an object, not the less may we be assured that there is a corresponding condition somewhere in the external world which it is our business to find, and which we shall assuredly find if we look for it with due skill and diligence.

It may fairly be contended that this is the meaning of the admitted longing and looking for life after death that is implanted in all minds and prevails throughout almost the entire of the human race. The universality of the desire may be reasonably held to imply the existence of the object of that desire. That all men eagerly look for a future life and most men believe that it is given to them is an argument fairly admissible where positive evidence is so difficult to be attained.

A *second* argument, but of lesser weight, may be drawn from the instinctive dread of annihilation felt by every mind that contemplates it. Extinction of self is difficult of reception, because, from the structure of thought, we are unable to conceive of such a condition. We cannot, by any effort of imagination, picture ourselves to our own minds as not existing. We shrink with instinctive terror from the contemplation. There are few who would not say with Claudio :

The weariest and most loathed worldly life,  
That age, ache, penury and imprisonment  
Can lay on nature, is a Paradise  
To what we fear of death.

That fear is not of possible suffering. The shrinking dread which all feel, though few venture to express it, is not of dying or of death, but of the *annihilation* which the stoutest of heart and firmest of faith cannot altogether avoid contemplating as the *possible* result of death.

It has been contended that this dread of annihilation is implanted in us as an inducement to exertion for the



preservation of our lives. But that purpose is more effectually accomplished by the instinctive dread of *death*, which belongs to the lower animals in common with man, and is given to them with the like object. The lower animals dread death but not annihilation. Man dreads both death *and* annihilation and annihilation more than death. If the fear of death is implanted in us for the special purpose of the preservation of life, may we not reasonably conclude that there is a special purpose also in the instinctive shrinking from the very thought of annihilation? If annihilation be our lot, why was this terror of it implanted in us? All natural sensations have corresponding objects. Even pain is never gratuitously inflicted. It has a purpose of utility.

A third argument, *à priori*, for the probable existence of Soul is our *Self-consciousness*—the recognition of ourselves as individual beings and the firm conviction we have that, although composed of a body moved by mind and both body and mind made up of many parts, we are yet *one whole*. We do not recognise any part of the body as being “ourselves.” We do not so contemplate any part of the mechanism of the mind. Amputation of a limb, or of all our limbs, does not make us feel that we are the less ourselves. Our *personality* has not been diminished. Nor does paralysis of any organ of the mind affect us otherwise. Sever limb after limb from the body (if life were not extinguished by the process), and we should still be conscious that the individual “*I*” had not been dissevered nor diminished. So it would be with the mind, if its organ the brain could be pared away and the parts extracted one by one. We should not be conscious while consciousness continued that we were less an individual whole. Each severed limb is not a part of “us,” either in our own estimation or in that of others. The dismembered hero of a hundred fights is the same man he was before. Could that be if the mutilated body were the Man and the Man were only that lopped body? Does not this consciousness of unity argue that there is *something* in us other than the body

and the molecular mechanism of mind—something which continues unharmed and undiminished when the molecular body and molecular mechanism of mind are partially destroyed?

Another powerful argument is based upon our consciousness of *unity*. I feel that I am *one* being. I speak of my arm, not as a *part of me* but as *belonging to myself*. I cannot conceive of "myself" as constructed of *parts*. I am compelled to think of my body and brain, not as being "myself," but as being merely the machine that "I" move, and whose motions "I" direct and determine.

These facts and arguments present themselves upon view of the mental and bodily mechanism of Man, and certainly raise a strong presumption of *probability* (but, it must be admitted, of probability only) that there exists in Man a something we call Soul. They are not nor do they pretend to be positive proofs. They are nothing more than *probabilities* reasonably to be presumed from the ascertained conditions of that mechanism. It may be frankly admitted, not only that they are not conclusive proofs and arguments, but that objections may be raised to some and that all are far from providing that actual demonstration which on a subject so important is so earnestly to be desired. But although each may be separately of small worth, collectively they go far to confirm the more scientific investigation to be entered upon in the next volume, when treating of *the mechanism in action*, with facts based, not upon argument only, nor upon probabilities merely, but upon positive *evidence*.

By far the most important region of inquiry yet remains to be explored, a region happily capable of examination by something more than merely argumentative conjecture, a territory to be surveyed by the senses, with the help of such instruments as Science employs in her researches and to be pursued by the same methods as those by which other branches of knowledge are explored. The Reader will be invited to enter into the region of FACT.

And this is the first question that will present itself.



If Man has a Soul, distinct from body and surviving the body, can no *proof* be found, at some time, in some place, among all the countless millions of Souls who have passed out of the flesh, of any one Soul returning to report itself to the living, either in visible or tangible shape, or by communication of facts known only to the dead, which would be evidence more cogent, perhaps, than any revelation to the senses?

Again I must repeat that the terms of this treatise forbid reference to the Word of God; the inquiry here being purposely limited to *evidence*, which properly excludes Authority and dogma and proceeds strictly upon scientific *proof* by observed facts and phenomena. But if it were permitted to me to adduce the Sacred Record, this question would be answered instantly and conclusively. The Bible teems with instances of Soul manifesting itself to the human senses and holding communication with the living after the life has passed away from the body. No true Christian can doubt or deny the reappearance of spirits of the dead.

But, apart from the evidence of the Scriptures, the stories reported of the reappearance of departed Souls are legion. Collected, they would fill a large library. They are few who have not credible friends who testify to facts they have personally known, or cases that have been reported to them on apparently good authority which, if true, *prove* the existence of Soul and its life after the death of the body as conclusively as any fact in nature can be proved. Few, indeed, of the recorded phenomena of Science can exhibit such a mass of *seemingly* reliable testimony (so far as the character and intelligence of the witnesses are of value) as the asserted reappearances of Spirits of the Dead. It is a tradition of every known people, the faith of every age, the foundation of every religion, the accepted creed of every past period of civilization.

But when this vast mass of testimony is reviewed with a critical eye—when this array of witnesses comes to be cross-examined—when the simplest rules of evidence

are applied to the narratives—it is wonderful to see how the evidence collapses—how the witnesses break down—how the huge fabric crumbles away—and how small is the residuum that resists the application of the tests.

The cause of this collapse is sufficiently clear. It has been already treated in a previous chapter. A brief summary of the argument will suffice.

Our senses are subject to self-deception. The Mind has no means, other than by the correction of the senses, of positively knowing whether any ideas vividly arising in it are brought by the senses or merely self-produced. Its instinctive tendency is to refer pictorial *ideas* (not thoughts) to external causes even if really hatched by the brain. Thus there may be formed in the mind the idea or mental image of a dead friend. In certain not rare conditions of the organism, this self-created image is vivid to the mind as is any actual picture of an external object brought by the optic nerve to the brain. The mind at once instinctively refers its own mental picture to the nerve, and believes that, which is in fact only an idea self-produced, to be the report by the sense-nerve of an actual painting upon the retina. The Conscious Self will thus firmly believe that the eye has seen unless the mind be corrected by one of the other senses—as by trying to touch the object and finding nothing,—or by the testimony of other witnesses who were present and saw nothing.

The evidence of *any one* person that he had seen a spirit is, therefore, of *no value*. The evidence of a hundred, or of a thousand persons, that each of them alone had seen a ghost, would not carry the proof a step further, because of the extreme liability of the sense of sight to the hallucination described and the impossibility of any witness knowing if the asserted vision was objective or subjective. But, if precisely the same form were seen by *two* persons at the same place at the same time, we have *evidence*, and very cogent evidence, of the actual existence of such an object, by reason of the extreme improbability that the identical hallucination



should arise in two minds at the same moment. If three or more persons beheld the same object at the same time, the proof amounts almost to demonstration, for the chances against such a concurrence of mental actions are as infinity to one. So it is if the impression on one sense is confirmed by impressions on the other senses; only that in this case the proof is not quite so cogent, because it is more probable that all the senses of one man should be simultaneously deceptive, than that two men should have the identical illusion in their minds at the same moment.

Observing these obvious principles of *evidence*, and applying them to the multitudinous reports of the appearance of spirits of the dead, with which the literature of all lands teems and which may be heard at every fireside, what is the result?

We begin by excluding nineteen out of twenty as being *hearsay*—tales told by somebody to somebody and which can be traced to no authentic reporter. In science, as in law, the *best* evidence only can be accepted—the same kind of evidence alone that would be admissible in a court of Justice and permitted by a Judge to influence the verdict of a jury on a question of life and death. Nothing less than the testimony of a credible witness as to what he had himself seen, and that testimony sifted and tried by cross-examination, should suffice for the establishment of *any* truth in Science.

This great sweep made, it will be found that of the ghost stories that remain ninety-nine out of every hundred, at the least, are narratives of appearances seen by the witness *alone*, uncorroborated by any other spectator. For the reasons set forth above, all of these must likewise be eliminated.

The instances in which a ghost is asserted to have been seen by two or more persons at the same moment, sufficiently attested by themselves and having upon the face of the narrative nothing that can be impeached for inconsistency beyond the marvel of the appearance itself, will by this process of exhaustion be reduced to a very

small number indeed, and it is with these alone that Science can concern itself.

But although comparatively few, they are advanced on sufficient authority to demand close and careful scrutiny, with a view to learn their true value; for if they are to be accepted as genuine, they must be admitted to be decisive of the question at issue. *If any one person who has ever lived can be proved beyond all reasonable doubt to have seen the Spirit of another person then dead, the existence of Soul and its life after the death of the body are DEMONSTRATED, and the question admits of no further discussion.* It is determined once and for ever in the affirmative.

The first and most doubtful question is, *can this be proved?*

Whether *any* such conclusive evidence can be found will be a subject for careful inquiry hereafter. For the present, I must ask the Reader to assume, as with the other arguments for the existence of Soul, that there is *some* admissible testimony, although very slight indeed. The precise value of that doubtful testimony will be measured in its proper place.

We come now to the second series of alleged facts that make the existence of *something* in the Mechanism of Man, other than the molecular structure, not merely probable, but which almost, if not quite, amount to positive *proof* and actual demonstration. These differ from the facts and argument last examined in this—*that they are derived from observation of the Mechanism of Man in action.*

Perhaps Physiology will ask by what right I call this region unexplored. Has she not been toiling for long years with scalpel, and microscope, and chemicals, with unnumbered experiments and countless tests, and found in the body no perceptible trace of any such non-corporeal *something*.

But Anatomy and Physiology might continue their explorations for ever after this fashion without finding that *something*, even if it exists. Science has made search for it in vain. Soul eludes her grasp. She cannot distil it, precipitate it, fuse it. The physical forces



are powerless over it. They cannot expand it into a gas nor compress it into a metal. It defies the force of gravitation. Heat does not dissipate it. Soul will not obey the laws of electricity nor of magnetism. It cannot be weighed, nor measured, nor expressed in a formula, nor exhibited to the Royal Society, nor used to illustrate a popular lecture by Professor TYNDALL at the Royal Institution.

True, again, that if Soul *is* it must be subject to law and exist under definite conditions, like all other beings. But, if it is to be found, it must not be looked for by the same instruments as Science employs for the investigation of *molecular structure* and the search must be pursued by other methods. Being invisible, impalpable, imponderable, imperceptible to any sense, its presence (if it exists) can be discovered only by *manifestation*. Itself imperceptible, it can be seen and known only by its action upon that which is perceptible. To learn if there be a Soul in Man, we must closely observe and carefully note the motions of the human mechanism, especially those of the machinery of mind, and strive to trace the connection between the sensations of our own consciousness, the actions of other men, and the power that prompted, directed and determined them. Collecting and collating the phenomena exhibited by mind and body alike, in health and in disease, in their normal and abnormal conditions, we can scarcely fail to find traces of any *Force* that may be operating in those phenomena other than the known physical forces or the vital force. If such a distinct force (or energy) be found, is there not the strongest probability that this force is the product—the manifestation in action—of that SOUL after which we are seeking?

It is not my purpose to enter upon the exploration of this great region of FACT for the present. It will come for consideration in due course in the next volume, which will be devoted to the phenomena attending the *action* of the human machine, as this volume has been devoted to a sketch of its *construction*. I must now ask

the Reader to favour me, for a time only, with a little of his *faith* and to accept *provisionally* an assurance that, when the phenomena exhibited by the living MAN have been progressively submitted to him, especially those shown in certain special conditions of the organism, such as Sleep, Dream, Insanity, Natural and Artificial Somnambulism, Unconscious Cerebration, Trance and Psychism, a mass of FACTS will be found that will, I hope and believe, bring home to him a profound *conviction* that, as a *fact* in Nature, proved as is any other fact, (and not merely as a speculation, an argument, or a dogma), *there is a something in us, other than the molecular structure, exercising a force, other than either of the known Physical forces; whose presence is only perceptible in action; which SOMETHING is governed by laws other than those that control the molecular structure of the body and of the world to whose conditions that molecular mechanism is adapted.*

Assuming for the present as *probable*, what I hope to *prove* hereafter to be *certain*, that there *is* in Man that non-molecular something we call *Soul*, it is necessary for the completion of this first division of the subject to inquire what, if there be such Soul in us, must be the place of its dwelling, the conditions of its existence with the body, the probable manner of its existence without the body, tracing these in strict accordance with the natural laws to which SOUL equally with the body must be subjected, alike during its existence with the body and its existence after the body has fallen from it.

To this very novel but profoundly interesting task let us now address ourselves.



## CHAPTER VI.

## WHAT SOUL IS.

Dim and vague are the conceptions of *Soul*, even by those who most firmly believe its existence. Go into any company and ask each person separately what are his notions of the material of which the Soul is constructed, of its form, its capacities, its dwelling-place here, the conditions of its existence hereafter; you will be astonished to find how very indefinite are the ideas of even the best instructed and the most thoughtful. Apply the same question to yourself and you will discover that your own conceptions of your own Soul—that is to say, of *yourself*—are equally hazy. In fact, you have never thought seriously about it, or, if ever, only in a dreamy and fanciful fashion.

Were not this so familiar a truth, it would appear incredible that civilized and educated men could treat with such careless indifference a subject the most important and interesting to themselves that could possibly engage their attention. Knowing that in a few years, and possibly in a few hours, we shall either cease to be, or pass into a new condition of being, changed in substance if not in form, with new faculties adapted to new conditions of existence, it might be presumed that to these themes the thoughts of all of us would recur continually. If we are not the mere automata the Scientists say that we are, it might be expected of us that we should eagerly explore every path that opened the slightest prospect of intelligence about this possible new condition and cordially welcome *all* endeavours to solve the great problem of the hereafter. Seeing what time,

and toil, and intelligence are by so many minds devoted to the transformations of a butterfly or the dwelling of a mollusc, it would be thought by any rational Man that the alleged existence or non-existence of Soul, its form, the conditions of its being here, its powers, its faculties, its dwelling and its destiny, would excite curiosity keener by a thousandfold, enlist a vastly larger number of eager investigators and profoundly interest the highest class of intellect. But, strange and wonderful as it may appear, the fact is otherwise. Nobody speaks or even thinks of his Soul as a *present reality*, like his body—nor otherwise than as a mere abstract idea—a name given to a *nothing*—a phrase to which no definite conceptions are attached.

And wherefore?

Is it not, in truth, because there is *not* the same firm belief in the existence of Soul as in the existence of body? Is it not because Soul is with too many a *faith*, not a *belief*, an *assent* rather than a *conviction*? Whence this infirmity of faith—this lurking doubt felt but not confessed by so many minds? Manifestly because they have not looked for positive evidence of the existence of Soul by the same process of investigation of *facts* as that by which they have pursued all other knowledge of infinitely less importance.

When once the thoughts are directed to the many questions that grow out of the full mental recognition of the existence of Soul *as a fact*, and not as a vague hope merely, we see at once the overwhelming interest of the questions thence arising. We are amazed that a subject of such transcendent interest to every human being should not long ago have forced itself upon the attention of every mind that ever thinks at all.

The first question that presents itself in the inquiry, what Soul is, if Soul be, is the obvious one, "What is the *material* of which Soul is constructed?"

I can imagine the surprise with which the Reader will peruse this question. Probably it had never entered into his thoughts as a problem to be solved. "Material!"



he will exclaim, "Nonsense! Soul is not made of 'matter' at all—Soul is immaterial." What, I pray you, is your meaning when you say Soul is *immaterial*? What is *immateriality*? The answer will be: "Something that is not matter—spirit—spirit is not matter. Spirit is—well, it is spirit."

Are you sure of this? You forget that before you can affirm that spirit is not matter you must determine what *matter* is and what *spirit* is. Then, and not till then, you will be enabled to assert positively the difference between them. At present you have a very vague notion of either spirit or matter. It is easy to demonstrate that, if Soul exists, it must be made of *something*. If composed of nothing, it would *be* nothing. It can be conceived of only as having *form*. If it has form, it must be constructed of something more dense than the medium that surrounds it and in which it exists. Let us then endeavour clearly to comprehend and to realise to our contemplations the fact, that, if a Soul be, that Soul is a substance—that is, a *structure made of something*. It may be a substance infinitely more refined than that of which our bodies are builded. Certainly it is a substance invisible and impalpable to our senses, which are constructed to take cognizance of molecular structure only. But even with molecular structure there are many substances apparently imperceptible which are known to be about us and capable of condensation so as to become sensible to us. We have no positive knowledge of the actual structure of Soul, nor the material of which it is constructed; but the probability is, that as it is certainly non-molecular it is probably more refined than the substance of the thinnest gas with which we are acquainted, insomuch that it could glide with ease through and among the molecules that compose the coarser materials of this earth. A wall of stone would offer no more impediment to the passage of such a structure than does unvarnished paper to the passage of hydrogen gas, or a glass of water to the infusion of the molecules of a lump of sugar.

To what extent matter is capable of being *refined*—that is to say—how small may be the atoms of which a substance is constructed—can be dimly conceived by this, that the matter of which a comet is composed, though filling thousands of millions of miles in space, if condensed to the solidity of gold, would, it is said, be little bigger or heavier than a watch, and might be carried in the pocket. (a) So if Soul be of material as rare as the matter of a comet, still it would be *matter* and *substance*. If it be a substance, probably it is not constructed like the body, of molecules, but of some other of the infinite combinations of atoms, those atoms, like the molecules that compose the body, not touching one another. It is conceivable that there may be something still more refined than the substance of Soul itself, which might permeate and pass through Soul, precisely as the finer particles of Soul structure can permeate and possess the coarser molecules of body structure.

SOUL, then, *scientifically* viewed, is not, as it is commonly conceived of, a mere name, a vague notion of something that is really nothing, because without form, substance or qualities, and, therefore, in truth not a definite idea at all; it is a distinct entity, possessing *substance* and *form* and therefore something of which the mind *can* have a definite conception.

Rightly then to conceive of Soul, the first step is clearly to comprehend that it is not, and cannot be, *immaterial*, although *non-molecular*—but doubtless composed of other than the molecular group of particles and *therefore* imperceptible to our bodily senses, which are constructed to perceive only that combination of atomic or ultimate particles which makes molecules.

---

(a) The radiometer, discovered by Mr. CROOKES, F.R.S., has revealed to us the astounding fact that matter can be reduced to molecules so small that, as compared with the smallest particle exhibited by the most powerful microscope, they are of the same proportionate size as a marble bears to the globe we live upon.



## CHAPTER VII.

## THE DWELLING PLACE OF SOUL.

It is *in* the body—it *possesses* the body. So much is certain. If there be a Soul in Man, it must be existing somewhere and that abode can only be looked for within the body of the Man.

But, if in the body, whereabouts in the body?

Ask the Anatomists. Their answer is, that they can find no place for it within the structure. In the whole frame there is not a vacant space in which Soul, be it ever so compressed, could live and move. There is in very truth no *tenement* reserved for it within the body, if a special place for it there to inhabit be looked for. Philosophers and some physiologists have hazarded all kinds of conjectures as to its actual seat, locating it in the head, in the heart, in the backbone, in the pineal gland. They have agreed only in this, that neither could produce the slightest evidence to support his conjecture. Anatomists could not discover in either of these speculative dwelling-places a room so big as a marble for Soul to dwell in. Physiologists, finding uses in the animal economy for every part of the structure, in despair of any proof of a place where the Soul *could* reside, were led to deny its existence. Their denial has certainly been the main cause of that prevailing doubt of the being of Soul which has spread from the circles of Science to the educated public and induced the terrible conflict between the natural longing for immortality and unquestioning faith in it and the evidence for an eternal sleep, produced by the Scientists, which has so painfully

troubled the thoughtful and shaken the confidence of the faithful.

There is no cause for despair. Science can dissipate the doubts of science. If there be Soul, and that Soul of non-molecular structure (that is to say, formed of atoms in some other combination than that which composes the body), there is no need to ask Anatomists and Physiologists to discover a dwelling for it. They may not find in all the frame a hole big enough for Soul to lodge in. A space the size of a pin's head may not be unoccupied there, Soul may nevertheless dwell in the body without being cribbed, cabined and confined. If the body is, as we *know* it to be, constructed of molecules no two of which are in actual contact, and those molecules are constructed of atoms that do not touch, there is abundance of space between the molecules, in which structure other than molecular might easily be contained

The SOUL, therefore, if formed of some atomic combination other than the molecular structure of the body, could, with perfect ease, permeate the entire body, infused among all its molecules, and so *possess and occupy the whole frame.*

And, if we have Soul, this is doubtless the manner of its dwelling in us. *Soul does not reside in any particular part of the structure ; it possesses the whole body.*

In few words, it is not that the body has a Soul, but that the Soul has a body.

It is no portion of the present inquiry, but the subject under discussion confirms the interesting and very important conclusion, suggested in an earlier chapter, that the Soul builds the body ; that is to say that the Soul is the individual Being—the Conscious Self—the Man—and clothes itself with flesh by means of the vital or psychic force, the body being in fact but the garment of the Soul. I have not even in thought followed out this suggestion to its conclusions, but it appears to me to be highly probable that the process of creation is not, as is commonly imagined, first the formation of a body and then a Soul consigned to the body, but the scheme



of the Mechanism is that of a Soul which, if the term may be permitted, incrusts itself, as it were, with a molecular body by means of the mechanism of the nerve system. While that nerve system is sustained by the vital force, the mechanism obeys the Will of the Conscious Self (or Soul). When the vital force ceases to flow, the wheels stand still, the mechanism no longer obeys the Will, the molecular structure, like a worn out garment, falls to pieces and being restored to the dominion of the inorganic laws is resolved into the elements from which its material was first attracted by the vital force.\*

This, however, is merely a speculation, which has crossed my mind as seeming to grow out of the recognition of the central fact in Psychology, that Soul permeates and possess the whole body and does not merely occupy some undiscovered part of it.

---

\* If this be the true construction of the Mechanism of Man, and such the relationship of Soul to body, it is the reasonable conclusion that Soul is structured much as body is, for it must underlie every part of the body. If capable of severance and separate existence from the body, it must, if it could become perceptible to our senses, appear in exact resemblance to the body, not in external aspect merely, but in every part. To become perceptible to all our senses, nothing more would be necessary than for the non-molecular combination of atoms to pass into the molecular combination, a condition by no means improbable nor scientifically inconceivable. My meaning may be shown by reference to a familiar illustration. A glass jar, brought from a warm into a cold room, although seemingly empty, will in a moment be filled with a visible vapour, which again disappears when the temperature is equalized. The molecules of the vapor were there and are there still, but they were perceptible by us under certain conditions, and are now imperceptible under certain other conditions.

## CHAPTER VIII.

## THE FORM OF SOUL.

HAS *this* question ever seriously presented itself to the Reader? Probably not, because of the vague and formless conception of Soul in the minds even of those who are most firmly assured of its existence. But, although shunned or neglected, the question is very important. Unless it be plainly expressed and definitely answered there can be nothing like *knowledge* of Soul but only a credulous faith in it. Soul, like body, must exist in space. If it exist at all, it must occupy a portion of space. It must have a boundary within the enveloping space and the shape of that boundary must be its form. So, as compared with whatever occupies the space within which Soul exists, it must have a *substance*, that is to say, it must be of some material other than the surrounding material that encloses it. That substance therefore must be fashioned in some *shape*.

Consequently Soul must have *form* as well as substance.

What is that form?

If Soul were found to be located in some special part of the body, in some otherwise unoccupied space within the structure, it would be difficult to conceive of even a probable solution of the question "what is the form of the Soul?" for, being of non-molecular construction, it might be capable of incalculable compression. But we have seen in the last chapter that the *evidence* points strongly to the conclusion that Soul does



not reside in any special part of the body but possesses the whole structure, permeating with its lesser atoms the vastly larger molecules of which the body is builded. Admitting that Soul exists, there is no difficulty whatever in assigning to it the possession of the whole frame by transfusion through the entire organism, precisely as the particles of a perfume permeate and possess the atmosphere. The practical result of this is, *that the shape of the embodied Soul is that of the body which it possesses*. Its form may be otherwise when parted from the body; but so long as it inhabits the body by permeation and possession of every part of the body, *the form of the Soul must be the form of the body*.

This is, of course, conjecture merely. But it is submitted to the thoughtful reader as the most reasonable and probable solution of a perplexing problem. The intellect hungers for something more than conjecture in a matter of such profound personal interest to every human being and asks if there be not *some* evidence, however slight, to support the probable conjecture.

A few facts reported by medical observers certainly tend to confirm the conjecture. Other phenomena presented in some abnormal conditions of the mechanism of Man and pointing to the same conclusions will be described in the next volume. While pondering upon this question my attention was attracted to a little book directly bearing upon it, the title being "The Seat of the Soul." It was written by Mr. GILLINGHAM, a surgical machinist, living at Chard, in Somersetshire. The author was a self-taught man, a keen observer and a most ingenious inventor, but imperfectly educated. His business was the construction of artificial limbs and he had achieved considerable provincial fame for skill in supplying lost arms and legs. Thus he possessed extraordinary opportunities for acquainting himself with the mental and bodily sensations of persons who have had the misfortune to be deprived of some of their limbs. Being of an inquisitive as well as ingenious turn of mind, Mr. GILLINGHAM was, it seems, curious to learn what were the

sensations attendant upon the deprivations it was his business partially to supply. He had early noticed the fact, familiar to everybody from hearsay, that after the loss of a limb the patient experiences many of the same sensations that attended its existence, insomuch that it is difficult to convince himself that the limb is really lost. After the leg is amputated, the patient feels pain in his toe, itching in the sole of his foot, cramp in his calves, and even the sensations of cold and heat. The lost foot will appear to share with the other the uncomfortable feeling of cold feet, and when the stump and the whole leg are presented together to the fire, the sense of warmth seems to be creeping into both *feet* together. The explanation offered of this phenomenon, and at present generally accepted, is that the nerves connecting the lost leg with the brain, which is the seat of sensation, have been so long accustomed to convey the actual sensations from the living limb that after the severance of the limb the mutilated nerves continue to act by suggestion or by sympathy with the nerves of the other limb with which they had been accustomed to work in concert. The repetition of the action induces in the *brain* a revival of the impression, although, in fact, it is only self-induced. The brain, consequently, receives the same impressions as before and the Conscious Self instinctively transfers them to the same source, allocating them in the same position in the structure to which it was accustomed to refer them before the limb was lost. This appears to be so reasonable an explanation of a circumstance very curious in itself that it has been received by Physiologists and by the public as a truth too obvious to be questioned. Nobody has cared to inquire if the explanation was sufficient for the facts, or if there were any facts inconsistent with it.

But Mr. GILLINGHAM was one of those observing men who take nothing upon trust which they have the means of investigating, so he questioned his patients about these strange sensations, with a view to ascertain if the facts sustained the popular hypothesis. He seems to have



been first induced to this by being called upon to supply an artificial arm to a woman who had been *born with one arm only*. He was surprised to find that she experienced precisely the same sensations as persons whose arms had been amputated. Like them, she felt pain and cold in the fingers, hand and arm she had never possessed,—sensations which could not be attributed to involuntary repetitions by the nerves of familiar conditions, for her nerves had never known those conditions. Pondering upon this remarkable fact, the idea flashed upon the thoughtful mind of the Machinist that possibly these perceptions of sensation, for which there was no visible cause, were conveyed to the brain by something in the nature of a nerve ether (*a*) extending beyond the actual nerve system. But this, although accounting for sensitiveness to actual impressions produced without positive contact, did not account for definite sensation in an imaginary hand and arm and therefore he sought some other explanation. He reflected that, when a man loses his limbs his Soul is not dismembered; he remains the same man; he has the same full consciousness of individuality after his legs are shot off as before his accident. How fares his Soul in such case? If, as the best opinion is, Soul occupies the whole body, and does not, as the vulgar suppose, dwell in some one part of it, when a limb is amputated, how is the Soul affected? Does it contract into the lesser space of the mutilated body? Certainly it is not excised. May it not be, then, that the sensation of a hand and fingers by the woman born without an arm, as well as by the person whose arms have been cut off, are real impressions made on the Soul, which not having been severed in the woman exists where the arm should be, though not clothed in flesh, and that in the man the Soul continues to occupy the place previously possessed by the limb when it was completely clothed with flesh and no part of it had been mutilated. It was certainly an ingenious suggestion of the Machinist.

---

(*a*) Dr. Richardson's nerve atmosphere.

Having started the idea, he resolved to pursue it, and he availed himself accordingly of his professional opportunities to inquire closely what were the sensations actually experienced by his patients, comparing them with his hypothesis, to learn how far it was supported or negatived by the facts. All that he could gather from them was confirmatory of his theory. From some he obtained the curious information that they had a consciousness of the existence of the lost leg or arm, although their eyes showed them nothing. If attention was distracted for a moment, the loss of the limb was not perceptible and they acted precisely as if it had been whole and present. It was an *effort* of thought to convince themselves that the limb was *not* there. But a fact still more remarkable remains to be stated. Some assured him that, when the stump of the leg was placed against a wall, they felt as if the leg below the stump was passing through the wall and exposed to wind and cold on the other side of it. So, if the stump of the amputated arm was placed on a table, the sensation was as if the arm had passed through the table. These facts of course admit of the explanation that it was a mere imagination growing out of knowledge by the patients that such would have been their sensations had the limbs been so placed. But even so they are interesting psychological facts. From these and other instances described in his little book, which presents profound and original thought expressed in the homely but forcible language of an illiterate observer, he draws the conclusion—or rather, it should be said, *suggests the question*—if it may not be that Soul is shaped by the body which it possesses and remains in its entirety when the body is severed, occupying the same space which the whole body occupied before a part of it was destroyed? He offers this as a *suggestion* merely; he does not affirm it as a truth; he desires nothing more than to induce others, who have opportunities for observation, to note the facts as he has done and state them publicly with the convictions, whatever they may be, to which they shall have led the investigator.



Of the accuracy of the facts thus asserted I know nothing and can offer no opinion. I present them for what they may be worth.

If further experiment should confirm these curious observations, the fact will go far to establish the presumption,—which had already presented itself as the most probable—that Soul occupies the entire body and does not merely dwell in some portion of it; consequently, that the form of the Soul, so long at least as it occupies the body, is the same as that of the body it possesses—insomuch that if we could conceive of such a process as the decomposition and dissolution of the entire bodily structure, while yet occupied by Soul, the Soul itself would remain, when stripped of all its molecular garments, perfect in the human form, but composed of matter over which the forces that controlled the perishable material of the body have no power, and subjected to other forces and other laws to which its different structure is adapted.

Nor is it difficult to conceive that precisely such may be the condition of *Death*. The organic laws having ceased to control the physical laws, these latter instantly come into active operation, the dissolution of the bodily structure proceeds rapidly and it is resolved into the elements from which it was attracted by the superior force of the organic laws. Life gone, the body perishing, the SOUL departs. Whither?

---

## CHAPTER IX.

## SOUL AFTER DEATH.

BEFORE the question that closed the last chapter can be considered, it will be necessary to give some reflection to other conditions of the emancipated Soul, from which alone any probable conjecture can be formed as to its *immediate* destiny.

It does not necessarily follow, however probably, that because the Soul was in human shape when wearing the molecular shell of body, it should preserve that shape when it has passed away from the body. Still it exists in space and occupies a portion of space, and therefore there also it must have *some* definite form. Is there then any sufficient reason why it should change its form when it enters upon its new phase of being?

To this two objections have been raised.

It has been argued that if the Soul retains the shape of the body, how is it where the body has been deformed or imperfect? Has the hunchback a crooked Soul? Was Miss Biffen's Soul armless and legless? Has the amputated body an amputated Soul?

These questions, though savouring of comedy and often put for the purpose of ridicule, are pertinent and demand serious consideration and an answer, if any can be found. When first they occurred to myself, they appeared to be fatal to the suggestion made above as to the form of Soul, which had so much to recommend it in other respects. But further and more profound reflection suggested an explanation, of whose value others will judge better than myself, having the natural partiality of a parent alike for the hypothesis and the explanation.



Deformity of body is not in the germ, but in its development. It is the result of physical causes. There is some accidental impediment either to the expansion of the nerve system or to the due exercise of the nerve force in some particular direction. Embodied Soul is almost certainly subject to defects of the structure it permeates. But at the moment of its release from the mis-shapen body it would, as being itself undeformed, regain its proper shape—that is to say, the normal shape (whatever that be) of the perfect Soul. So it would be with the Soul of a child. It is difficult to suppose that it remains like a child after quitting the child's body. In such case, also, the reasonable and probable conjecture is that it attains, sooner or later, the mature condition—that which may be termed the normal development—of the disembodied Soul, whatever that may be. If Mr. GILLINGHAM's observations are founded on fact, it will be apparent at once how it must be in the case of a *mutilated* body. The bodily limb is lost, but the perfect Soul remains invisible and impalpable, making itself conscious to the patient under certain conditions in which alone it is enabled to receive impressions from the molecular world directly, without the interposition of the nerves of the Senses.

As the Soul must have *some* shape, and the reasonable probability is that, permeating the body during their association, its shape is that of the body; it is equally probable that, when released from the body, it preserves the same form, with possibly extended powers of mobility, of compression and expansion, as the consequence of its molecular structure? This question is not readily answered. The human body is constructed with special reference to the conditions of its existence in a molecular world, where it is subjected to the law of gravitation. Its legs are so shaped because the body moves upon the surface of the earth and must overcome the force of gravitation at each step. Where this condition is not imposed, the form of the structure is different, as with fishes, which float in the medium through

which they move. When Soul quits body and exists as non-molecular structure, it is no longer subject to the force of gravitation. It has no need to move by steps. If it have any force within itself it can, like the fish, advance in any direction in which it is not opposed by some obstacle it can neither remove nor penetrate. Therefore the complete human shape would be useless, if not a positive impediment. May we not reasonably conclude from this that Soul does *not* preserve the complete form it had when clothed with body, but when disembodied can adapt its shape to its requirements? Such are at least the *probabilities* of the case. I am not sure that some facts will not be found hereafter tending to confirm such a suggestion.

Let us now for a moment consider what other conditions must belong to Soul when disembodied. Few, perhaps, even of those who believe in the existence of Soul as a matter of *fact*, and not merely as a matter of faith, have ever troubled themselves to reflect what are the *conditions* under which Soul, if it exists, *must* exist.

It must be *material*, that is to say, it must be composed of *something*, and that something must be matter of some kind existing in space and therefore something other than mere space. It must be infinitely more refined than the perceptible molecular substance we call "matter." But still it is a substance. When we talk of "spirit" we can conceive of it only as a substance, although it may be a substance altogether differing from that molecular formation which alone of the many atomic combinations our senses are constructed to perceive.

If, as doubtless it is, if it exists, that Soul is constructed of some other combination of atoms than the molecular formation, it is very probable that Soul is not subject to the force of gravitation, which acts only on molecular structure, or at least this force does not operate upon Soul as it operates upon body. Consequent upon this exemption from the law of gravity, rapidity of action and the power of locomotion possessed by the disembodied Soul must be vastly greater than anything we can con-



ceive. It is the force of gravity alone that chains our *bodies* to the surface of the earth on which we stand and makes motion laborious and slow. Could we be released from the ever present influence of gravitation, we should be able to scale the sky, to walk the water, to *flash*, as it were, from place to place. But vastly more than our molecular bodies could thus accomplish must be within the capacity of Soul, constructed of non-molecular material, infinitely more refined and elastic, lighter than the atmosphere, having no impediment in earth or air and unaffected by the physical force of gravitation. A being so formed could move in any direction at will. It could pass almost with the speed of thought from place to place, however distant. Whether it could soar beyond the atmosphere of this earth we cannot even guess, because we are ignorant how the space beyond it is occupied. But whatever be the composition of the interspaces between the molecular worlds, there can be no doubt that what by us is called *Spirit*, because of its comparative *rarity*, may in those regions of space be as is the densest rock to ourselves, because of the still greater rarity of the medium by which it would be encompassed. Or if Soul could be conceived as having free power of locomotion throughout the atom of creation our senses can perceive, it by no means follows that the same liberty of flight should belong to it in the great Universe without, of whose structure and of the material of whose interspaces we are wholly ignorant. We must be content to know this only, that *if* we have Soul, it *must*, when disembodied, be of such a structure as to be exempt from the force of gravitation, and as the consequence of such exemption must possess capacity for locomotion with inconceivable rapidity within the range of the earth's atmosphere and in any direction it wills to go. (a)

---

(a) A mental effort is required rightly to conceive of the difference in *time*, as it presents itself to us and as it is in reality. Our conceptions of it are based entirely upon the action of our own mechanism. We can act only by muscular motion; we can think only through brain motion. The latter is far more rapid than the

There is another equally curious and equally certain faculty of Soul, such as we know that it must possess if it exists. Soul being non-molecular, in the same manner as it possesses the whole body might *penetrate the most solid molecular substances*.

For, be it remembered, that what we call *a solid is such only to our sensations*. There is no actual solid in Nature. To the eye of Science, the most compact substance is only an agglomeration of molecules, themselves agglomerations of atoms, drawn and kept together by the attractive force we call "gravitation," certainly not in actual contact, with spaces between them and in continual motion among each other. We say of a substance that it is *solid* only because it impedes the action of *our* muscles. If the finger could pass through that substance by separation of the molecules and compression of them into a smaller space, as is the process known as elasticity, we should cease to call it a "solid." It would be a "fluid" to us.

But Soul, being composed of some atomic combination infinitely smaller than the molecules that form all perceptible being, can certainly penetrate and pass with perfect ease and facility through the most solid substance known to us. It can permeate the whole mass, or glide through any part of it, as readily as water penetrates a sponge or gas passes through paper. No displacement of a single molecule of the penetrated body would be necessary and no greater effort would be required than for ourselves to pass through the softest summer air. The process of penetration is different. The coarser and more compacted molecular material of

former; but the speediest flow even of thought is slow compared with the rapidity of action by an Intelligence not subject to the conditions of organic structure. Working without that structure the Conscious Self would be capable of rapidity of action infinitely greater than is possible in the normal condition of the mechanism. Something of this is exhibited in *dream*, in which the mind lives the life and passes through the states of consciousness in a few minutes of what in mental or bodily action would have occupied as many days.



the human body passes through the air by displacement of the molecules that constitute the atmosphere. But Soul would pass through a wall of granite by the gliding of its particles through and among the spaces between the molecules that compose the stone, precisely as the particles of ether will flow through the pores of a cork that wine cannot penetrate. *If there be a Soul in Man*, it is as certain as any fact in Nature that if that Soul should linger upon the earth or be permitted to revisit it in any form, it could come into a room with closed doors and stand in the midst with even more facility than the molecular body, when living, could have entered through the doorway. A wall would not offer so much resistance to the passage of Soul as did the atmosphere to the passage of the body with which that Soul was clothed.

By reason of this power of rapid and unlimited locomotion and this capacity to penetrate the most solid substances, the relationship of Soul to space must be very different from that of the body, which, by the conditions of its structure, is subject to the law of gravitation and surrounded by substances whose molecules are more closely compacted than its own and which, therefore, on all sides gird it in and limit progression. As another consequence of the solid structure of the body and its very restricted power of locomotion and penetration, knowledge of the external world can come to it only through the senses, which have been therefore called the windows of the Soul. The intelligent Conscious Self within the body, be it an independent Soul (as I contend) or only a mind secreted by the body (as the Materialists assert) obtains such knowledge as it has through the medium of an apparatus constructed especially for the purpose—and only thus.

The organ of sight makes known the forms and colours of things within a certain limited range that permits of the rays of light passing from those objects to the little screen in the centre of the eye called the retina. But this sense can perceive only such objects as answer to the conditions of vision, and there is no certainty, but only

a strong presumption, that the Conscious Self perceives the things as they are and that the representation of them by the sense is an exact semblance of the reality. So it is with the other senses. As the necessary consequence, the Intelligence is dependent upon the senses for the accuracy and extent of its information. It is certain that our senses reveal to us but the veriest fragment even of the small portion of creation which is immediately about us and within the range of the senses. How much must there be within the circle of the sight which the eye cannot perceive because the constituent particles are too small, or because they cannot reflect light and of whose existence we are therefore profoundly ignorant! How must the atmosphere be laden with things imperceptible to our sense of touch, although incessantly striking upon us! How many delicate waves of sound are travelling through the air which the ear cannot catch, although they are continually beating against it! The loss of a single sense will convey to us some conception of the extent of the actual subjection of the Intelligence to the senses. From the limitation of knowledge consequent upon such a calamity, we may partially measure the result of the addition of a new sense, or of the emancipation of the Intelligence from its dependence upon all the senses. What a vast world of new knowledge must flood the mind of a man, blind from birth, to whom the sense of sight is restored. What restored sight would be to him, the addition of a *new* sense would be to us who are in possession of all our senses. Even a slight extension of the power of any one of the existing senses would confer incalculable benefits. To take a single illustration from the sense of sight. As it is constructed, some substances impede vision and are called *opaque*, and other substances offer no obstacle to it, or only a slight one, and are called *transparent*. The difference is caused by this only. The rays of light pass more or less freely through the latter and cannot pass through the former, and the eye is constructed to receive only the impressions made by rays of light. But



if the structure of the eye or of the optic nerve were changed in a degree so slight as to be sensitive to the impressions of the magnetic or electric wave, as it is to the waves of light—what would be the consequence? Perhaps the question has never presented itself to the Reader, but it is very curious and interesting. *This* effect would follow. *Everything would be transparent to us*—there would be *no opacity*. The electric and magnetic waves pass through all known substances, and as *transparency* is caused by the passage of the waves of *light* through the body we call “transparent,” so transparency would result from the passage of the *magnetic* wave and nothing would be opaque to us.

What would be the consequence of such a change? All things being transparent, there would be no limitation to vision except the diminution of the object by distance. Solid bodies would not impede our sight, and we should see into the substance of the earth as easily as we now see so much of its surface as immediately surrounds us.

And if such great effects would result from so slight a modification of a single bodily sense as would be necessary in order to cause the magnetic force to make the same impression upon the sense of vision as does the force of light, we may imagine what would be the consequence of an addition of but one *new* sense to those we already possess. What would be the influx of strange and undreamed of knowledge and what new beauties and new wonders would be opened to us! Our senses being very limited in their range, we actually perceive but the merest fragment of the creation that encompasses us, even within the circle of those senses.

And so also we may form some dim and distant conception of what must be the result of emancipation from the restraining limits of perception through the senses. Suppose, for instance, that instead of restricting the sense of sight to the information brought by the limited powers of the eye the Intelligence could perceive external objects without the aid of the eye—what infinite

variety of novelty would be presented to it. The reason why the Conscious Self cannot perceive the *entire* of the creation that encircles it is that *the eye* is limited in *range* and capacity of vision. The perceptive power of the Conscious Self is restricted by the conditions consequent upon the construction of the body, which forbids perceptions more than a very small fraction even of that which surrounds it on the surface of this earth—not to speak of the marvels that would be revealed in the heaven, if perception by the Conscious Self could be obtained otherwise than through the imperfect medium of the sense of sight, to which it is now restricted.

But when Soul has parted from body, it is necessarily emancipated from subjection to the senses. Its perceptions are no longer limited to the compass of the eye, the ear, the touch. The impressions that in the flesh could come to it only in the manner and to the extent permitted by the bodily senses, in its disembodied life come to it either directly or through some medium infinitely more sensitive and powerful than were the bodily organs of the senses. It is manifest, on a moment's thought, that perception by the disembodied Soul must be by a process very different from that through which knowledge was obtained when it could be procured only through the sense organs. We cannot even conjecture *how* this power of direct perception may be accomplished, but we may safely predicate some of its necessary conditions. It will be far more extended in its range, because infinitely smaller waves of light and sound will be perceptible than were perceived before. Much that is not visible to the eye, and therefore of whose existence about us we are not now conscious, will be apparent to the larger capacities then possessed. It is impossible to assign a limit to the power of perception which must necessarily be enjoyed by the disembodied Soul, nor what a Universe of new knowledge and wonder must certainly be opened to it.

Thus, with greatly extended power of locomotion and of perception, exempt from the law of gravitation, and



with the conditions of *Space* and *Time* very different from our conceptions of them as presented through the slow and imperfect medium of the senses, it is manifest that Soul, released from body, must have a vastly wider range of knowledge than it could possibly procure when in the flesh. But it does not therefore follow that its knowledge is *unlimited*. It is vastly larger than we can hope to attain in this life. But to whatever extent it may be expanded, Science would say that its information is probably small as compared with that which is *to be* known. If Soul be a refined body (and it must be that or nothing), we may be assured that it is subjected to natural *laws* and can exist and act only in accordance with *conditions* by which it is encompassed and its capacities restricted.

And this is precisely what might be predicated by the law of progression. We advance towards the perfection of DEITY by stages. When Soul passes from body, it enters on a new sphere of existence, with expanded powers and capacities. Why should it not advance thence again to another sphere of being—and so continually through the ages—ever approaching nigher to GOD, ever increasing in knowlege, ever advancing in intelligence, with new senses continually developed; but that progress hastened or impeded according to the use or abuse of the faculties with which it is gifted in each successive sphere of its existence.

These anticipations are strictly in accordance with the laws which Science shows us to be governing the world in which we are now dwelling, and we may fairly deduce from them the prospect of an existence in the future for the Spirit that has been emancipated from the “muddy vesture of decay” that here had “so grossly hedged her in.”

Is not such a destiny for the period that must precede the final judgment that awaits us more reasonable and probable in itself, and more in accordance with the teachings of Theology, than the long sleep anticipated by some or the long purgatory asserted by others?

## CHAPTER X.

## THE OUTLOOK OF SOUL.

THE conclusion at which we arrived in the last chapter—that Soul, released from body and receiving its intelligence directly, without the interposition of the senses, must have a vastly more extended means of knowledge than it could possess while intelligence came to it only through the restricted and sluggish media of the senses—suggests a question of very great importance.

Is it possible for Soul, while dwelling in the body, to perceive external objects directly, *by its own perceptive power*, without the interposition of a bodily organ of sense to convey the impression?

There is no inherent impossibility or even improbability in the suggestion. So small is our positive knowledge of the relationship of Soul to body, how they are united and how the one controls the other, that we cannot venture to predicate anything of the powers that may be possessed by Soul in such circumstances. We must look for the answer to experience only. All we can certainly say of it is that it is *not impossible*. Perhaps we might go one step further, and say that, *primâ facie*, it is *probable*. Comparing Soul with body and seeing the vast superiority of the former in capacity as in destiny, we should certainly predicate that, upon occasions, the non-molecular and immortal would be enabled to vindicate its power by more or less emancipation of itself from the conditions imposed upon it by the physical and organic laws that govern the body to which it is tethered. There is no known law of Nature that would prohibit a loosening



of the links between Soul and body, seeing that they are wholly severed by the death of the body. There is *no presumption against it*. The question must be referred for solution to experience only. And what does experience say about it?

Is there any evidence that Soul, in any circumstances, can so far sever itself from its dependence upon body as to be enabled to receive impressions—that is, *to obtain perceptions of the external world* molecular and non-molecular—directly and without the intervention of the apparatus of the bodily senses, through which alone, in the normal condition of the organism and in their regular relationship, the communication between Soul and external existence is maintained?

Undoubtedly there are phenomena that *appear*, not only to admit of such an explanation, but to be explicable on no other theory. I will briefly enumerate some of them. They will present themselves for full investigation when, in the second part of this treatise, to which the next volume is devoted, we proceed to examine the *mechanism in action* whose construction has been the sole subject of the present volume.

Who has not many times received intimations, arising in his mind he knows not how or why, of persons coming or events occurring far beyond the range of his senses? The incident is so frequent that it has been embodied in a proverb. The memory suddenly flashes upon your mind of some acquaintance whom you have not seen for many a day, whom you had almost forgotten, of whom you had not been thinking then, nor for years past, and soon afterwards he appears in person. What is the meaning of this? Neither eyes nor ears perceived his coming. Was it not that the Conscious Self (or Soul), certain unknown conditions having then occurred, was enabled to obtain perceptions, by its own natural powers, beyond the range of the senses or without their interposition? True, there was no special cause for the approach of that person being notified to us. He brings no news; he comes to us neither for good nor for harm; there

was no motive for the invocation of an abnormal faculty. May it not be that the conditions necessary for such direct perception by the Conscious Self without the mediation of the senses chanced to be then existing, and so the impression of the distant friend was conveyed directly, instead of being transmitted through the medium of the sense, as it would have been had he come within the range of vision and the image of him had been carried to the brain by the optic nerve?

A very remarkable instance of this mental suggestion has been narrated to me by a near relative. He was in an omnibus reading a newspaper; a lady was at his side—a stranger to him. Suddenly some lines of POPE which he had learned at school thirty years ago, came into his mind, for no apparent cause; he had never even thought of them since his school-days. He mentally repeated them, but failed to recal one line only. He was striving hard to revive it, when the lady took from her pocket a book and began to read. Glancing his eye at the page, to his astonishment he saw that it was a volume of POPE, open at the page containing the very passage he was trying to recal. Asking the lady how it happened that she had this volume then, she informed him that she was learning the poem for an examination. The explanation is doubtless that, having to learn this poem, it was strongly in *her* mind and that her mental action was transmitted to his mind by the process popularly but erroneously called “thought reading.” The suggestion so unconsciously made to him by her mental action was followed by recalling of the poem on his part.

May not the phenomena of *Natural Somnambulism* be thus accounted for? The senses of the Somnambule are sealed in a sleep so profound that a pistol discharged at his ear does not startle him, nor a pinch, a cut, a prick, produce any flinching as of pain. With his eyes firmly closed and all his senses sealed, he performs with ease and accuracy the operations of a waking Will. He walks over dangerous paths safely; writes correctly in regular lines, at even spaces, even dotting the i's and crossing



the t's; he reads, works and does the bidding as of a conscious intelligence, although without consciousness, and has the knowledge which the senses bring although the functions of the senses are suspended.

So also it is in *Artificial Somnambulism*. Senses and consciousness of the patient are alike asleep; he has no Will nor is there any memory afterwards of anything that occurs during the condition of somnambulism. His mind, that most delicate instrument, no longer obedient to the Will, from whose influence it is for the time dissevered, may be subjected to the control of other minds. The senses having ceased to convey intelligence, the mental faculties excited, and the Conscious Self obtaining perception directly without the aid of the senses, those remarkable phenomena are exhibited which are now admitted by medical science to be substantially true, although they were not long ago vehemently denied, and all who dared to assert belief in them were denounced by the dogmatists of Science as rogues or fools.

So likewise do the phenomena of *Psychism* illustrate the argument. The *psychic* (or Soul) *force* is undoubtedly directed and controlled by some Intelligence, and the overwhelming weight of evidence indicates the Intelligence to be that of the Psychic. This Intelligence is never so marked as when the Psychic is in the state of *Trance*—which state closely resembles, if it be not identical with, the state of Somnambulism.

All of these abnormal states of the Mechanism of Man have the common feature of a temporary suspension of the connection between the external senses and the Conscious Self. The condition is attended, not with a diminution of information and intelligence, as might have been anticipated from the fact that the mind in its normal state has no knowledge of the external world save that brought to it by the senses, but with a positive increase of both, and, in many cases, a very extraordinary increase.

What is the reasonable conclusion from this? That in these conditions the intelligence comes through some other medium than the senses. The *brain* is constructed

to perceive external objects by means of the mechanism of the senses alone, and then only in the shapes in which they are presented by that mechanism. When the mechanism is disordered, the information it conveys is imperfect; when the senses are paralysed and the communication severed between the nerves and the brain, their ability to inform the brain is entirely suspended.

How in such a case comes the knowledge of the external world?

Is it not the reasonable and probable presumption that the Conscious Self which, in the normal state of healthy structure and action is informed by the brain, itself informed by the senses, when in abnormal conditions, the links that bind it to the body being loosened and its communication with the outer world through the mechanism of brain and nerves cut off, is enabled to obtain *direct perceptions*, not merely within the limited range of the senses, but within the wider circle of its own vastly larger capacity for perception?

May not *this*, or something of this nature, be the solution of the phenomena seen in Somnambulism and in Trance? It would at least explain completely that which is explicable upon no other theory yet advanced.

When the natural Somnambule reads, writes and works with his eyes fast closed and in the dark, may it not be that his Conscious Self *perceives directly*, without the intervention of the sealed up sense of sight?

When the patient in Somnambulism artificially produced becomes what has been called *clairvoyant*, reads where the sight cannot penetrate and perceives objects and occurrences far beyond the range of vision, may it not be that the Conscious Self, partially released from its normal condition of receipt of intelligence through the senses alone, possesses the power of *direct perception*, under peculiar conditions, so that opacity and distance, which were obstacles to the sense of sight, cease to be obstacles to that Conscious Self perceiving directly without the intervention of the eye?

If there be any truth in this conjecture, and if in



certain unexplored conditions of the organism the Soul (or Conscious Self) can so far free itself from its dependance upon the bodily organs as to receive, partially at least, perceptions by other media than the senses—a condition of whose existence there is *very cogent evidence indeed*—the curious question at once suggests itself, is the Soul under *any* circumstances partially released from the chain that links it to the body, so that it can act to a limited extent without the aid of the senses and beyond the boundaries of the body ?

The existence of such a possible condition would supply a sufficient explanation of all the phenomena, which has been done by no other theory yet advanced. I dismiss at once the ancient and popular notion that, in dream, the Soul quits the body and that many dreams are dramas really acted by the severed Soul. The phenomena of dream need no such hazardous solution, for they are sufficiently explained by Psychology, as we shall presently see. Physiology does not offer the very slightest rational explanation of the phenomena of Somnambulism. The nearest approach to a solution of them is Dr. CARPENTER's theory of "Unconscious Cerebration," as a condition of the organism in which the brain carries on an independent intellectual existence, without consciousness by the individual, receiving the messages of the senses and acting upon them rationally, without the Will or even the knowledge of the patient.

But although this may explain some of the phenomena, it leaves still more unexplained. In Somnambulism, both *Natural* and *Artificial*, the senses are undoubtedly sealed up and either carry no intelligence to the brain, or the brain does not carry that intelligence to the Conscious Self. The eyes are firmly closed and may be covered with any quantity of envelopes impervious to light. The ears are insensible to sound, as is proved by sudden shocks of noise, which make not the slightest impression. The nerves of sensation cease to feel, as is shown by insensibility to pain. Yet that external objects are perceived distinctly is proved by every action of the

patient. Obstacles in his path are avoided, danger is shunned, minute work is performed, writing is read in the dark with closed eyes as readily as by the waking eye in the light. In brief, there is conclusive proof that, although every sense is paralysed, the patient obtains *perceptions* even more accurately than when in his normal condition he receives them through the senses. Beyond all question perceptions of external objects come to him. Certainly they do not come to him through the accustomed senses. How then do they come? This first step in the investigation is an assured one, that, in certain conditions of the organism, the patient, subject to those conditions, *can perceive without the intervention of the senses* which, in his normal state, are the only media for perception. This we know as a *fact*—but we are wholly ignorant how the peculiar condition is caused or what are the physical changes that attend it.

Unconsciousness is a frequent, but not an universal, attendant on this condition. In the vast majority of cases the patient has no consciousness at the moment, and no memory afterwards, of what passes without him or within him, of what he says or of what he does. But sometimes, although rarely, when the patient is seemingly awake and in the possession of his senses, perception extends beyond the range of the senses and occurs under conditions in which the senses could neither have received nor conveyed them.

What is this super-sensuous power of perception? Where does it reside? Not in the brain, for the brain is constructed to receive impressions of external objects by means only of the apparatus of the senses. But if the brain be not the recipient of these abnormal perceptions, that recipient must be something other than the brain, and it is not a rational and *scientific* conclusion, that the Intelligence which thus perceives is *that Something*, other than brain and mind, which we designate the SOUL or Conscious Self.

For the solution of the question if the Soul is ever partially released from its alliance with the body during



life, very little evidence is found. If consciousness were an invariable concomitant of the condition in which perception is obtained otherwise than through the media of the senses, it would afford a strong presumption of such a severance. *Trance* is a very peculiar condition. It is not sleep and bears no resemblance to sleep, other than closed eyes and unconsciousness to outward impressions. The body is capable to act and the brain controls the body intelligently; but the individual Will has ceased to control the brain; consciousness is lost and there is no memory, after consciousness is restored, of what has occurred in the trance.

Trance, then, seems to be a condition in which the communication between body and Soul is suspended. The Soul appears then to possess the power to perceive surrounding objects directly, without the aid of the senses and beyond their range. This seems to point to the conclusion that, during the existence of such a condition, in some unexplained manner, there is a partial loosening of the links that connect Soul with body, inso-much that it is enabled to obtain perceptions otherwise than through the media of the bodily senses, which when in their normal condition of relationship the Soul cannot do.

---

## CHAPTER XI.

## PSYCHIC (OR SOUL) FORCE.

WHETHER we *have* Souls or *are* Souls; whether we are bodies whose mechanism is moved by Soul, or Souls clothed with bodies,—if it be found to be a fact that we are not merely of molecular structure, but that there is something in us, or something a part of us, that is *not* of molecular structure—if the controlling Intelligence be not that of the body but of something other than the body,—it is certain that this controlling Intelligence—this *Something*—must possess power and exercise a *force* by means of which it controls the action of the material body.

This will not be disputed by any who recognise the existence of such a non-corporeal “something.” The Materialist will probably admit that, if there be in us anything in the nature of Soul, it must possess such a power and exercise *some force*.

Nevertheless, the existence of such a *Soul force* does not appear to have been recognised as the necessary consequence of recognising the existence of Soul. This strange oversight is doubtless due to the vague and indefinite conceptions that have prevailed as to the nature of Soul. To most minds the term “*Soul*” was little more than a mere phase conveying no definite and distinct idea. Contemplated only as a formless nothing, Soul was assumed to be incapable of exercising *force*, which was thought to be the property of “matter” only. “How,” it was asked, “could a thing, not itself material and substantial, move substantial matter?” It was forgotten that the forces of electricity, of magnetism and of gravitation, although immaterial, possess enormous power and



are continually moving huge masses of matter. It was forgotten also that the Soul does *in fact* exercise command over the body and directs its movements and this it could not do without the exercise of some *force*.

"Nerve force," "vital force," "mind force," have been recognised as motive powers in the organism (although the existence of either has been lately denied by some distinguished Physiologists), and the actions of the body have been attributed to them alone. It will be shown in the next volume how insufficient these forces, or any of them, are to explain a multitude of phenomena that present themselves upon a close examination of the Mechanism of Man *in action*. It will then plainly appear that *some force* is in operation other than the force of life or mind. If such a force be found, the reasonable conclusion is that it is the force which, if Man has a Soul, that Soul *must* exercise.

That is the force to which I have ventured to give the name of the PSYCHIC FORCE.

It is, indeed, only another name for the *Soul Force*. But so many differing ideas are attached to the term "Soul" that the use of it would certainly prevent that community of conception (so necessary to the advancement of Science), of the *idea* intended to be conveyed by all terms employed. Hence my suggestion of a name as yet unhackneyed. Hence probably the almost universal acceptance and adoption of it by Psychologists everywhere.

*Psychic Force*, therefore, as here used, is designed to signify *the force exercised by the Soul*, as distinguished from the forces of *life* and *mind*, the *vital* force, the *nerve* force.

The design and purport of this term, as descriptive of an important element in the Mechanism of Man, has been so much misunderstood and misrepresented that it was due to myself to present to the Reader once for all this definite explanation of it, for it will be of frequent recurrence in his future researches into the action of that mechanism.

## CHAPTER XII.

## THE PRE-EXISTENCE OF SOUL.

WE stand between two eternities—the eternity of the past and the eternity of the future. We have arrived, by a process of strictly scientific argument, at the conclusion that we are constructed of a Soul, inhabiting the body by permeating the entire structure, capable during life of more or less loosening of that alliance, insomuch that Soul can sometimes receive impressions otherwise than through the media of the bodily senses; and that, upon the death of the investing body, the Soul parts from its muddy vesture of decay, and, still a definite being, but of structure other than the molecular combination of atoms that composed the body, enters upon a new stage of existence, for which it is adapted by the different material of which it is constructed and consequent change in functions and powers to live, and act under new conditions, probably destined to an infinite progression of existences ever advancing towards, but never to attain, the perfection of Deity.

That is the *Eternity of the Future* which Science seems to indicate for us and Reason approves as *probable*. It is permitted to us to look forward and to catch some glimpses, dim though they be, of the life that is *to come*. But what of the *Eternity past*? Can we gaze into “the dark backward and abysm of time,” and catch there the slightest intimation of what we have been, if we have been indeed? It must be confessed that into the *Eternity of the past* we can see but very dimly, if we can see at all. Yet the question is almost as large and



as important as that which concerns the Eternity of the Future. Are we new creations, or have we existed through the ages? If we have a past, in what form of being, in what regions of the Universe? If we are newly *created*, and not merely newly *born*, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that we perish and have no new birth in a new form of existence. If we are to live through the future, it is almost certain that we must have lived through the past. Eternity before us implies an Eternity behind us. Progression from this present condition of existence to a better life almost compels the conclusion that we have progressed to this life from some inferior condition of existence. Where there is no end there can be no beginning.

If we have passed into this life from a life that has been before, the mind cannot but inquire if the slightest memory remains of that past existence? Do *any* traces linger about us of the world whence we have come? Poets have indulged themselves with such a vision and very beautiful it is and boundless is the field it opens wherein imagination may disport itself. But Science can be content with *facts* alone. It looks at the least for a foundation of fact. By none has the doctrine of a pre-existence been more distinctly or more eloquently propounded than by WORDSWORTH, in his "Ode on the Prospect of Immortality."

Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting :  
 The Soul that rises with us, our life's star,  
     Hath had elsewhere its setting,  
     And cometh from afar,  
     Not in entire forgetfulness,  
     And not in utter nakedness,  
 But trailing clouds of glory do we come  
     From God, who is our home.  
 Heaven lies about us in our infancy!  
 Shades of the prison house begin to close  
     Upon the growing boy,  
 But he beholds the light and whence it flows,  
     He sees it in his joy ;  
 The Youth, who daily further from the East  
     Must travel, still is Nature's priest,

And by the vision splendid  
 Is on his way attended;  
 At length the man perceives it die away,  
 And fade into the light of common day.

Earth fills her lap with pleasures of her own;  
 Yearnings she hath in her own natural kind,  
 And, even with something of a Mother's mind,  
     And no unworthy aim,  
 The homely Nurse does all she can  
 To make her Foster-child, her inmate Man,  
     Forget the glories he hath known,  
 And that Imperial Palace whence he came.

O joy! that in our embers,  
     Is something that doth live,  
 That Nature yet remembers  
     What was so fugitive!  
 The thought of our past years in me doth breed  
 Perpetual benediction; not indeed  
 For that which is most worthy to be blest,  
 Delight and liberty, the simple creed  
 Of Childhood whether busy or at rest,  
 With new fledged hope still fluttering in his breast.  
     Not for these I raise  
     The songs of thanks and praise;  
     But for those obstinate questionings,  
     Of sense and outward things,  
     Fallings from us, vanishings;  
     Blank misgivings of a Creature  
 Moving about in worlds not realized;  
 High instincts before which our mortal nature  
 Did tremble like a guilty thing surprised;  
     But for those first affections,  
     Those shadowy recollections,  
     Which, be they what they may,  
 Are yet the fountain light of all our day;  
 Are yet the master light of all our seeing;  
     Uphold us, cherish, and have power to make  
 Our noisy years seem moments in the being  
 Of the eternal Silence; truths that wake  
     To perish never,  
 Which neither listlessness, nor mad endeavour,  
     Nor Man, nor Boy,  
 Nor all that is at enmity with joy  
 Can utterly abolish or destroy!  
     Hence, in a season of calm weather,  
     Though inland far we be,



Our souls have sight of that immortal sea  
Which brought us hither,  
Can in a moment travel thither,  
And see the Children sport upon the shore  
And hear the mighty waters rolling evermore.

Here we have philosophy closed in exquisite poetry. The Poet has by intuition arrived at the conclusion which the Philosopher has attained by the slower process of reason, that the prospect of Immortality to come almost involves the admission of an Immortality in the past. Birth into this world, he says, is only "a sleep and a forgetting" of a world from which we have come. But he finds in this new birth not an *entire* forgetfulness. We bring with us memories of the past existence, dim and undefined, but not the less real; recollections that attend upon the first buddings of childhood, but gradually pass away as we grow to maturity, until they are wholly blotted out by the cares and occupations and later ideas of this world into which we are brought by the new birth. But, beautiful and poetical as is this fancy, is it more than fancy? Is there *any* foundation whatever for the assertion that very young children have visions of another world than this; that boys and girls, waking or sleeping, have at any time flashes of memory that reveal to them, even for a moment, anything not in this world or not constructed by the imagination out of ideas supplied by this world? In very truth the visions of childhood are nothing more than the dreams woven by the unfettered fancy out of the material supplied by the senses and which are wild and vague in precise proportion to the paucity of that material. "The man begins to see it die away, and fade into the light of common day," only because age and experience have filled his mind with facts and fettered fancy with their hard realities.

A little poem that came into my possession many years ago, and the authorship of which I have been unable to trace, very beautifully embodies and expresses this conception of pre-existence:

## TO AN INFANT SMILING AS IT AWOKE.

After the sleep of night as some still lake  
 Displays the cloudless heaven in reflection,  
 And, dimpled by the breezes, seem to break  
 Into a waking smile of recollection,  
 As if from its calm depths the morning light  
 Call'd up the pleasant dreams that gladden'd night—

So doth the laughing azure of those eyes  
 Display a mental heaven of its own :  
 In that illumined smile I recognise  
 The sunlight of a sphere to us unknown ;  
 Thou hast been dreaming of some previous bliss  
 In other worlds—for thou art new to this.

Hast thou been wafted to elysian bowers  
 In some blest star, where thou hast pre-existed ;  
 Inhaled the ecstatic fragrancy of flowers  
 About the golden harps of seraphs twisted ;  
 Or heard the nightingales of paradise  
 Hymn choral songs and joyous harmonies ?

Perchance all breathing life is but an essence  
 Of the great fountain SPIRIT in the sky,  
 And thou hast dreamed of that transcendent presence  
 Whence thou hast fall'n—a dew-drop from on high—  
 Destined to lose, as thou shalt mix with earth,  
 Those bright recallings of thy heavenly birth.

We deem thy mortal memory but begun ;  
 But hast thou no remembrance of the past,  
 No lingering twilight of a former sun  
 Which o'er thy slumbering faculties hath cast  
 Shadows of unimaginable things  
 Too high, or deep, for human fathomings ?

Perhaps, while reason's earliest fount is heightening,  
 Athwart thine eyes celestial sights are given,  
 As skies that open to let out the lightning  
 Display a transitory glimpse of heaven ;  
 And thou art wrapt in visions all too bright  
 For aught but seraphim or infants' sight.

Emblem of heavenly purity and bliss !  
 Mysterious type, which none can understand !  
 Let me with reverence then approach to kiss  
 Limbs lately touched by the Creator's hand.  
 So awful art thou, that I feel more prone  
 To ask *thy* blessing than bestow mine own.



Very poetical is the idea that an infant's smile is a memory of a past existence, because it could have no impression of this one. But it is only a fanciful thought. There is no reason whatever to suppose that an infant's smile is caused by a dream. Even if it be so, it is the merest conjecture that the dream must have been of other worlds. If a dream, it was much more likely to be a dream about its food. Youth, maturity and age might be appealed to for proof in this matter. Has any person a single recollection of a dream, or vision, at any time of his life, however young, which was of an existence other than this, of a world altogether different? Are not all dreams, even the wildest and the vaguest, merely shadows compounded of things in this world, exaggerated and combined monstrously, but having the same elements? Has a man, blind from birth, visions of a world unlike this one—for *his* blindness here would not affect his "shadowy recollections" of objects there?

I fear, therefore, we are compelled to this conclusion—that there is no *memory* of a former existence; that we emerge from the eternity of the past with entire forgetfulness of all that has preceded our present life.

But if the past is blotted from us, and there is no consciousness of it now, it is as if we had been newly created. Are we to gather from this, that although we are to live through the eternity of the future, we are to enter upon it from this life with the same oblivion of the past as that with which we have already entered upon the present existence? That is undoubtedly the problem that presses upon us, for, unless we are to have a conscious, continuous life in the future, and know ourselves there as ourselves, and others as we have known them here, what is our gain? If death is "a sleep and a forgetting," as the poets say of our birth; if we are to pass to the next world as we came into this, with oblivion of the past, or even with such dim and doubtful glimpses as the poets say we have of the world whence we have emerged, the prospect is not hopeful.

Let me hazard the suggestion that removes the difficulty; may it not be that when we rise to another and higher stage of being, with enlarged powers and added senses, we may *regain the memory*, not of the last only, but of all former existences, and thus preserve the continuity of individual being?

I think we may fairly conclude from the facts that so it is. If we have Soul, that Soul does not sleep in the grave with a decaying body, nor remain there when the body is resolved into its elements and scattered through space. When the Soul parts from the body, it must exist somewhere. It preserves the same form. It suffers no immediate change. It has merely cast off its garment of flesh. It is still the same Being, with the same consciousness of identity, the same mental emotions and capacities. It is difficult to imagine any after circumstances under which Soul could lose the identity it preserved at the moment of parting with the body. If its individuality is continued then, what subsequent change can be contemplated that should destroy it?

And if there be for Soul a continued conscious existence, the conclusion is inevitable that it carries into the next life the mental character that belonged to it in this. The passage from one existence to the other must be momentary. It is not, as the poet says, "A sleep and a forgetting," a trance and then an awakening to a new world and a new life. Were it thus, it might well be that "the forgetting" should be perfect, and that Soul might live its new life in entire forgetfulness of the existence whence it has emerged—practically a new Being, with not even a dream of the past. But if Soul does not sleep, but merely passes away from the body in a moment, what instant of time can be reasonably conjectured as that at which it can be supposed to lose its self-consciousness and the memory of the past? If a sleep and a forgetting does not take place at the moment of dissolution, can we suppose that it occurs at the moment after death? But if not then, if once the Soul enters into its new life with the consciousness of its



individuality and the recollection of its former life, not even a plausible argument can be adduced for its subsequent submission to the process of oblivion.

The conclusion is, therefore, *probable*, because reasonable, that Soul emerges from its existence in the body, clothed with the memory of its deeds in the body, in full possession of its capacities for intelligence and emotion not merely unimpaired, but greatly extended, with all its virtues and vices, and with all the knowledge it has acquired in the present stage of its being as a foundation for that far wider range of intelligence which the conditions of its new existence must of necessity bring to it.

---

## CHAPTER XIII.

## THE DWELLING-PLACE OF SOUL.

WHERE does the Soul go when the body falls from it? The belief of a large section of the Christian world is that the Soul sleeps with the body. The Roman Catholics hold that the Soul passes into purgatory where

The sins done in our days of Nature  
Are burnt and purged away.

Others, again, think that it flies straightway to heaven or hell. All, if closely questioned, will be found to have most hazy conceptions of what they intend by what they say, and, in fact, have never thought about it at all.

The first conjecture is impossible, because the body does not sleep but is dissipated. Decomposition begins on the instant that life ends and the particles that compose the structure of the body are dispersed, absorbed by plants which, in their turn, are eaten by animals who are eaten by other human beings, and thus in the course of ages the selfsame particles go to the composition of a great number of men and women. Consequently it is impossible that the Soul and body can remain together. Nor can the identical body itself exist again, because the substances of which it was built will have gone to the construction of many other bodies. It is the *Spiritual Body*, of which the Apostle speaks, that survives the material body.

Nor does the Soul, as some have imagined, pass straightway to its doom. Authority asserts a Day of Judgment as *to come*.



What then is the lot of Soul in the interval? The world has existed many millions of years and we have good reason to conclude that Man has existed upon it for countless generations. All the people who have died upon this earth in the course of the æons of ages are awaiting the last day. Where are *their* Souls? What has been *their* abode? Where are *they* dwelling at this moment? *Wheresoever they are we shall be.* Their intermediate condition will be ours. In what region are now existing the multiplied millions of Souls that have been born into this world and departed from it? That is the problem which must present itself to every mind that gives a moment's thought to Psychology.

The only solution that Science can suggest, and it will be found to square substantially, perhaps literally, with the teaching of Authority, is that of *progression*, and it accords also with all that we see and know of the Divine Government of this world. According to the doctrine of progression, the Soul does not pass *directly* from this life to a distant and final place of bliss or torment, with *immediate* judgment, but it throws off the garment of flesh that clothed it here and enters upon a new form of existence, to whose new conditions it is adapted by virtue of its non-molecular structure. New and much-extended powers and capabilities must attach to it from the nature of its new perceptions, which must enable it to obtain a more extended knowledge of the surrounding Universe.

Where its sphere of existence lies we are profoundly ignorant. Conjecture has busied itself with imaginations, but without any solid foundation for them. This only we *know*, that there are vast interspaces between the worlds, so vast that the entire agglomerated substance of all the worlds that compose the solar system, compared with the space in which they are floating, would be but as a grain of sand to an African desert. Consequently there is in these regions between the planets, even in our own system of worlds—to say nothing of the Universe without—ample space for the dwelling of all the Souls that have existed from the beginning of time, not on this

earth only, but on all the planetary worlds that roll about the sun. All our researches into Nature reveal to us more and more the marvellous ubiquity of life. No sooner do we suppose that we have found its limits than some instrument of greater power is discovered and new worlds of life are disclosed to us. It is scarcely conceivable that, if life is so crowded upon this world, where-soever our coarse and limited senses can penetrate its structure, the huge spaces between the worlds should be without life. If they are, it is not in accordance with all that we witness elsewhere of the economy of Creation. It must be remembered that we have no right to affirm that living things do not exist about us because they are not perceptible to our senses, which are constructed to perceive only one of the infinite varieties of combinations of the particles of matter. It may well be that all space around us, and the very atmosphere in which we dwell, are thronged with beings formed of other than the molecular combination of atoms, and *therefore* invisible, impalpable, and wholly imperceptible to us. It is possible, it is not even improbable, that there may be something more than a Poet's "fine frenzy" in Milton's language:

Millions of spiritual creatures walk the earth  
Unseen, both when we sleep and when we wake.

Not alone, then, in the air that wraps our globe, but in the spaces that lie between the centre Sun and the furthest planet, and even in the planets themselves, are regions that *may be* the dwelling-places of all the Souls that ever have been, or ever will be, till Time shall be no more. And in this vast region they may continue to proceed by *progression* from one stage of being to another, ever advancing towards the perfection of Divinity, at a rate of progress determined by the conduct of the individual in each successive stage of his existence.

---



## CHAPTER XIV.

## THE CONDITION OF THE DISEMBODIED SOUL.

AND if Soul passes from the life of this world to another life in a march of infinite progression, what may we reasonably conjecture to be its condition in the stage of existence next to its present one?

Soul quits the body in shape the same, carrying with it the precise intelligence and character it had here. This at the first glance surprises us, because we are accustomed to contemplate Soul (if ever we think about it at all) as some vague indefinite thing—a name and nothing more. But if we view it calmly and sensibly, as a fact and not as a fancy—we shall remember what Soul is, if it be at all. *My Soul is merely myself.* It is “I” that go away from my body, just as I throw off a worn-out garment,—the “I,” who thought, willed, felt pain and pleasure and was conscious of my own individuality. That “I” am the same personage the day after death as yesterday I was. “I” am still myself, although I have quitted a body to which I was bound by links imperceptible to me in that world-life, but now plainly discerned. “I” have new powers and new perceptions, because “I” am constructed of other particles than my body was made of. “I” am not subject to the law of gravity, nor to the limited range of the organs of sense, nor to the notions of time consequent upon brain structure. But “I” *am*, nevertheless, still myself, still a body, a shape, a definite being, existing in space, occupying a distinct portion of space, built of particles of matter, but subject to new conditions in accordance with

my new needs and governed by other natural laws than those that controlled the stage of *evolution* from which I have emerged. "I" am *spirit* now. But spirit is a structure of atoms like those of the body, only in a different combination. That which seems to me natural now appeared strange and improbable to me in my former being because I did not sufficiently investigate the scheme of creation; because I measured everything by the standard of my own limited perceptions, denying what my senses could not reveal and forgetting that there is a limitless Universe infinitely smaller than anything my sight could discern, as there is a boundless Universe of things infinitely larger than sense could show or mind conceive.

Keeping these considerations steadily in view, it will be easy to comprehend how the change may be from existence in a molecular body to existence without such body, with a form of non-molecular structure, having extended capacities and new powers, with memories of the past, the accumulated intelligence of the state that has ended, a progressive march from this life to the new life, and thence onward, stage by stage, through a mighty chain of being the last link of which is GOD.

---



## CHAPTER XV.

## THE MYSTERY.

IN the honest pursuit of Scientific Truth it is forbidden to conceal difficulties and doubts. Seeing how very little we really know of Nature—of how much even of that which is about us we know positively nothing—how wholly ignorant we are even of our own structure—there is no shame in confessing ignorance of anything that belongs to Psychology or Physiology.

I cannot, therefore, attempt to disguise from the Reader or from myself a difficulty that is urged with some force by the Materialists, in opposition to the theory that endows Man with a Soul—or, I should rather say, that holds *Man to be a Soul clothed in flesh*. “If you have a Soul,” they say triumphantly, “when did that Soul take possession of your body? Was it in the germ? If so, every germ has a Soul, and as only one germ in a hundred thousand expands into a man, what become of the Souls of all the rest of the wasted germs? If the Soul be not in the germ, at what period of growth does it enter the body? Before birth or after birth? And whence does it come? And by what process does it take possession of its tenement?”

I candidly confess this to be a mystery which I cannot solve. At most we can do little more than indulge in *guesses* at truth. Whatever explanation is adventured, it can be nothing more than a fanciful conjecture. On this point, so profound is the mystery, that Authority itself does not attempt to withdraw the veil.

Theology, which proclaims the fact that man is a living Soul, does not inform us, or even suggest to us, when and how that Soul enters the body of the Man. In such circumstances, almost any conjecture may be permitted to the curious inquirer.

The only reasonable suggestion I can adventure seems sufficiently strange and vague. It supposes the Universe to be entirely possessed by Soul—that it is, in fact, what we call “*spirit*,” and that what we call “*matter*” is only that portion of the great world of spirit which is manifest to our senses, because our senses are specially constructed to perceive it. According to this theory, there is really no distinction in *Nature* between “*spirit*” and “*matter*,” the apparent difference being merely in our own perceptive powers. If our senses could be extended, so as to enable us to perceive things about us that are now imperceptible, we should add so much the more to the sum of that which we call “*matter*” because it is perceptible to us, but which in fact is not matter but “*spirit*” (or at least what we call “*spirit*,” because it is imperceptible by our senses). Thus does this theory practically maintain that “*matter*,” as we understand it, is such only in relation to ourselves—it is *spirit in a form perceptible to our senses*. If the functions of those senses were to be changed or modified, that which we now call “*spirit*” might appear as “*matter*,” or that which now seems to be “*matter*” might be resolved into “*spirit*.” As it is with time, space, colour and sound, *materiality* is not a quality actually existing in the object, but merely a sensation in ourselves which we so call,—an impression upon our own minds to which we have given that name.

Another scarcely less interesting conjecture is, that the molecular Universe is possessed by spirit pervading it everywhere, not individualized but in aggregation; that this “*spirit substance*” (if so seeming a contradiction in terms may be permitted) penetrates all matter and moulds it to all shapes. That in organized beings it becomes a distinct individuality and operates through



the vital force that moves all organized structure; that this "spirit" possesses the germ, grows with it to maturity and is released from it on the ceasing of organic life; that precisely as the material atoms pass from mineral to vegetable and from vegetable to animal structure, so "spirit" advances from being a mere spiritual protoplasm (if the metaphor will be allowed) by the same process of expansion and progression, to have, first, a separate being, then a development in one stage of existence, then advancement to another stage, and so onward. Thus it may be conjectured that the particle of the spirit mass which becomes an individual Man is born with him, grows with him, is in fact, *himself* in the condition in which he is perceptible to the senses of other men and therefore is to them a material being. Spirit, *thus matured*, does not return into the mass, but, when the body falls from it, preserves its individuality and is that "Soul" entity to the contemplation of which the previous chapters have been devoted.

Another theory has been suggested to me by a correspondent and it is not unworthy of consideration. May it not be that Soul is eliminated from Soul and becomes individualized by division? We must banish as impossible the supposition that a Soul is placed in the body at some stage of its growth. It is equally improbable that every germ has a Soul. But the vivified germ forms a part of the body of the mother, and, so long as it is a part of her, may it not be transfused with her Soul, and on separation from her become an individual Soul with an independent being? May not Soul be inherited from Soul as body is from body?

I submit these *conjectures* to the Reader in default of any positive knowledge. All that can be said of them is that they are not impossible, and some argument might be used to show either of them to be even probable. For my own part, having no *evidence* whatever upon the subject, I can venture upon no opinion. They certainly supply an answer to the Materialists, if there be truth in them—but that is precisely the question to be solved.

Readers must accept them as being little more than pleasing fancies, at least until patient investigation by the Science of Psychology shall have thrown some better light than we have yet enjoyed upon this, the obscurest region of Natural Philosophy.



## CHAPTER XVI.

## SPECULATIONS.

No thoughtful and inquiring mind could contemplate the being of Soul, *as a fact in nature* and not as a faith merely, without a strong desire to penetrate yet further into the history of non-molecular being generally and to learn what relationship Man bears to that special atomic form of being to which the Soul *that is himself* belongs and of which it is a part. If such knowledge can ever be procurable in our present condition of existence is, indeed, very doubtful; but not the less is eager curiosity awakened by the problems that present themselves.

Some of them may be fitly stated here, not with any hope of solving them, but to stimulate the mind by the grandeur and strangeness of the questions raised and to point the direction inquiry must take. Although full knowledge may not be attainable, something will be gained by the process of searching after it.

I must remind the Reader that all of this chapter is purely speculative—merely *guesses at truth*—unsupported by any evidence and therefore to be taken as nothing more than *conjecture*.

If the Mechanism of Man be constructed of Soul as well as body, or, as I prefer to say, is a Soul wearing a body, when did that Soul first come into being, or first become an individual Soul?

This question is always advanced by Materialists in a triumphant tone, justified, I must admit, by the vague conception of Soul once universally prevailing. So long as it was assumed that Soul was something put into the body in some wonderful way at some unknown time

after the formation of the embryo man, or as the popular notion was, at the moment of birth, the objections of the Materialists were insuperable. *Where* was the Soul the moment before it was sent into the body? Was it created *then*? If so, is there a distinct act of creation at each birth? If not this, when was the Soul first formed, and where and how had it been kept until the moment it was wanted to occupy the body? If it had existed before the body, where—how?

These were unanswerable objections and scepticism as to the being of Soul owes its wide diffusion to the consciousness that no rational answer could be given to them. They had staggered my own faith in Soul until further reflection raised the doubt if this almost universal conception of the junction of Soul and body was the true one and if some other might not conduct to more satisfactory conclusions.

But two answers are possible. Either the individual Soul has pre-existed, or it is a newly created being. The possible pre-existence has been considered in a previous chapter and it must be admitted to be in itself neither impossible nor even improbable. But it is attended with two difficulties. First, it involves the condition that the Soul must, in such case, become a babe again, which is scarcely to be imagined; and secondly, that there is absolutely no evidence whatever of pre-existence. Even they who profess to prophesy of the future can never tell us of the past.

We are, then, almost compelled to the conclusion that the individual Soul has commenced its individual being with the natural body.

But whence does it come? To this there can be but one answer. From the parent.

And if from the parent, is it a new creation? This can scarcely be. How then? The organic structure is a bud or offshoot from the parent. The life of that structure is certainly a continuation of the life of the parent. The man is in body and mind a representative of all his ancestors.



Why should it be otherwise with the Soul? May not it also be an offshoot from the Soul of the parent, becoming a *new Soul*, having its own individuality at the moment of severance from its parent?

I will not speculate which of these two theories of Soul-birth most commends itself to the thinking mind. The important point is, that no alternative appears.

Another *speculation*.

We have seen that the human senses can perceive only molecular structure. That structure is but a small fraction, not of this world only, nor of our Solar system, but of the Universe that is visible to us. What is all this vast non-molecular structure by which we are encompassed, and which presses upon us everywhere, which is in the air that wraps us round, in the earth on which we tread, filling the vast interspaces between the worlds that spangle the sky, but of which we have no perception whatever and to us is as if it were not and yet is as real and as substantial as is the molecular creation? Seeing the incessant interchange between molecular and atomic being—how atoms are agglomerated into molecules and molecules resolved into atoms—how small a change in the arrangement of the atoms of which all things are made would suffice to convert matter into spirit or spirit into matter—is it improbable that our conception of creation, based upon the information of the senses, may be as incomplete and partial as the powers of the senses themselves? We can perceive only the one atomic structure that makes molecules. Consequently we come to think of all being as similar to that we perceive. May it not well be, that the creation we perceive is only the shell or crust of the creation that is—that the true substance of creation is *spirit* or *soul*—that is to say, *non-molecular being*;—and that the molecular structure palpable to our perceptions is but the embodiment of spirit structure, under laws and conditions of which we are ignorant but which are passing incessantly from one to the other, as water becomes ice

on the surface when exposed to certain conditions and returns to water again when those conditions cease?

This change is accomplished by a slight change in the position of the molecules of which the water is made. May not a like slight change in the position of the atoms, or whatever be the ultimate particles of which molecules are made, produce an equal change in form and structure and create what we call *spirit*, which is in fact merely a structure of the same particles as what we call "matter," but in another combination

Viewed thus, the world, nay, the Universe, would not be "material," in the sense in which we are accustomed to think of it, but substantially *Spirit* with a clothing of *Matter*, as Soul is clothed by the body.

It is a conjecture merely. But if there be in it any truth it would solve most of the problems that perplex us as to structure of creation, the mechanism of Man, the being of Soul, the relationship of *matter* to *spirit* and of Man to the past, the present and the future.

I do but throw it out as a suggestion to exercise the thoughts of the reflecting Reader.



## CHAPTER XVII.

## CONCLUSIONS.

WE have now concluded the survey of the human structure, viewed merely as a machine. Of the body, nothing more than a mere outline has been attempted, for any detailed description would have occupied more space than can be given to this entire treatise. But that portion of the mechanism which is devoted to the functions of mind has received a more elaborate review, because it is at this point that the province of Psychology properly begins.

Much space has been given also to the subject of SOUL, or SPIRIT (which name soever may be preferred), not only because of its intrinsic importance, but because that also is entirely and solely within the domain of the science to which this work is designed to be an introduction.

Much of the subject matter contained in the preceding pages has been unavoidably difficult, abstruse and uninteresting. But it was necessary to a clear comprehension of the more interesting themes that are to come.

Having now a definite and, I hope, tolerably clear, comprehension in his mind of the general Mechanism of Man, the Reader will be enabled more easily to pursue that investigation into the phenomena exhibited by the mechanism in action, to which the second and concluding volume is devoted. He will there be invited to view the mechanism *in motion* which he has here been contemplating at rest. He will see how the various parts of

it act and react upon each other ; how the mind influences the body and the body the mind and how the Soul (if its existence be deemed to be established, or at least accepted as probable) influences both mind and body. He will discover that his investigations must be conducted under other conditions than such as attend upon the analysis of a metal or a muscle. The subjects to which his examination will be directed being imponderable, intangible, and imperceptible to his ordinary senses, he can obtain knowledge of them and of their conditions and qualities only by observation of their action upon the surrounding matter. Like magnetism, heat and the other imponderables, they are perceptible only, and therefore can be studied only, in their *manifestations*. But thus, if we carefully collect a sufficient number of facts, established by the best *evidence*, we may attain accurate knowledge of the operating agent as certainly as by any manipulations of material substances in the laboratory ; we can learn their properties, their powers and the conditions of their being.

The subjects that will thus present themselves for consideration are some of the most profound, and at the same time most curious and perplexing, that could be opened to the Mind, and all will acknowledge their high interest and importance to every human being. For reasons, perhaps not far to seek, they have hitherto been treated with a strange neglect. The study of them has been decried and discredited by two parties of opponents. The Scientists have sought to scare inquirers by the cry of "Superstition," because there, if anywhere, was to be found the sling and the stone that could slay Materialism. On the other side, Authority formerly sought to frighten by a warning against trespass upon holy ground, because it deemed, wrongly, that to apply science to the question of Soul, its existence, its dwelling and its destiny, was to deny the validity of its own mission. The time has come when the pretensions of any party to prohibit inquiry can no longer be recognized. Anathema cannot be per-



mitted to rest on *any* branch of knowledge. Wherever there is something to be known, it is our right and our duty to make search for it. There is no dangerous truth nor desirable ignorance. There is *no* boundary to the explorations of science. No subject may now be tabooed. Nothing that *is* is really insignificant or trifling. Nothing is unworthy of being known. A new fact of *any* kind, however seemingly small, is a substantial addition to the sum of our knowledge. Petty as it appears, it may be the pioneer to a whole territory of new learning.

Scientists may sneer at Psychology as being a visionary science, based upon mere assumption and dealing with that whose very existence is problematical. But its subject matter is as real as that with which *they* deal. Even were it not so, the more important it would be that the study of it should be pursued, with an honest endeavour to ascertain if the foundation on which it is erected be sound or baseless—that if, after due investigation, it be found to be false, the world may cease from a vain labour; but that, if it be proved a truth, MAN may have the blessed assurance that, as a *fact*, and not merely as a *faith*, he has a SOUL and inherits an IMMORTALITY.

# INDEX.

<b>ACQUISITIVENESS:</b>	<i>page</i>
faculty for, defined.....	314
uses of .....	314
abuses of.....	315
<b>AMATIVENESS:</b>	
faculty for .....	306
<b>AMBITION:</b>	
if the product of self-esteem.....	320, 322
<b>ANNIHILATION:</b>	
natural dread of.....	439
<b>APPROBATION, LOVE OF:</b>	
faculty for, defined.....	320
uses of.....	321
abuses of.....	321
vanity .....	321
<b>ATTACHMENT:</b>	
to persons and places, faculty for, defined.....	308
to parents and brethren.....	309
love of country and home...	310
<b>AUTOMATON:</b>	
man is not .....	393
<b>BASTIAN, DR.:</b>	
on the beginnings of life ...	200
<b>BENEVOLENCE:</b>	
faculty for, defined.....	324
Dr. Brown on .....	324
uses of.....	325
charity.....	325
abuses of.....	325

<b>BODY, THE:</b>	<i>page</i>
germ of .....	73
how it grows .....	112
formative force .....	116
building by force from within	118
manner of growth .....	117
work of the nerve system...	118
the process of body making	121
growth of the chicken in the egg .....	123
its shape is that of the nerve organization .....	126
changes in .....	127
scars in, indelible .....	129
a completed man.....	130
how we live .....	133
vital force .....	134
the nerve system.....	136
health .....	140
reparation of .....	143
inherited constitution .....	144
how we sicken.....	149
classification of diseases ...	150
remedies for disease .....	154
disordered function .....	157
organic disease .....	158
disorder at the nerve centre	159
at seat of the malady .....	159
constitutional debility .....	160
irregularity of the flow of nerve force .....	161
cure by mesmerism .....	162
cure by faith .....	164
how we die .....	166
process of death.....	167
contains all the machinery of the mind.....	214



<b>BODY, THE—continued:</b>	<i>page</i>
has an envelope of nerve force.....	255
and of its own material ...	254

**BRAIN, THE:**

decline of power in old age	170
the material organ of mind	215
structure of.....	219, 234
a great ganglion.....	220
medulla oblongata, function of .....	220
has a variety of organs.....	222
undiscovered by anatomy ..	224
phrenological theory of .....	225
not completely established...	227
analysis of the mental powers .....	229
meaning of term "faculty"	231
is duplex .....	232
opinions of Brown-Sequard and others .....	234
history of.....	234
objections to, answered.....	238
results of duplex structure	238
operation of.....	240
unconscious cerebration.....	241
proofs of .....	245
uses of the double brain ..	247
illustrative cases .....	248
disease of one brain only ..	249
structure of.....	292
has distinct parts .....	293
and distinct faculties.....	294
proofs of .....	295

**BROWN-SEQUARD:**

on the duality of the mind...	235
-------------------------------	-----

**BROWN, DR. THOMAS:**

on love.....	307
on attachment and friendship .....	308
on combativeness and destructiveness .....	310
on acquisitiveness .....	315
on benevolence .....	324
on conscientiousness .....	334

**CARPENTER, DR.:**

on unconscious cerebration .....	241, 433
----------------------------------	----------

**CARPENTER, DR.—contd. page**

on action of the whole brain.....	293, 298
answer to.....	294, 299
process of.....	295
on memory .....	373

**CAUSALITY:**

faculty of, defined .....	365
process of reasoning .....	366
functions of.....	366

**CAUTIOUSNESS:**

faculty for, defined.....	323
uses of.....	323
abuses of.....	323
cowardice.....	323

**CHARACTER:**

difficulty in reading .....	384
-----------------------------	-----

**CHARITY:**

what benevolence prompts	326
definition of.....	326

**CHEMICAL FORCE:**

its relation to vital force ...	189
---------------------------------	-----

**CHILDREN:**

faculty of love for .....	306
---------------------------	-----

**CLIFFORD, PROFESSOR:**

on human automatism .....	399
---------------------------	-----

**COLOUR:**

only a mental sensation.....	272
------------------------------	-----

**COMBATIVENESS:**

faculty for, defined.....	309
uses of.....	310
abuses of.....	312

**COMPARISON:**

faculty of, defined .....	364
---------------------------	-----

**CONCENTRATIVENESS:**

faculty for, defined.....	317
doubtful .....	318

**CONSCIOUSNESS:**

of soul as existing.....	433
--------------------------	-----

- CONSCIENTIOUSNESS: *page*  
 faculty of, defined ..... 331  
 the sense of right and wrong ..... 332  
 operation of ..... 334  
 Dr. Brown on ..... 334
- CONSERVATION OF ENERGY :  
 effect of ..... 55
- CONSTRUCTIVENESS :  
 faculty for, defined ..... 316  
 Why man improves his structures ..... 317
- DEATH :  
 how we die ..... 166  
 physical process of..... 167  
 moment of, not known ..... 168  
 resuscitation ..... 168  
 decline of mental power ... 170  
 only ceasing of vital force 171  
 state of the Soul after ..... 463
- DESPAIR :  
 physiology of ..... 339
- DESTRUCTIVENESS :  
 faculty for, defined..... 309  
 uses of..... 310  
 abuses of..... 311
- DISEASE :  
 what is..... 149  
 classification of ..... 150  
 remedies for ..... 152  
 failure of vital force ..... 153  
 failure of the nerve system 153  
 failure of the organs of  
 nutrition ..... 154  
 where source of, to be sought 155  
 constitutional debility ..... 160  
 irregularity in the flow of  
 nerve force ..... 162  
 mesmeric influence on ..... 163  
 cures by faith..... 164
- DUALITY OF THE MIND :  
 brain structure ..... 232  
 two brains imply two minds 233  
 maintained by Sir H. Holland, Brown-Sequard, and  
 others ..... 234
- DUALITY OF THE MIND—  
*continued : page*  
 Dr. Wigan on ..... 235  
 importance of..... 237  
 objections to answered..... 238  
 manner of its action ..... 238  
 explains unconscious cerebration ..... 241  
 proofs of ..... 245  
 argument of Dr. Wigan and  
 Sir H. Holland ..... 244  
 illustrations of ..... 277  
 Opinions of Mr. Solly .... 250
- DWELLING PLACE :  
 of the soul ..... 490
- EGG, THE :  
 mode of propagation in..... 100  
 contains a double germ ..... 101  
 mode of growth of embryo 102  
 growth of the chicken in ... 123
- EVENTUALITY :  
 faculty of ..... 357  
 functions of..... 357
- EVIDENCE :  
 what is scientific ..... 27  
 what are facts..... 28  
 fallacies to be avoided in ... 30  
 the best to be required ..... 31  
 hearsay inadmissible ..... 31  
 belief follows desire ..... 34  
 of the senses ..... 284  
 relative value of sensual  
 and mental impressions... 286  
 multiplication of proofs..... 285  
 mental impressions ..... 288  
 of facts ..... 288
- FACT :  
 what is ..... 28  
 how to be proved ..... 29  
 duty to learn the very truth 31
- FACULTIES, THE MENTAL :  
 classification of ..... 303
- FAITH :  
 curative influence of ..... 164



<b>FEELINGS, THE :</b>	<i>page</i>	<b>GERM, THE—continued :</b>	<i>page</i>
classification of .....	303	structure is by junction of	
the propensities .....	303	two germs .....	87
<b>FERTILIZATION .</b>		explains hybridism.....	89
of the germ .....	83	and heredity .....	89
of eggs.....	101	union of the germs.....	92
of seeds .....	105	a fac-simile of the parent...	93
<b>FIRMNESS:</b>		objections to .....	94
function of .....	330	answered .....	95
abuses of.....	331	misshapen births .....	97
<b>FOOD :</b>		resemblances and differences	98
importance to health .....	146	the egg.....	100
<b>FORCE AND FORCES :</b>		manner of growth .....	102
what they are.....	20	the like in vegetables .....	103
operation of .....	21	process of reproduction.....	104
how observed .....	22	fertilization of seeds .....	105
the organic forces .....	24	growth of .....	113
definition of.....	50	by force from within .....	117
the forces of nature .....	51	<b>GHOSTS :</b>	
unity of .....	52	value of evidence of .....	445
physical forces defined .....	53	<b>GILLINGHAM, MR. :</b>	
psychic force defined .....	53	cases reported by .....	457
they are imperceptible .....	54	<b>GRAVITATION :</b>	
how known to us .....	54	is a condition of matter only	10
formative.....	112	<b>HARMONY :</b>	
that cause growth .....	113	physiology of .....	276
Life, Mind, Soul .....	175	<b>HEALTH :</b>	
chemical and vital forces		in what consisting .....	140
contrasted .....	191	supply of nerve force.....	141
structure by .....	193	effect of the vital force .....	142
<b>FORMATIVE FORCE :</b>		the process of nourishment	143
what is.....	123	of reparation .....	143
<b>GERM, THE :</b>		rules for recovering .....	144
definition of.....	73	temperance .....	145
life of .....	75	animal and vegetable food...	146
Materialist theory of.....	75	drink and air .....	147
answer to .....	76	<b>HEARING, SENSE OF :</b>	
requirement of two parents	77	its function.....	275
elimination of.....	79	apparatus for .....	275
origin of .....	79	harmony, melody, and dis-	
influence of either parent ..	81	cords .....	276
vivification of .....	84	music is in ourselves.....	276
the duplex structure .....	85	<b>HEREDITY :</b>	
two parents the cause of the		definition of.....	108
duplex form.....	86	physiology of .....	108
		of parental constitution.....	144

HOLLAND, SIR H. :	<i>page</i>	INTELLECTUAL FACULTIES—	
on the duality of the mind...	243	<i>continued :</i>	<i>page</i>
HOPE :		Tune.....	359
faculty of, defined .....	337	Language.....	359
function of .....	337	INTRODUCTION :	
despair.....	338	to the Mechanism of Man...	67
HUMOUR :		to the forces that move the	
faculty for .....	344	mechanism .....	175
wrongly confused with wit...	345	to the Mind.....	208
definition of.....	345	LANGUAGE :	
uses of .....	347	faculty of.....	359
ridicule a test of truth .....	347	functions of .....	360
HUXLEY, PROFESSOR :		stuttering, cause and cure of	360
on human automatism .....	399	LAW :	
HYBRIDISM :		organic and physical .....	12
explained by the double germ	91	LIFE :	
IDEALITY :		in the germ.....	73
faculty of, defined .....	340	Materialist theory of .....	74
functions of.....	341	answer to.....	76
does it exist in animals .....	342	how we live .....	133
uses and pleasures of.....	343	effect of .....	133
IMAGINATION :		vital force .....	134
<i>See "Ideality."</i>		one of the moving forces ...	175
IMITATION :		is a blind force .....	175
faculty of, defined .....	348	what life is .....	178
INORGANIC MATTER :		not a specific entity ...	181, 203
definition of.....	10	as a force.....	179
INSANITY :		a condition of organization	182
not of the whole brain .....	295	how ceases .....	183
INSTINCT :		characteristics of.....	184
meaning of term.....	403	comparison of living man	
possessed by man .....	404	with a statue .....	187
is untaught knowledge .....	406	the forces that control life	188
how produced .....	407	where it lies .....	191
INTELLECTUAL FACULTIES :		is it in the germ ? .....	192
classification of .....	350	the beginning of .....	195
the perceptive faculties.....	350	what it is <i>not</i> .....	196
Individuality .....	350	where it dwells .....	197
Form, Size, Weight, Colour	351	the process of organization	199
Locality .....	355	the cessation of .....	202
Number .....	356	distribution through the	
Order .....	356	body .....	204
Eventuality .....	357	is in the nerve system .....	204
Time.....	358	is not the Soul .....	206
		the force that moves the	
		body.....	212
		LIMBS :	
		reported cases of lost.....	458



<b>LOVE :</b>	<i>page</i>	<b>MEMORY :</b>	<i>page</i>
faculty for, defined .....	306	what it is.....	371
for children .....	306	physiology of .....	372
		may be without conscious-	
		ness .....	373
<b>MACHINERY OF THE MIND :</b>		recollection .....	375
working of .....	381, 385	office of.....	375
<b>MAN :</b>		phenomena of .....	376
what a man is.....	9	what the true seat of.....	378
cause of the form of .....	12		
what the science of, com-		<b>MIND :</b>	
prises .....	15	what it is .....	176
sketch of a .....	67	introduction to study of ...	208
mechanism of .....	68	is distinct from Soul .....	209
molecular construction of ...	69	how to be studied .....	210
not a solid body .....	70	the mechanism of .....	213
germ of.....	71	machinery of, is in the body	214
duplex structure of .....	84	brain is the organ of .....	215
heredity in .....	108	nerve an extension of brain	216
how we grow .....	112	the nerve system .....	217
body built by force from		composed of parts .....	223
within .....	116	phrenological theory of.....	224
the nerve system .....	119	faculties of, defined .....	228
attracts the material.....	120	how it works .....	231
the process of body making	122	duality of the .....	232
sketch of a man .....	131	we have two brains .....	232
how we live.....	133	physiologists upon .....	234
how we maintain health ..	140	history of.....	234
how we sicken.....	149	objections to, answered .....	237
		results of two brains ..	238
<b>MATERIALISM :</b>		operations of .....	239
doctrine of .....	65	duplex action of .....	244
its theory of life.....	74	instances of.....	246
answer to .....	75, 209	structure of.....	289
argument of .....	212	soul is not mind .....	290
its views of memory .....	378	brain structure .....	291
explanations of the will .....	394	operation of, distinct .....	292
argument of.....	410	does not act as one whole..	293
answer to.....	411	has distinct faculties .....	294
doctrine of .....	423	mechanism of, described.....	295
recognises life and mind ..	429	Dr. Carpenter on oneness of	297
		classification of the faculties	
<b>MATTER :</b>		of .....	300
what it is .....	24	the intellectual faculties ...	301
definition of .....	40	the Propensities .....	304
		Sexual Love .....	306
<b>MEDULLA OBLONGATA :</b>		Love of Children.....	306
function of .....	220	Attachment.....	307
<b>MELODY :</b>		Combativeness and Destruc-	
physiology of .....	275	tiveness .....	309
		Secretiveness .....	312

<b>MIND—continued:</b>	<i>page</i>	<b>NERVES, THE:</b>	<i>page</i>
Acquisitiveness .....	314	are the true being .....	118
Constructiveness .....	316	they clothe themselves with flesh .....	119
Concentrativeness .....	317	attraction of .....	120
The Sentiments .....	319	manner of building .....	121
Self-esteem .....	319	the nerve system .....	133
Love of Approbation .....	320	action of, in health .....	140
Cautiousness .....	323	sources of disease .....	151
Benevolence .....	324	remedy for .....	152
Sentiments proper to man...	328	disorder of the nerve centre	156
Veneration .....	328	at the seat of the malady ...	156
Firmness .....	330	constitutional debility .....	159
Conscientiousness .....	331	irregular flow of nerve force	160
Hope.....	337	mesmeric influence.....	160
Wonder .....	339	influence of faith over .....	162
Ideality .....	340	life resident in .....	196, 203
Wit .....	344	an extension of the brain ...	215
Imitation.....	348	structure of .....	216
The Intellectual Faculties...	350	nerve force in .....	253
Individuality .....	350	source of .....	254
Form, Size, Weight, Colour	351	not limited to the body .....	254
The Perceptive Faculties ...	355		
Locality .....	355	<b>NERVE FORCE:</b>	
Number .....	356	source and diffusion of .....	253
Order .....	356	envelopes the body.....	255
Eventuality.....	357		
Time.....	358	<b>NON-MATTER:</b>	
Tune .....	359	another name for spirit.....	48
Language.....	359	distinction between matter	48
The Reflective Faculties.....	364		
Comparison .....	364	<b>NUMBER:</b>	
Causality.....	365	faculty of, defined .....	359
Memory and recollection ...	371		
how the machinery of, works	385	<b>OBSTINACY:</b>	
how to be studied .....	386	abuse of firmness .....	331
the will .....	387		
<b>MOLECULES:</b>		<b>ORDER:</b>	
attraction and repulsion of	10	faculty of, defined .....	356
molecular construction of			
man .....	69	<b>ORGANIC MATTER:</b>	
growth by agglomeration of	115	definition of.....	1
<b>MONOMANIA:</b>			
result of the double brain...	246	<b>PAIN:</b>	
<b>MUSIC:</b>		sense of .....	264
physiology of .....	274	classification of pains.....	265
mental faculty for .....	351		
function of .....	357	<b>PERCEPTIVE FACULTIES:</b>	
<b>NATURAL, THE:</b>		Individuality .....	350
definition of.....	63	Form, Size, Weight, Colour	351
		Locality .....	355
		Number .....	356



## PERCEPTIVE FACULTIES—

<i>continued :</i>	<i>page</i>
Order .....	356
Eventuality.....	357
Time.....	358
Tune .....	359
Language ..	359

## PHRENOLOGY :

principles of .....	223
not proved by anatomy .....	224
theory of Gall and Combe... ..	224
not completely established .....	225
but a correct map of the mind .....	227
memory of .....	228
adoption of scheme .....	229
meaning of term "mental faculty" .....	230
how the mind works .....	231
classification of the moral faculties by .....	300

## PHYSIOLOGY :

definition of .....	15
province of.....	16, 212

## PLEASURE :

sense of .....	264
----------------	-----

## PRE-EXISTENCE :

of the Soul .....	482
-------------------	-----

## PROGRESSION :

prospect of .....	491
-------------------	-----

## PROOF :

what is scientific proof .....	28
--------------------------------	----

## PROPENSITIES, THE :

Sexual Love.....	306
Love of Children.....	306
Attachment.....	308
Combativeness and Destruc- tiveness .....	309
Secretiveness .....	312
Acquisitiveness .....	314
Constructiveness .....	316
Concentrativeness .....	317

## PSYCHIC FORCE :

is soul force .....	475
what it is.....	480

## PSYCHISM :

phenomena of .....	475
--------------------	-----

## PSYCHOLOGY :

province of .....	14
definition of .....	14
method of study .....	20
how pursued hitherto .....	25
sciences allied with .....	26
at what point commencing	120

## REASON, THE :

what it is.....	365
process of reasoning .....	366

## RECOLLECTION :

not to be confused with memory .....	375
---	-----

## REFLECTIVE FACULTIES :

Comparison .....	364
Causality .....	365

## REMORSE :

the expression of outraged conscientiousness .....	334
---	-----

## RIDICULE :

a test of truth.....	347
----------------------	-----

## SCIENCE :

neglect of Psychology .....	196
-----------------------------	-----

## SCIENTISTS :

dogmatism of .....	18
fallacies of .....	34
neglect of psychology by ...	195

## SCEPTICISM :

dogmatism of .....	37
--------------------	----

## SECRETIVENESS :

faculty for, defined.....	312
uses of .....	313
abuses of.....	314

## SELF-ESTEEM :

faculty for, defined.....	319
uses of.....	319
abuses of .....	319

## SENSES, THE :

definition of .....	259
how they work .....	260
each a special duty.....	261
effect of loss or addition of one sense .....	262

SENSES, THE—*continued*: page

relationship between, and	
external objects .....	263
convey only relative truth...	264
pleasure and pain .....	264
of sight .....	266
organ of .....	265
reality of impressions of ...	267
confirmation of .....	268
are the same impressions	
conveyed to all .....	269
capacity and limit of sight	272
operation of .....	273
hearing .....	274
sound a sensation merely...	274
harmony, melody, and dis-	
cords .....	275
music is in ourselves.....	275
of taste .....	277
of smell .....	277
difference between, and sight	278
limitation of .....	279
of touch .....	280
function of .....	281
evidence of .....	283
fallibility of.....	284
conformation of .....	285
whether mental or sensual	286

SENTIMENTS, THE:

classification of .....	319
Self-esteem .....	319
Love of Approbation .....	320
Cautiousness .....	323
Benevolence .....	324
Veneration .....	328
Firmness .....	330
Conscientiousness .....	331
Hope .....	337
Wonder .....	339
Ideality .....	340
Wit .....	344
Imitation .....	348

SICKNESS:

how we sicken .....	149
---------------------	-----

SIGHT, SENSE OF:

function of .....	267
the eye.....	267
what we do when we "see"	268

SIGHT, SENSE OF—*con-*

*tinued*: page

reality of external objects...	270
confirmation by other senses	270
do all see alike .....	271
what is colour.....	273
capacity and limit of.....	274

SIZE:

definition of.....	59
--------------------	----

SMELL, SENSE OF:

function of .....	277
differs from that of sight ...	278
limitations of .....	279

SOLIDITY:

definition of .....	58
man not a solid .....	68

SOLLY, MR.:

on the duality of the brain	250
-----------------------------	-----

SOMNAMBULISM:

phenomena of.....	475
-------------------	-----

SOUL;

what it is.....	177
is not the life .....	206
is not the mind .....	209
Soul or psychic force.....	410
Materialism, argument of...	410
answer to.....	411
scientific proof of .....	414
nature of evidence of.....	418
conception of .....	420
modern science on .....	423
argument against .....	424
is soul possible .....	428
consciousness of self .....	433
presumptive proofs of .....	438
where to be sought .....	439
general belief in .....	440
dread of annihilation.....	441
self consciousness .....	442
sense of unity .....	443
reappearance of .....	444
evidence of .....	445
from action of the body.....	447
conclusions .....	449
what it is.....	450



- SOUL**—*continued*: page
- of what material ..... 451
  - its dwelling place ..... 454
  - its shape ..... 457
  - permeates the body ..... 458
  - effect of lost limbs ..... 458
  - after death ..... 463
  - must be material ..... 465
  - consequences of ..... 466
  - perceptive power of ..... 468
  - outlook of ..... 473
  - power of severance from
    - body ..... 474
  - supersensuous perception... 475
  - somnambulism ..... 475
  - psychism ..... 475
  - psychic or soul force..... 480
  - pre-existence of ..... 482
  - dwelling place of ..... 490
  - progression of..... 491
  - condition of when disembodied ..... 496
  - mystery of ..... 495
  - when it enters the body..... 496
- SPACE**:
- definition of ..... 60
- SPIRIT**:
- distinction between spirit and matter ..... 41, 43, 48
  - what is ..... 56
- SPECULATIONS**:
- as to the source of soul..... 499
- SPIRITS**:
- evidence for, value of..... 445
- STUTTERING**:
- cause and cure of ..... 361
- SUPERNATURAL, THE**:
- does not exist ..... 63
  - and the natural ..... 64
  - nothing solid in nature ..... 69
- SUPERSENSUOUS PERCEPTION**:
- power of ..... 475
- TASTE, SENSE OF**: page
- function of ..... 278
  - distinction between, and the other senses ..... 279
  - limitations of ..... 280
- TEMPERANCE**:
- value of ..... 154
- TIME**:
- definition of ..... 60
  - faculty of, defined ..... 358
  - functions of ..... 358
- TOUCH, SENSE OF**:
- function of ..... 278
  - limitations of ..... 279
- TRUTH**:
- duty to discover and proclaim ..... 31
  - reluctance to admit ..... 35
  - fallacies ..... 35
  - ridicule, a test of ..... 347
- TUNE**:
- function of ..... 359
  - faculty of..... 359
- UNCONSCIOUS CEREBRATION**:
- theory of ..... 436
- VANITY**:
- an excess of love of approbation ..... 321
- VENERATION**:
- faculty of, defined ..... 328
  - function of ..... 329
- VITAL FORCE**:
- influence of ..... 131
  - definition of ..... 134
  - action of, on health ..... 141
  - effect on disease..... 154
  - operation of ..... 183
  - compared with chemical force..... 189

- VITAL FORCE**—*continued* : page  
 ceasing to flow, life ceases... 203  
 probably the nerve force ... 253  
 diffusion of ..... 254  
 envelopes the body ..... 255  
 sympathetic action of ..... 256
- WALLACE, MR A. :**  
 on the earliest forms of life 201
- WHAT AM I ?**  
 origin of the question ..... 1  
 answer to..... 3
- WIGAN, DR. A. :**  
 on the duality of the mind... 234  
 cases reported by ..... 248  
 effect of brain disease ..... 251
- WILL, THE :**  
 what it is..... 387  
 material organ of ..... 389
- WILL, THE**—*continued.* page  
 how it works ..... 389  
 seat of ..... 390  
 the mental machinery ..... 391  
 freedom of ..... 398  
 argument for ..... 399  
 objections to ..... 400  
 not unlimited ..... 401
- WIT :**  
 faculty of, defined ..... 344  
 distinction between wit and  
 humour ..... 345  
 uses of the faculty ..... 345
- WONDER :**  
 faculty of, defined ..... 339  
 function of ..... 339
- WORDSWORTH, W. :**  
 on imitation in childhood ... 348  
 on pre-existence ..... 483



WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE

# MECHANISM OF MAN:

A Popular Introduction to Mental Physiology and Psychology.

AN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION "WHAT AM I?"

By EDWARD W. COX, Serjeant-at-Law.

*President of the Psychological Society of Great Britain.*

## VOL. II.—THE MECHANISM IN ACTION.

### CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

SECOND EDITION.

#### PART. II.—THE MECHANISM IN ACTION.

##### BOOK I.—THE NORMAL ACTION OF THE MECHANISM OF MAN.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Cap. I. Introductory.                                  | Cap. IV. Of Mental Sympathy and Com-<br>munion. |
| II. The Action of the Material<br>Mechanism in Health. | V. Body, Mind, and Soul in Health.              |
| III. Of Unconscious Cerebration.                       |   |

##### BOOK II.—THE ABNORMAL ACTION OF THE MECHANISM.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Cap. I. Introduction — The Psychology<br>of the Future. | Cap. V. Prepossession and Dominant<br>Idea. |
| II. How to be Pursued.                                  | VI. How we Know.                            |
| III. Objections and Objectors.                          | VII. Scientific Evidence.                   |
| IV. Precautions in Research.                            | VIII. The Plan Proposed.                    |

##### BOOK III.—OF SLEEP AND DREAM.

- |                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Cap. I. What Sleep is.              | Cap. VI. The Material Mechanism of<br>Dream. |
| II. The Physiology of Sleep.        | VII. The Psychology of Dream.                |
| III. The Mental Condition of Sleep. | VIII. The Phenomena of Dream.                |
| IV. The Seat of Sleep.              | IX. The Philosophy of Dream.                 |
| V. Of Dream.                        | X. Conclusions.                              |

##### BOOK IV.—THE PHENOMENA OF DELIRIUM AND INSANITY.

- |                   |                    |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| Cap. I. Delirium. | Cap. II. Insanity. |
|-------------------|--------------------|

##### BOOK V.—THE PHENOMENA OF SOMNAMBULISM.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Cap. I. Introduction.                           | Cap. VI. The Physiology of Somnam-<br>bulism. |
| II. Somnambulism.                               | VII. The Psychology of Somnam-<br>bulism.     |
| III. Natural Somnambulism.                      |   |
| IV. Artificial Somnambulism.                    |   |
| V. The Phenomena of Artificial<br>Somnambulism. |   |

##### BOOK VI.—SUPERSSENSUOUS PERCEPTION.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| I. Introduction.  | Cap. II. The Physiology and Psychology<br>of Supersensuous Perception. |
| Cap. I. The Phenomena of Super-<br>sensuous Perception. |  |

##### BOOK VII.—TRANCE.

- |                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Introduction.                    | Cap. II. The Physiology and Psychology<br>of Trance. |
| Cap. I. The Phenomena of Trance. |  |

(Continued on next page.)

# THE MECHANISM OF MAN (*continued*).

## BOOK VIII.—PSYCHISM.

- Introduction.
- Cap. I. Objections and Objectors.
- II. The Witnesses.
- III. Psychic Force.
- IV. The Methods of Investigation.
- V. The Phenomena of Psychism.
- VI. The Psychic.
- VII. The Physiology of Psychic Force.

- VIII. The Directing Intelligence.
- IX. Phenomena of Psychism.
- X. More Phenomena of Psychism.
- XI. Other Phenomena of Psychism.
- XII. Communicated Phenomena.
- XIII. The Physiology and Psychology of Psychism.

## BOOK IX.—THE ARGUMENT.

- Cap. I. The Summing up.

- Cap. II. Conclusions.

## OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

We have said enough to show that "The Mechanism of Man" is a work of sustained interest and ingenious theories.—*Westminster Review*.

We can promise all a vast fund of information in these pages.—*Hampshire Telegraph*.

That Mr. Cox is not only an earnest advocate of the principle of truth as he conceives it, an elevated thinker, an intelligent teacher of the science he loves, but also an enthusiast, may be inferred from these few words, with which we may aptly conclude our necessarily brief review of his book. "Psychology will thus be seen to be a science as liberal as it is large. There is none so calculated to expand and elevate the mind, for its contemplations are of the past, the present, and the future of man; its issues are annihilation or immortality."—*Lloyd's Newspaper*.

This is a powerful manifesto against the doctrine of materialism, and it is made by exactly the sort of person whom one would like to hear on this question—a hard-headed practical lawyer; one accustomed to weigh evidence, and not likely to be led astray by high-flown language or visionary ideas. The author is the well-known Recorder of Portsmouth, Chairman of the Middlesex Sessions, and the writer of law treatises, one of which is in the seventh and another in the eleventh edition. . . . A most able and interesting work.—*Brighton Guardian*.

We think Serjeant Cox has succeeded in establishing his proposition (the existence of Soul as an entity distinct from the body) on unimpeachable grounds of reason, and that his work will have a most useful effect on the many whose faith has been disturbed.—*Sheffield Independent*.

The reader will be struck with the popular way in which the subject is treated, and with the amount of independent thought which is manifested throughout the volume. They are topics of intensely human interest, and they are handled by Serjt. Cox with a power of statement and illustration which will be appreciated wherever the book is introduced.—*Bristol Mercury*.

We recommend the volume to the careful study of every thoughtful man, and with an almost impatient anticipation look for the appearance of further treatises on kindred subjects by the same hand.—*Somerset County Gazette*.

This volume opens up a very wide and deeply interesting study—interesting from innumerable points; and to all honest students of nature and science, full of invaluable thoughts and suggestions. Mr. Cox takes nothing for granted; he begs no part of the great and abstruse questions which he sets out to examine, but he goes carefully and patiently into a searching investigation of the most minute details and branches of his subject.—*Birmingham Daily Gazette*.

Mr. Serjeant Cox is a gentleman whose whole being concentrates on his subject. So perfectly is he at home in it that an uncommon ease and pleasant garb adorn all his chapters. . . . It is a felicity to all thinking men to see a high member of the Bar devoting to such topics those energies which many a man may possess but has not the will to exert.—*Leicester Daily Post*.

To those who care to wander in the obscure border land that lies between the material and the spiritual, there is alike in its facts and fancies material for most interesting thought and speculation.—*Ayr Advertiser*.

### Notices of the Last Edition.

Few books more remarkable than this have been issued of late.—*Eastern Daily Post*.

The entire work is of absorbing interest.—*Civilian*.

The legal mind of the author displays itself here in a very characteristic manner, for all through there breathes the spirit of one who will be content to take nothing for granted—nothing, in short, that is not proved.—*Somerset Gazette*.

All lovers of physics will find much to delight them in the earlier pages of the work, where the author discusses the nature and condition of our animal structure.—*Standard*.

Thoughtful, and calculated to make its readers think.—*Graphic*.

A most useful and charming work.—*Standard*.

(Continued on next page.)



Revelations full of interest.—*Leicester Daily Post*.

There is in this, and through the volume generally, much to challenge the attention of reflective readers.—*Bristol Mercury*.

A thoughtful and remarkable book, full of original and suggestive ideas.—*Builder*.

The work will be found of the greatest value, not only to the scientific scholar, but to every reader who is desirous of knowing himself.—*Irish Daily Telegraph*.

A difficult task, but one which the writer has shown his ability to deal with.—*Brighton Times*.

A work that may be very profitably read, and deserves much careful thought.—*Figaro*.

The spirit throughout is that of a man who seeks truth only, and who desires to promote its search by others.—*Edinburgh Daily Review*.

Mr. Serjeant Cox's book is full of thought, and well worth reading.—*Morning Post*.

He has a way of seizing the central *nodus* of a difficulty with a swift and sudden grasp that one can't help admiring.—*Literary Churchman*.

The result of deep investigation, careful and laborious research, and extensive reading.—*Chester Courant*.

LONDON: LONGMAN AND CO.

Recently Published, Price 7s. 6d.

THE

# PRINCIPLES OF PUNISHMENT

AS APPLIED IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE CRIMINAL LAW  
BY JUDGES AND MAGISTRATES.

BY MR. SERJEANT COX,

*Chairman of the Second Court of Middlesex; Recorder of Portsmouth.*

## CONTENTS.

### CHAPTER.

Preface.

I.—The Purpose of Punishment.

II.—Crimes and Criminals.

III.—The Principle of Punishment.

IV.—Legal Classification of Crimes.

V.—The Province of the Judge.

VI.—Classification of Criminals.

VII.—1. Crimes of Wantonness.

VIII.—2. Occasional Crimes.

IX.—3. Crimes Involving Breach of Trust.

X.—4. Crimes of Fraud.

XI.—5. Crimes of Passion.

XII.—6. Crimes of Violence.

### CHAPTER.

XIII.—7. Crimes of Cruelty and Brutality.

XIV.—8. Prevalent Crimes.

XV.—The Character of the Criminal.

XVI.—Circumstances of Aggravation.

XVII.—Mitigation of Punishment

XVIII.—Abuses of the Criminal Law.

XIX.—Costs—Compensation—Restitution.

XX.—Juries and Verdicts.

XXI.—Summary Convictions.

XXII.—Payment of Penalties and Costs—

Rewards—Bail.

XXIII.—General Remarks on the Administration of Criminal Justice.

It is very seldom that a book so thoroughly satisfactory to the lay as well as to the legal mind has been given to the world. We can only wish that passing an examination based upon it were made a *sine quâ non* in all judicial and magisterial appointments.—*Morning Advertiser*.

The learned Serjeant has succeeded in laying down many broad rules for the guidance of magistrates.—*Lloyd's News*.

No better book has in these later days been produced for the young county magistrate.—*Globe*.

The work will be of great assistance to the magistrate and judge.—*Court Journal*.

LONDON: "THE LAW TIMES" OFFICE, 10, WELLINGTON-STREET.

[TURN OVER.]

MESSRS. LONGMAN & Co.  
HAVE PUBLISHED ALSO THE FOLLOWING WORKS BY  
MR. SERJEANT COX:

---

THE PROVINCE OF PSYCHOLOGY.  
INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

*Price One Shilling.*

---

THE SECOND SESSIONAL ADDRESS.

*Price Sixpence.*

---

THE  
PROGRESS and PROSPECTS of PSYCHOLOGY.

*Being the Third Sessional Address.*

*Price Sixpence.*

---

SOME PHENOMENA of SLEEP and DREAM.

*Price Sixpence.*

---

THE  
PSYCHOLOGY of MEMORY and RECOLLECTION.

*Price Sixpence.*

---

MATTER and SPIRIT: a DEFINITION.

*Price Sixpence.*

---

THE PSYCHOLOGY of HAMLET.

*Price Sixpence.*



# THE CLAIMS OF PSYCHOLOGY TO ADMISSION INTO THE CIRCLE OF THE SCIENCES.

Being the Fifth Sessional Address.

*Price Sixpence.*

---

## HAS MAN A SOUL? ANSWER TO PROFESSOR TYNDALL.

Being the Fourth Sessional Address to the Society.

*Price Sixpence.*

---

## SOME MORE PHENOMENA OF SLEEP AND DREAM.

*Price Sixpence.*

---

## HEREDITY AND HYBRIDISM: A SUGGESTED SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM.

*Price 3s. 6d.*

---

*Just Published, Price 3s. 6d.*

## A MONOGRAPH ON SLEEP AND DREAM; THEIR PHYSIOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY.

BY MR. SERJEANT COX,

*President of the Psychological Society of Great Britain.*

---

LONGMAN AND CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.

---

N.B.—Any of the above sent to any address on receipt of a Post-Office Order or Postage Stamps for the amount addressed to Mr. Poole, Secretary, at the Offices of "The Psychological Society of Great Britain, 11, Chandos-street, Cavendish-square, London."

Now ready, price 7s. 6d., the THIRD EDITION (and Fifth Thousand), revised, of

# THE ARTS OF WRITING, READING, AND SPEAKING. LETTERS TO A LAW STUDENT.

BY EDWARD W. COX,  
Serjeant-at-Law, Recorder of Portsmouth.

N.B.—A New Chapter treats of the CAUSES and CURE of STUTTERING.

## CONTENTS.

### LETTER. INTRODUCTION.

- I.—Introductory.
- II.—The Objects, Uses, and Advantages of the Art of Speaking.
- III.—The Foundations of the Art of Speaking and Writing.

### ART OF WRITING.

- IV.—First Lessons in the Art of Writing.
- V.—Reading and Thinking.
- VI.—Style.
- VII.—Language.
- VIII.—Words—Sentences—Rhythm.
- IX.—The Art of Writing.

### ART OF READING.

- X.—The Art of Reading.
- XI.—What to avoid—Articulation.
- XII.—Pronunciation—Expression.
- XIII.—The Art of the Actor and the Reader.
- XIV.—The Management of the Voice—Tone.
- XV.—Emphasis.
- XVI.—Pause—Punctuation—Management of the Breath—Inflection.
- XVII.—Attitude—Influence of the Mental over the Physical Powers.
- XVIII.—Illustrations.
- XIX.—Illustrations of Tone, Emphasis, and Pause.
- XX.—Illustrations (continued).
- XXI.—Illustrations (continued).
- XXII.—How to read Poetry.

- LETTER.
- XXIII.—Reading of Narrative, Argument, and Sentiment.
  - XXIV.—Special Readings—The Bible.
  - XXV.—Dramatic Reading.
  - XXVI.—The Reading of Wit and Humour.
  - XXVII.—The Uses of Reading.
  - XXVIII.—Public Readings.

### ART OF SPEAKING.

- XXIX.—The Art of Speaking.
- XXX.—Foundations of the Art of Speaking.
- XXXI.—What to Say—Composition.
- XXXII.—How to Begin—Cautions.
- XXXIII.—Writing a Speech.
- XXXIV.—First Lessons.
- XXXV.—Public Speaking.
- XXXVI.—Delivery.
- XXXVII.—Action.
- XXXVIII.—The Construction of a Speech.
- XXXIX.—The Oratory of the Pulpit.
- XL.—The Oratory of the Senate.
- XLI.—The Oratory of the Bar.
- XLII.—The Oratory of the Bar (continued).
- XLIII.—The Oratory of the Bar (concluded).
- XLIV.—The Oratory of the Platform.
- XLV.—The Oratory of the Platform (continued).
- XLVI.—The Oratory of the Platform (continued).
- XLVII.—The Oratory of the Platform (concluded).
- XLVIII.—Social Oratory.
- XLIX.—Stuttering—Its Causes and Cure.
- L.—Penny Readings.

*Liverpool Mercury*: "A text-book for all whose avocations render accuracy of speech and elegance of composition a necessity of comfortable existence. The precepts, founded on experience, are unexceptionable."

*Sheffield Independent*: "We should recommend the budding orator to patiently sit down and study the wise and necessary counsels which long experience and careful and extensive observation have enabled the writer to put into what he modestly calls this 'little treatise.'"

*Hampshire Advertiser*: "It teaches how to avoid a bad style, and at the same time points out how to attain a good one."

*The Athenæum* says: "Herr Mendel has asked and obtained from the Author permission to translate this book into German for educational uses in that country."

NOTE.—A copy sent by post to any person inclosing a Post-office Order for the price.

LONDON:

"LAW TIMES" OFFICE, 10, WELLINGTON-STREET, STRAND, W.C.



THE  
MECHANISM OF MAN:

AN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION

WHAT AM I?

A POPULAR INTRODUCTION TO

MENTAL PHYSIOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY.

BY

EDWARD W. COX,

SERJEANT-AT-LAW, PRESIDENT OF THE PSYCHOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF  
GREAT BRITAIN.

VOL. II.

THE MECHANISM IN ACTION.

LONDON:  
LONGMAN AND CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.  
1879.

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND VOLUME.

---

COMMUNICATIONS from many persons in many countries inquiring, suggesting, reporting, have not only delayed the completion of this volume far beyond the time contemplated at the issue of the first, but they have led to a considerable extension of the volume itself. Correspondents and writers have directed my attention to portions of the work that appeared to them obscure, inducing me to a careful review of much that was there avowed to be conjectural or suggestive only. The result of that protracted review has been to cause modifications of some of the suggestions and to expand the proofs and arguments to meet the objections of others.

The treatise has been changed in shape and method of arrangement, and almost entirely rewritten. But in the extended reflection which this process of reconstruction has forced upon me, I have found no reason to depart in any degree from the conclusion arrived at by the argument, when the first edition was submitted to the public—the existence of a Soul in Man. The evidence afterwards collected and the further arguments founded upon it have all tended to confirm that conclusion. As of



course, it has been subjected to severe attacks from those of our Scientists and Journals who maintain the doctrine that Man is wholly material, Soul a myth, and future life a fiction. I make no complaint of this. To recognise in Man, as a fact in Nature and not as a dogma merely, something other than the body that perishes is, I am well aware, to expose myself to ridicule or abuse, to be called the victim of prepossession and "dominant idea," and charged with "diluted insanity." But having "the courage of my opinion" I do not shrink from the avowal of more than of mere faith—of a *firm conviction*, induced by positive evidence derived from this examination of the Mechanism of Man at rest and in action—that SOUL is a part of that Mechanism—that Man is in fact a Soul clothed with a body—that for this Soul there is a future, and in this future GOD.

If but a few readers should be led by the facts and arguments set forth in these pages to the like conviction, the labour of its production will be amply compensated.

*Moat Mount, Hendon.*

*21st January, 1879.*

---

# CONTENTS.

---

## PART II. THE MECHANISM IN ACTION.

---

### BOOK I.

#### THE NORMAL ACTION OF THE MECHANISM OF MAN.

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTORY . . . . .	1
II. THE ACTION OF THE MATERIAL MECHANISM IN HEALTH . . . . .	4
III. OF UNCONSCIOUS CEREBRATION . . . . .	10
IV. OF MENTAL SYMPATHY AND COMMUNION . . . . .	22
V. BODY, MIND, AND SOUL IN HEALTH . . . . .	28

### BOOK II.

#### THE ABNORMAL ACTION OF THE MECHANISM.

I. INTRODUCTION — THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE FUTURE . . . . .	31
II. HOW TO BE PURSUED . . . . .	35
III. OBJECTIONS AND OBJECTORS . . . . .	39
IV. PRECAUTIONS IN RESEARCH . . . . .	43



CHAPTER	PAGE
V. PREPOSSESSION AND DOMINANT IDEA . . .	52
VI. HOW WE KNOW . . . . .	58
VII. SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE . . . . .	63
VIII. THE PLAN PROPOSED . . . . .	77

### BOOK III.

#### OF SLEEP AND DREAM.

I. WHAT SLEEP IS . . . . .	79
II. THE PHYSIOLOGY OF SLEEP . . . . .	81
III. THE MENTAL CONDITION OF SLEEP. . . . .	84
IV. THE SEAT OF SLEEP . . . . .	87
V. OF DREAM . . . . .	91
VI. THE MATERIAL MECHANISM OF DREAM . . . . .	94
VII. THE PSYCHOLOGY OF DREAM . . . . .	109
VIII. THE PHENOMENA OF DREAM . . . . .	116
IX. THE PHILOSOPHY OF DREAM . . . . .	141
X. CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	143

### BOOK IV.

#### THE PHENOMENA OF DELIRIUM AND INSANITY.

I. DELIRIUM . . . . .	146
II. INSANITY . . . . .	152

### BOOK V.

#### THE PHENOMENA OF SOMNAMBULISM.

I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	158
II. SOMNAMBULISM . . . . .	161
III. NATURAL SOMNAMBULISM . . . . .	164
IV. ARTIFICIAL SOMNAMBULISM . . . . .	179

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. THE PHENOMENA OF ARTIFICIAL SOMNAMBULISM . . . . .	182
VI. THE PHYSIOLOGY OF SOMNAMBULISM . . . . .	232
VII. THE PSYCHOLOGY OF SOMNAMBULISM . . . . .	235

## BOOK VI.

## SUPERSENSUOUS PERCEPTION.

INTRODUCTION . . . . .	257
I. THE PHENOMENA OF SUPERSENSUOUS PERCEPTION . . . . .	259
II. THE PHYSIOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY OF SUPERSENSUOUS PERCEPTION . . . . .	276

## BOOK VII.

## TRANCE.

INTRODUCTION . . . . .	283
I. THE PHENOMENA OF TRANCE . . . . .	287
II. THE PHYSIOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY OF TRANCE . . . . .	299

## BOOK VIII.

## PSYCHISM.

INTRODUCTION . . . . .	306
I. OBJECTIONS AND OBJECTORS . . . . .	315
II. THE WITNESSES . . . . .	326
III. PSYCHIC FORCE . . . . .	329
IV. THE METHODS OF INVESTIGATION . . . . .	336
V. THE PHENOMENA OF PSYCHISM . . . . .	340



CHAPTER	PAGE
VI. THE PSYCHIC . . . . .	359
VII. THE PHYSIOLOGY OF PSYCHIC FORCE . . . . .	374
VIII. THE DIRECTING INTELLIGENCE . . . . .	385
IX. PHENOMENA OF PSYCHISM . . . . .	421
X. MORE PHENOMENA OF PSYCHISM . . . . .	429
XI. OTHER PHENOMENA OF PSYCHISM . . . . .	436
XII. COMMUNICATED PHENOMENA . . . . .	476
XIII. THE PHYSIOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY OF PSYCHISM . . . . .	492

## BOOK IX.

## THE ARGUMENT.

I. THE SUMMING UP . . . . .	504
II. CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	533

THE  
MECHANISM OF MAN.

---

PART II.  
THE MECHANISM IN ACTION.

---

BOOK I.  
THE NORMAL ACTION OF THE MECHANISM  
OF MAN.

---

CHAPTER I.  
INTRODUCTORY.

As with the mechanisms constructed by the ingenuity of man, so it is with the mechanisms of Nature. The observer can discover but little of the internal structure and the contrivances by which action to the desired end is brought about so long as the machine is in sound condition and all its parts are working in perfect harmony.

Only when the machine is disordered, when its wheels work irregularly or not at all, when there is discord between its parts, when in mechanical phrase it is "out of gear," when the force fails or flags, when the directing



intelligence is sleeping, or paralysed, or absent, when the animal structure is in the condition we term *unhealthy*, are we enabled to trace the connection of the parts, ascertain their several functions and uses and learn their mutual relationships.

This characteristic presents itself turn where we may in the exploration of Nature. The *normal* action is always so complete and equable, the co-ordination of parts is so perfect, that we can see little more than *results* and are almost unconscious of the processes by which they are brought about. The Physician studying for years the action of the healthy body could learn but little of its internal mechanism and of the functions of its various organs. He will procure more of this knowledge in a few hours of observation by the bedside of the sick, when the organs are not working in harmony and their functions are imperfectly performed, when the human mechanism is "out of gear," than in as many years of observation of the healthy body or even of the lifeless form—for anatomy does not reveal function.

So it is with Psychology. When the relationship between the mechanism of the body and the forces that move and direct it is in all respects normal very little can be learned of either. We see results alone and it is difficult to trace the visible actions to their immediate, much less to their ultimate, sources. But when this relationship is disturbed or dislocated, however slightly, the Psychologist finds facts and phenomena that throw a flood of light upon the obscurest problems of his science. Consequently the phenomena presented under these abnormal conditions properly demand his first and most earnest study and to them will his investigations and experiments be mainly directed.

Hence the necessary brevity of the first part of the scheme of this volume which proposes to treat of the *Mechanism of Man in action*. It will view that mechanism in its normal (or healthy) condition, when all its parts are

acting in complete co-ordination. From observation of this *healthy* action very little can be learned of structure or of function or of the relationship of the several parts of the mechanism. A short sketch of it will suffice before we proceed to the really instructive and more important examination of the mechanism in its *abnormal* conditions.

---



## CHAPTER II.

THE ACTION OF THE MATERIAL MECHANISM  
IN HEALTH.

WE view the wonderful mechanism of the body, with all its parts perfectly adapted to the conditions of an existence in a material—that is to say, a molecularly constructed—world. Whether that mechanism was made thus perfect, at the beginning or whether it has grown to be what it is by a slow process of evolution in millions of years, in no way concerns this treatise. We take the facts as we find them to be at this present and contemplate the human mechanism as it is now.

In such an inquiry we must not consult our own misleading consciousness alone. We must use our senses and observe that which is without us.

Contemplate this marvellous mechanism as it is seen in a swoon or in a trance—motionless and insensible. By what process is it to be set in motion?

A machine of human making would require that you should apply to it some motive force from without. That done, it would go through its series of mechanical actions always in precisely the same manner to precisely the same ends. If any part of it should break down or fall “out of gear,” the entire structure would suddenly stand still. It would have no power of self-repair and only the skilful workman could set it going again.

But the machine we are now contemplating is set in motion, not by a force applied from without but by a force generated *within*. The *direction* of that force is determined by some powerful agent existing within the machine itself. That agent is indisputably an *intelligent*

agent, for the machine exhibits infinitely various motions directed to infinitely various ends, and those motions are by that intelligent agent self-adapted to those ends.

We have already (Vol. I. p. 69) contemplated the manner of this action—how the machine is formed—how it grows—how it lives—how it dies. In this place we have to consider only the relationship of the moving forces to the mechanism they move.

If it were possible, without destroying life, to extract the entire brain from that body what would be the result?

The machine would continue to move under the influence of the *vital* force. The involuntary actions would proceed as now. The heart would beat, the lungs play, the blood flow. Some actions might still appear to simulate intelligence, such actions as use has converted into *habit* and which the nerves, accustomed to certain motions in succession, might repeat by mere force of habit. But the vast majority of its actions would be indeterminate. They would be begun without intention and be directed to no end.

Thus the brain is proved to be that part of the mechanism which immediately controls its intelligent action. No brain, no mind. No mind, no *intelligent* motion.

Thus far we are on firm ground. Nobody now disputes the fact that the brain directs the motions of the mechanism. But at this point opinions diverge, some contending that the brain is the sole director, others that it is merely the mechanical agent of another director and is itself directed.

It matters not to the *present* part of this treatise in which aspect the brain is viewed. Whether it be the source of the moving Intelligence or only the material organ by which the Intelligence governs the actions of the material structure, is a question of high interest and importance, treated of elsewhere. But the answer given to that question in no way affects the present subject of investigation, for the brain is a part of



the mechanism and its relationship to the other parts of the mechanism is precisely the same, whether it be the original source of action or itself only a mechanism moved by another independent force. Undoubtedly the brain is the ostensible actor. To avoid controversy, it will be most convenient exclusively so to treat it in this division of the work, which is devoted to the contemplation of the mechanism in action.

The brain, then, being either the mind in action, as some assert, or merely the organ of the mind, as others contend, we shall be in accord as to certain *facts*. When the action of the brain is disturbed or impeded there is an instant failure of bodily action, proportioned generally to the extent of that impediment. Hence we learn that the brain is either the centre and seat of the intelligence that directs the motions of the body or is itself the source of that intelligence. These motions of the mechanism are of two kinds. (1) *Automatic Motions*, all of which are manifestly necessary to maintain the mechanism in healthy action; and (2) *Voluntary Motions*, which direct the movements of the body to ends desired by *something* within the body, which something differs from all of that body perceptible to our senses by the possession of intelligence, consciousness, individuality and Will. We do not yet certainly know the precise source of the *automatic* motions, but there is much evidence pointing to the ganglia below the brain hemisphere as being their seat. No doubt, however, is now entertained by any Physiologist that the brain is the immediate mechanism by which *voluntary* action is directed.

It should be noted that in all the automatic actions of the structure there is no consciousness of them so long as they are healthily performed. Digestion, assimilation, elimination, the processes of growth and repair, numerous and intricate as they are, continue to be executed without our knowledge even of the existence of the wonderful laboratory within us, so long as they work in the condition of perfect health. But if either fails or even flags, we are at once made painfully con-

scious of its existence and its operations. We know nothing of the process of digestion in its healthy state, but we are instantly informed of the presence of indigestion. We learn that we have lungs when they are inflamed or congested. We are conscious that we possess a heart when its force begins to fail and itself becomes feeble and fluttering.

Otherwise it is with the *voluntary* actions. We *desire* to do something. We *Will* to do it. The body obeys the Will and the act is done. We are conscious of each of these processes if we pause to review them. But in the vast majority of our voluntary actions we do *not* pause at the moment to reflect upon the successive actions of mind and body executed between the conception of the desire and the performance of the act. Try it thus. A thought suddenly comes to you and you wish to express it in words and in writing. You construct a sentence in which to embody your thought and the desired act is done. It is the work of an instant. All you are seen to do is to use your hand, hold the pen and cover the paper with some marks. What you really do is a complicated process. The desire arises in the mind to send some information to a friend. The *Will* (whatever that may be), set in motion by the desire, conveys its command to the nerve centres at the base of the brain and these, acting through the nerve threads that link the whole body to the brain, move the muscles to take the paper and the pen. Then the brain turns the thought into words and dictates to the muscles of the hand the motions it is to make in order to set down the signs that are to suggest the same words to the mind of the reader and by those words the thought your mind had desired to convey to him. But so long as the various parts of the mechanism employed in this series of actions are in a condition of health you are not conscious of any one of them. You feel the impulse and you see the result and this is all you know. With the voluntary as with the involuntary actions, if any part of the mechanism employed in the process be disordered, there



is instant consciousness of the presence of the part that so fails to perform its functions. Thus we learn more of the intricacies and delicacies of the structure in one minute of disorder than we can discover by observation through years of orderly action.

So intimate is the alliance of the mind with the body that although we may sever them in contemplation we cannot do so in practice. The influence of the mind over the body is very great. But equally great is the influence of the body over the mind. Their boundaries have never been distinctly defined. Body would be a mere automaton without mind to move it. Mind in this molecular world would be merely an abstraction had it not the intervening mechanism of a body of molecular structure through which to express itself upon external molecular existence. Medical records abound in proofs of the power of the mind over the health of the body. The seemingly miraculous cures by laying on of hands, touching of ulcers and other exercises of faith, attest the influence the mind has upon the functions of the nerve system and the vital organs, and through them upon the very structure itself. In like manner does the body control the mind. We see diseases and defects of the body producing mental maladies and imperfections. A scrofulous habit of body will produce insanity. Paralysis of a few fibres of the brain may cause the extinction of many faculties of the mind. So intimate is their relationship that it is impossible for any practical man for practical purposes to estimate the power of the one without taking into account also the power of the other. The Art of Healing would boast a very different position from that it now has if this intimate alliance of mind and body and their mutual influence in health and in disease had been more distinctly recognised and more closely studied.

The Mechanism of Man is a perfect whole. Every part has a definite relationship to every other part and all the parts work in strict co-ordination. No part can be disordered without more or less disorder to the

whole. The harmony is so complete that when we contemplate the entire structure in its healthy work we cannot discover the parts of which that whole is composed, nor in what manner they are moved, nor what are the various functions performed by the various parts. We are equally unconscious of them in ourselves. But when something goes wrong, when disorder occurs,—that is to say, when the structure is in an *abnormal* condition,—we become conscious of the complication of the mechanism.

Still more do we learn of it when we view the phenomena of that disordered mechanism as they are presented to us by others.

---



## CHAPTER III.

## OF UNCONSCIOUS CEREBRATION.

AFTER some hesitation, this now accepted mental process is referred to the section that treats of the *normal* action of the Mechanism, because it is in no way associated with unhealthy or accidental conditions of the organism, but is common to all in the daily experiences of their lives. Moreover, it is not the result of any disordered action of the brain, but of its peculiar mechanism.

To Dr. CARPENTER the credit is due of having distinctly detected and given an appropriate name to this mental condition, the recognition of which solves so many problems in Psychology hitherto deemed to be insoluble.

Few discoveries have been more ridiculed and abused than this by the metaphysical school of Mental Philosophers. None, however, is more completely confirmed by examination of mental facts and phenomena. This instance supplies an admirable illustration of the good results that may be anticipated from the systematic pursuit of Psychology, as other sciences are pursued, by observation instead of *à priori* argument, and by deducing theory from facts instead of fitting facts to theories.

Dr. CARPENTER was not the first to observe the phenomena of Unconscious Cerebration, but he first assigned them to their true source. No mental or psychological facts can be new. They are as old as man. They have existed at all times, in all countries. Whatever of

novelty appears to belong to any of them is due to more careful observation with more unprejudiced eyes and minds. For centuries Soul was a theme prohibited to scientific inquiry and even forbidden to thought. The Soul, its structure, its qualities and its relationship to mind and body were held not to be fit subjects for Science but to belong exclusively to the province of Theology. To touch them was impiety. They were mysteries to be taken upon trust but not to be examined by reason. Psychology has been but recently emancipated from this mental thralldom. Within the memories of many now living the very being of Soul was treated as a faith to be accepted and not as a fact to be investigated. This is why it *seems* a new Science. But it is new in seeming only.

The mental condition to which the appropriate name of *Unconscious Cerebration* has been given may be thus described.

In certain conditions some of the mental faculties work without consciousness by ourselves of their action. The brain, or some portion of it, thinks, feels, has ideas, goes through complicated and elaborate courses of thought and even prompts to action without consciousness of the operation by the individual who, at the same moment, is consciously employed in some other mental work. Sometimes there is a self-consciousness of the *results* of such action; sometimes also the results are cognizable by others although quite unrecognized by the actor.

This curious mental condition has been noticed by Metaphysicians, especially by LIEBNITZ and Sir W. HAMILTON, under the names of "Latent Thought" and "Preconscious Activity of the Soul." But the name given to it by Dr. CARPENTER is much more appropriate and by that it will doubtless be recognised hereafter when it takes its place as a permanent chapter in Mental Science. The following are some of the more familiar instances of it, collected by Miss COBBE in her interesting paper on the subject contributed to *Macmillan's Maga-*



*zine* and since reprinted in a volume of great value and interest. (a)

For example: It is an everyday occurrence to most of us to forget a particular word, or a line of poetry, and to remember it some minutes or hours later, when we have ceased consciously to seek for it. We try, perhaps anxiously at first, to recover it, well aware that it lies somewhere hidden in our memory, but unable to seize it. As the saying is, we "ransack our brains for it," but failing to find it, we at last turn our attention to other matters. By and by, when, so far as consciousness goes, our whole minds are absorbed in a different topic, we exclaim, "Eureka! The word, or verse, is—so and so." So familiar is this phenomenon that we are accustomed in similar straits to say, "Never mind: I shall remember the missing word by and by, when I am not thinking of it:" and we deliberately turn away, not intending finally to abandon the pursuit, but precisely as if we were possessed of an obedient secretary or librarian, whom we could order to hunt up a missing document, or turn out a word in a dictionary, while we amused ourselves with something else. The more this very common phenomenon is studied, the more I think the observer of his own mental processes will be obliged to concede, that, so far as his own conscious Self is concerned, the research is made absolutely without him. He has neither pain, nor pleasure, nor sense of labour in the task, any more than if it were performed by another person; and his conscious Self is all the time suffering, enjoying, or labouring on totally different ground.—P. 308.

Again there is the ordinary but most mysterious faculty possessed by most persons of setting over-night a mental alarm clock and awaking, at will, at any unaccustomed hour out of dreamless sleep. Were we up and about our usual business all night, without seeing or hearing a timepiece, or looking out at the stars or the dawn, few of us could guess within two or three hours of the time. Or, again, if we were asleep and dreaming with no intention of rising at a particular time, the lapse of hours would be unknown to us. The count of time in dreams is altogether different from that of our waking life, and we dream in a few seconds what seem to be the events of years. Nevertheless, under the conditions mentioned, of a sleep prefaced by a resolution to waken at a specified hour, we arrive at a knowledge of time unattainable to us either when awake or when sleeping without such prior resolution.—P. 309.

Unconscious Cerebration attends the performance of

---

(a) *Darwinism in Morals, and other Essays*, by Frances Power Cobbe. London: Williams and Norgate, 1872.

many—Miss COBBE says, of all—*Voluntary* acts, meaning by this term acts done with the *permission* of the Will, which are to be distinguished from *volitional* motions that require a direct *exertion* of the Will.

Now of these three classes of action it would appear that all Voluntary acts, as we have defined them, are accomplished by Unconscious Cerebration. Let us analyse the act of Walking, for example. We intend to go here or there; and in such matters "he who wills the end wills the means." But we do not deliberately think, "Now I shall move my right foot, now I shall put my left on such a spot." Some unseen guardian of our muscles manages all such details, and we go on our way, serenely unconscious (unless we chance to have the gout, or an ill-fitting boot) that we have any legs at all to be directed in the way they should go. If we chance to be tolerably familiar with the road, we take each turning instinctively, thinking all the time of something else and carefully avoid puddles or collisions with fellow-passengers, without bestowing a thought on the subject. Similarly, as soon as we have acquired other arts besides walking—reading, sewing, writing, playing on an instrument—we soon learn to carry on the mechanical part of our tasks with no conscious exertion. We read aloud, taking in the appearance and proper sound of each word and the punctuation of each sentence, and all the time we are not thinking of these matters, but of the argument of the author; or picturing the scene he describes; or, possibly, following a wholly different train of thought. Similarly in writing with "the pen of a ready writer" it would almost seem as if the pen itself took the business of forming the letters and dipping itself in the ink at proper intervals, so engrossed are we in the thoughts which we are trying to express. We unconsciously cerebrated that it will not answer to begin two consecutive sentences in the same way; that we must introduce a query here or an ejaculation there and close our paragraphs with a sonorous word and not with a preposition. All this we do not do of *malice prepense*, but because the well-tutored sprite whose business it is to look after our p's and q's, settles it for us as a clerk does the formal part of a merchant's correspondence.

Music-playing, however, is of all others the most extraordinary manifestation of the powers of unconscious cerebration. Here we seem not to have one slave but a dozen. Two different lines of hieroglyphics have to be read at once, and the right hand is to be guided to attend to one of them, the left to another. All the ten fingers have their work assigned as quickly as they can move. The mind (or something which does duty as mind) interprets scores of A sharps and B flats and C naturals, into black ivory keys and white ones, crotchets and quavers and demi-semi-



quavers, rests, and all the other mysteries of music. The feet are not idle, but have something to do with the pedals; and, if the instrument be a double-acted harp, they have a task of pushings and pullings more difficult than that of the hands. And all this time the performer, the *conscious* performer, is in a seventh heaven of artistic rapture at the results of all this tremendous business; or perchance lost in a flirtation with the individual who turns the leaves of the music-book, and is justly persuaded she is giving him the whole of her soul.—Pp. 310, 311.

Very remarkable phenomena of Unconscious Cerebration are produced in certain conditions of abnormal excitement.

Among these I class those mysterious Voices, issuing we know not whence, in which some strong fear, doubt, or hope finds utterance. The part played by these Voices in the history both of religion and of fanaticism it is needless to describe. So far as I can judge, they are of two kinds. One is a sort of lightning-burst suddenly giving intensely vivid expression to a whole set of feelings or ideas which have been lying latent in the brain and which are in opposition to the feelings and ideas of our conscious selves at the moment. Thus the man ready to commit a crime hears a voice appealing to him to stop; while the man praying ardently for faith hears another voice say, "There is no God." Of course the good suggestion is credited to Heaven and the other to the powers of the Pit; but the source of both is, I apprehend, the same, namely, Unconscious Cerebration. The second class of Voices are the result, not of unconscious Reasoning, but of unconscious Memory. Under some special excitement, and perhaps inexplicably remote association of ideas, some words which once made a violent impression on us are remembered from the inner depths. Chance may make these either awfully solemn or as ludicrous as that of a gentleman, shipwrecked off South America, who, as he was sinking and almost drowning, distinctly heard his mother's voice say, "Tom! did you take Jane's cake?" The portentous inquiry had been addressed to him forty years previously and (as might have been expected) had been wholly forgotten. In fever, in a similar way, ideas and words long consigned to oblivion are constantly reproduced; nay, what is most curious of all, long trains of phrases which the individual has indeed heard, but which could hardly have become a possession of the memory in its natural state, are then brought out in entire unconsciousness. My readers will recall the often-quoted and well-authenticated story of the peasant girl in the Hôtel Dieu in Paris, who in her delirium frequently "spouted" Hebrew. After much inquiry it was found she had been cook to a learned priest who had been in the habit of reading aloud his Hebrew books in the

room adjoining her kitchen. A similar anecdote is told of another servant girl who in abnormal sleep imitated some beautiful violin playing which she had heard many years previously.

From Sounds to Sights the transition is obvious. An Apparition is to the optical sense what such a Voice as I have spoken of above is to the hearing. At a certain point of intensity the latent idea in the unconscious brain reveals itself and produces an impression on the sensory; sometimes affecting one sense, sometimes another, sometimes perhaps two senses at a time.—Pp. 316, 317.

Drunkenness is a condition in which the conscious self is more or less completely obfuscated, but in which unconscious cerebration goes on for a long time. The proverbial impunity with which drunken men fall without hurting themselves can only be attributed to the fact that the conscious will does not interfere with the unconscious instinct of falling on the parts of the body least liable to injury. The same impunity is enjoyed by persons not intoxicated, who at the moment of an accident do not exert any volition in determining which way they shall strike the ground. All the ludicrous stories of the absence of mind of tipsy men may obviously be explained by supposing that their unconscious cerebration is blindly fumbling to perform tasks needing conscious direction. And be it remembered that the proverb "*in vino veritas*" is here in exact harmony with our theory. The drunken man unconsciously blurts out the truth, his muddled brain being unequal to the task of inventing a plausible falsehood.—P. 321.

The conclusion is thus stated:

Thus it would seem that neither Memory nor Volition have any constant relation to unconscious cerebration. We sometimes remember, and sometimes wholly forget its action; and sometimes it fulfils our wishes, and sometimes wholly disregards them. The one constant fact is, that *while the actions are being performed*, the Conscious Self is either wholly unconsicant of them or unable to control them. It is either in a state of high activity about other and irrelevant matters, or it is entirely passive. In every case the line between the Conscious Self and the unconsciously working brain is clearly defined.—P. 328.

Dr. CARPENTER suggests a Physiological explanation of the phenomena of Unconscious Cerebration. (a)

All parts of the Nervous system appear to possess certain

---

(a) Report of Meetings of Royal Institution. Dr. Carpenter's Lecture, March 1, 1868, pp. 4, 5.



powers of automatic action. The *Spinal cord* has for primary functions the performance of the motions of respiration and swallowing. The automatic action of the *Sensory ganglia* seems to be connected with movements of protection—such as the closing the eyes to a flash of light—and their secondary use enables a man to shrink from dangers of collisions, etc., before he has time for conscious escape. Finally, we arrive at the automatic action of the *Cerebrum*; and here Dr. Carpenter reminds us that, instead of being (as formerly supposed) the centre of the whole system, in direct connection with the organs of sense and the muscular apparatus, the *Cerebrum* is, according to modern physiology,—

“A superadded organ, the development of which seems to bear a pretty constant relation to the degree in which intelligence supersedes instinct as a spring of action. The ganglionic matter which is spread out upon the surface of the hemispheres, and in which their potentiality resides, is connected with the Sensory Tract at their base (which is the real centre of conveyance for the sensory nerves of the whole body) by commissural fibres, long since termed by Reid, with sagacious foresight, ‘nerves of the internal senses,’ and its anatomical relation to the sensorium is thus precisely the same as that of the Retina, which is a ganglionic expansion connected with the Sensorium by the optic nerve. Hence it may be fairly surmised—1. That as we only become conscious of visual impressions on the retina when their influence has been transmitted to the central sensorium, so we only become conscious of ideational changes in the cerebral hemispheres when their influence has been transmitted to the same centre; 2. That as visual changes may take place in the retina of which we are unconscious, either through temporary inactivity of the Sensorium (as in sleep), or through the entire occupation of the attention in some other direction, so may ideational changes take place in the *Cerebrum*, of which we may be unconscious for want of receptivity on the part of the Sensorium, but of which the results may present themselves to the consciousness as ideas elaborated by an automatic process of which we have no cognizance.”

The conclusion drawn by the writer from the whole investigation is in accord with that maintained throughout this treatise—namely, that the phenomena of Unconscious Cerebration prove the existence of a Conscious Self—that is, an individual being—that is, a *SOUL*—distinct from the brain, which in this condition is acting unconsciously to that Soul—or Self.

Are the anti-Materialists right to say that the agent in un-

conscious cerebration is, "We, ourselves, who merely use our brains as their instruments;" or are the Materialists right who say, "It is our physical brains alone, and these brains are ourselves"? With regard to the first reply, I think that all the foregoing study has gone to show that "we" are *not* remembering, *not* fancying, *not* understanding, what is being at the moment remembered, fancied, or understood. To say, then, that in such acts "we" are "using our brains as our instruments," appears nothing but a servile and unmeaning adherence to the foregone conclusion that our brains are nothing else than the organs of our will. It is absurd to call them so when we are concerned with phenomena whose speciality is that the will has nothing to do with them. So far, then, as this part of the argument is concerned, I think the answer of the anti-Materialists must be pronounced to be erroneous. The balance of evidence inclines to the Materialists' doctrine that the brain itself performs the mental processes in question, and, to use Vogt's expression, "secretes Thought" automatically and spontaneously.

But if this presumption be accepted provisionally, and the possibility admitted of its future physiological demonstration, have we, with it, accepted also the Materialist's ordinary conclusion that *we* and our automatically thinking brains are one and indivisible? If the brain can work by itself, have we any reason to believe it ever works *also* under the guidance of something external to itself, which we may describe as the Conscious Self? It seems to me that this is precisely what the preceding facts have likewise gone to prove—namely, that there are two kinds of action of the brain, the one Automatic, and the other subject to the will of the Conscious Self; just as the actions of a horse are some of them spontaneous and some done under the compulsion of his rider. The first order of actions tend to indicate that the brain "secretes thought"; the second order (strongly contrasting with the first) show that, beside that automatically working brain there is another agency in the field under whose control the brain performs a wholly different class of labours. Everywhere in the preceding pages we have traced the extraordinary *separation* which continually takes place between our Conscious Selves and the automatic action of the organ, which serves as our medium of communication with the outward world. We have seen, in a word, that we are not Centaurs, steed and rider in one, but horsemen, astride on roadsters which obey us when we guide them. and when we drop the reins, trot a little way of their own accord or canter off without our permission.

When we place the phenomena of Unconscious Thought on one side, and over against them our Conscious Selves, we obtain, I think, a new and vivid sense of the separation, not to say the antithesis, which exists between the two, close as is their mutual



interdependence. Not to talk about the distinction between object and subject, or dwell on the absurdity (as it seems to me) of the proposition that we ourselves are only the sum-total of a series of cerebrations—the recognition of the fact *that our brains sometimes think without us*, seems to enable us to view our connection with them in quite a new light. So long as all our attention was given to Conscious Thought, and philosophers eagerly argued the question, whether the Soul did or did not ever sleep or cease to think, it was easy to confound the organ of thought with the Conscious Self who was supposed alone to set it in action. But the moment we marshal together for review the long array of the phenomena of Unconscious Cerebration, the case is altered; the severance becomes not only cogitable, but manifest.—*Miss Cobbe*, Pp. 331-333.

These are instances familiar to all of us because of frequent occurrence. The attention of the Reader being now directed to the condition, he will daily find new proofs of its presence. He will discover also in Unconscious Cerebration the explanation of many of the more rare Psychological phenomena treated of in the following pages.

Differing, with all due respect, from Dr. CARPENTER upon a question of Physiology, I yet venture to suggest another and more probable cause for Unconscious Cerebration.

I trace it directly to the duplex structure of the brain described in the first volume (p. 69), to which the Reader is referred for full information respecting it. Enough here to remind him that we have *two* brains that are two distinct mental mechanisms having two distinct and perfect sets of the material organs of the mental faculties. The two brains commonly act in strict co-ordination, precisely as do the two eyes. But sometimes they act separately and sometimes one acts alone.

When the two brains are working separately we have the phenomenon of Unconscious Cerebration, which is produced thus.

The Conscious Self can take cognizance of one impression only brought to it at one and the same instant of time. It is a condition of the material structure that we shall receive and perceive impressions in succession only.

It is this condition of perception that imposes upon us our notions of time. If two or more impressions are presented together to the brain, the Conscious Self takes cognizance of that to which *attention* is given because it is the most vigorous or vivid. But because we can recognize one impression only at one and the same instant of time, it does not follow that no other ideas or emotions, thoughts or feelings, are formed. On the contrary, the undoubted existence of the double brain makes it highly probable that in certain conditions the two brains may be working separately—one brain exercising one faculty, the other brain another faculty. In such case the brain most actively employed and producing the most energetic expression would engage the *attention* of the Conscious Self and there would be *consciousness* of the action of that brain, with *unconsciousness* of the action of the other brain, which would continue to work until its increased energy, by the excitement of its own action and the diminished energy of the brain that has done its work, compelled *attention* to be given to it in its turn. *Then* it imparts its own ideas or emotions to the Conscious Self. These may or may not be in accordance with the train of thought or feeling that had been previously imparted by the other brain; but the process described would certainly produce precisely the results upon the mental operations that are so vividly described by Dr. CARPENTER and Miss COBBE as instances of Unconscious Cerebration.

That the mind can receive many more impressions than it can *perceive* is established by the phenomena of memory, which receives and retains innumerable impressions of whose access we were entirely unconscious. So with mental operations. If two such brain actions are concurrent, and but one is perceived, the other is not the less a work done and its results become perceptible when the condition for perception occurs.

But Unconscious Cerebration points also to a conclusion of the utmost interest and importance to



Psychology. It supplies very potent proof of the existence of Soul as part of the Mechanism of Man, a conclusion which may be thus presented.

Expressed in scientific language, the condition intended to be described is a peculiar state of the mental organism in which the whole brain, or a portion of the brain, performs its functions without the control of the Will and without any intelligence of its action being conveyed to the "I"—"the Mind"—"the Soul"—or whatever name is preferred by which to signify the individual being to whom that brain belongs.

Thus defined, we start with this most important admission—that the brain is *not* the individual being; that if ever there is unconsciousness of its action that "unconsciousness" must refer to something other than itself. It would be a contradiction in terms and an absurdity in fact to say that the conscious brain is busy unconsciously to itself. If consciousness is in the material brain it could not act without being conscious of its own actions. If consciousness is not in itself, if the unconsciousness is that of something other than the brain, which *something* is conscious of the brain's action, we have conclusive evidence that this conscious entity is something other than the body of which the brain is a part. Does not this powerfully confirm the argument that we possess Souls—or rather that we *are* Souls possessing bodies?

It will be observed that Dr. CARPENTER does not trace the physiological process nor explain in any way the cause of his discovered fact of Unconscious Cerebration. He could not do so, indeed, prepossessed as he is by the dominant idea that the whole mind is employed in every mental act. This Unconscious Cerebration is a fact in itself utterly inconsistent with his own theory of mental action, as would have been made unpleasantly apparent if he had attempted an explanation of it.

Few doctrines have been more abused and ridiculed by the Metaphysical School of Mental Philosophers than has Dr. CARPENTER'S Unconscious Cerebration.

But none has been more completely confirmed by further examination of mental facts and phenomena. The conception of it once clearly formed, every day, almost every hour, of our lives supplies us with proofs of Unconscious Cerebration, whether we note the action of our own minds or observe the actions of others.

---



## CHAPTER IV.

## OF MENTAL SYMPATHY AND COMMUNION.

It is the misfortune of Psychology that the greater portion of the names given to its phenomena are terms that express some foregone conclusion. It is a too common error in all science. Scientific names should express nothing but *the fact*. They should studiously avoid anything that, however remotely, appears to assign a cause for or the source of the fact.

Such a term is *Thought-reading*. It implies that one mind *reads* something that is in another mind. The term is misleading. It is understood often by those who use it, and always by those to whom it is addressed, as being identical with reading a book or viewing a picture. The common conception of "thought-reading" is that thoughts are things—*words* printed somehow upon the mind or brain—which the person having the faculty of thought-reading peruses, precisely as he would read a book ; or that it is a picture positively painted upon one mind and actually viewed by the other mind.

With such a name and such conceptions of the thing, it is not surprising that the fact itself should be received with incredulity as wholly inconsistent with what we know of brain structure and mental action. Thoughts are not *written* upon the brain, and if they were so written the *eye* of another person could not read them there. Even the overwhelming evidence of the existence of the phenomenon has not sufficed to remove the prejudice caused by the unfortunate name inflicted upon it. At some risk, I prefer to throw aside that familiar but mis-

leading name and to substitute for it one that precisely expresses the fact, without appearing to affirm the cause or source of the fact or the means by which it is produced. I therefore adopt the descriptive but not prejudging title of *Mental Sympathy and Communion*, as being the mental action intended to be designated, whatever may be the true explanation of it.

The *fact* is that, under certain unknown conditions, one Mind can communicate *ideas* to another Mind through some other medium than the bodily senses. *Emotions* can be communicated in like manner. Sympathy of emotion between minds has been recognised long ago, not only by poets but by philosophers. The fiercer passions were known to be contagious. The contagious influence of the gentler emotions was acknowledged under the name of *sympathy*. But so far as my own researches have gone I have found no endeavour to trace the mental or physical process by which this phenomenon is produced. By many it is assumed to be excited only by some outward *expression* of the emotion in face, form, or voice which, being perceived by the senses of the other party, excites in him the corresponding passion or emotion by simple suggestion. But a larger survey of the phenomena contradicts this conclusion. It is within the experience of all careful observers that sympathies are often excited without a visible or audible sign. A striking instance of this is shown in panic. A sudden fear seizes on a multitude. It may be wholly without cause, or if there be a cause it is known only to a few. Nevertheless it is felt by all, being communicated so instantaneously as to appear simultaneous. Ask why they fly, nine out of ten will answer, "I do not know; I felt an ungovernable terror; I lost self-control; I rushed on I cared not where, nor how, nor why." And this sympathy seems to be multiplied by the number of communicating minds. A fear that would not turn one man pale will make half-a-dozen men tremble and put a hundred men to flight. The influence of sympathetic emotion upon public assemblies



is too familiar to need description. It is exhibited in the remarkable phenomena of that which has been so absurdly called electro-biology. It is seen in natural somnambulism and its allied abnormal conditions, treated of in a later chapter. But while sympathy of mind is undisputed in relation to *emotions*, there has been no distinct recognition of a similar community of *ideas*.

Yet does it exist. There are few who could not tell of its frequent occurrence within their own experience. Who has not many times found some thought straying into his mind apparently without a cause and associated with no previous thoughts (perhaps on a theme long forgotten) and the friend by his side has been thinking the same thought? The saying "Talk of the devil and you see his horns" is the embodiment of a fact so common as to have become a proverb. A person of whose very whereabouts you are ignorant and who had not "been in your mind" for years, suddenly comes into your thoughts without any perceptible cause and presently he appears. Such an instance occurred lately within my own knowledge. A near relative had heard nothing of an old schoolfellow for fifteen years, did not even know if she was living, nor had that friend of long ago been once in her thoughts. At breakfast she said, "It is very odd, I have been thinking all the morning of Mrs. D——. I had quite forgotten her." That very day's post brought a letter from the long forgotten friend. This is surely something more than a coincidence. But similar cases scarcely less striking in their circumstances are continually occurring to all of us.

The phenomena of Somnambulism and Psychism abound in illustrations of this communion of Mind; but these will be treated of in their proper places as abnormal phenomena. I refer here only to the *normal* occurrence of that mental communion.

I venture to suggest if something like the same phenomenon may not exist in the lower animals? Is it certain that they do not communicate thus? All who have observantly noted their ways agree that they do in

some unknown manner exchange *ideas* as well as sympathise with emotions. All bird communities that flock together, such as rooks, starlings, plovers and the like, have leaders and obey commands that certainly are not conveyed by the voice. Ants and bees silently carry to their fellows notice where rich spoil is to be obtained. Dogs are often seen to meet, put their heads together and then depart on a common expedition of plunder. I have a pair of ponies who silently say to each other as plainly as by words, "Faster." "Slower." Observe any of our domestic animals. Can you doubt that they possess some faculty that performs for them some such process for communication of ideas and thoughts as speech does for us? Certainly their converse is neither by sounds nor by signs. May it not be by that *communion of mind* which we find to exist among ourselves and which, abnormal now and of infrequent occurrence, may once have been the means of inter-communication with ourselves also? It is consistent with the theory of evolution. Is what is so absurdly called "Thought-reading" a survival from a time when it was with us—as it is now with the lower animals—the sole means of mental communication?

This is, however, merely a suggestion thrown out to the thoughtful, for as yet it is little more than a reasonable and probable conjecture.

I am not here considering "Supersensuous Perception," with which what is called "Thought-reading" is commonly confused. The former is an abnormal condition and as such will be treated of hereafter. The present reference is strictly to that sympathy and communion between minds which are found in the common intercourse of the world under purely normal conditions and which probably occur very much more frequently than our consciousness informs us. We are in truth quite ignorant how ideas and emotions come into the mind. It may well be that many, if not most, of them are prompted by the imperceptible influences of other minds about us. *You* suddenly think of something because *my*



thought has suggested *your* thought. If, when three or four persons are together, what is passing at the same moment in each mind could be revealed on the instant, doubtless some curious and instructive discoveries of simultaneous ideas would prove the fact that there is between these minds an unconscious communion and sympathy.

No supernatural power need be invoked to explain this phenomenon. Physiology will assist Psychology to a solution of the problem. The brain is the material—that is the *molecular*—organ by which the operations called mental are conducted. This brain is constructed of a countless multitude of fibres, so fine that many millions of them are contained within the compass of a sixpence. These fibres are instruments of infinite and inconceivable delicacy. They vibrate to waves of the atmosphere and respond to vibrations of other brain fibres that are imperceptible to any sense. Even the vastly coarser strings of a harp take up waves of the atmosphere that our senses do not perceive and echo the sound made by other harp-strings in motion.

But the atmosphere is not the only medium for transmitting motion. Itself floats in a more pervading fluid which physicists have agreed to call “the ether.” Any person who has witnessed the experiments of Professor TYNDALL with sensitive flames, showing how the atmosphere in a large room cannot be stirred so slightly that the flame will not betray the motion, will readily understand how the vibration of the finest brain fibre may be communicated to other brain fibres. The telephone is a still more startling illustration of the multitudinous atmospheric waves imperceptible to our very obtuse senses, which can perceive only the smallest fraction of the things and motions that surround us. But infinitely more delicate must be the waves of the ether. *They* must penetrate the most compact substance—solidity being only a human conception, not a fact in nature. Brain action is brain motion. When *any* mental act is done the fibres of the brain are set in motion

and of these motions the Conscious Self takes cognisance. The psychological conclusion from this physiological fact will be at once apparent. An idea or thought in my mind is attended with certain molecular movements of certain fibres in my brain. The motion of those fibres in my brain is communicated by ether waves to the corresponding fibres in your brain, setting up in them a similar motion, precisely as the harp that is played upon evokes the same tone from the strings of the untouched harp. Those motions of my brain impart to your brain identical impressions, and consequently we think and feel in unison—not, of course, always in concert, but in the same direction.

These impulses communicated from brain to brain are not perceived at all times because we are constructed to be conscious of one impression only at one instant of time and for the most part Consciousness is engaged in taking cognisance of some other more vivid impressions. Moreover, some brains are less sensitive than others—have coarser fibres—and therefore are more slow to catch the finer impulses. Let it be understood that this explanation is presented to the reader, not as the assertion of a proved fact, but merely as a suggestion of the manner in which the undoubted phenomena of *Mental Communion and Sympathy* might be accomplished by purely natural means, without attributing them to the supernatural, the miraculous or the spiritual.



## CHAPTER V.

## BODY, MIND AND SOUL IN HEALTH.

WHEN *Body*, *Mind* and *Soul* are in a condition of perfect health they work in perfect harmony. The Conscious Self—the “I”—the “You”—receives and perceives through the medium of the nerve structure (when the whole mechanism is in its normal condition), the impressions made upon the nerves by the external world. Through the agency of the same mechanism the Conscious Self expresses its Will upon the external world, thus controlling intelligently the action of the nerve forces by which the direction of bodily motion is determined. The manifold functions we term collectively “Mind” are, in this condition of health, performed with ease and rapidity and no jarring of any wheel, no irregularity of any action, reveals even to the consciousness of the individual, much less to the external observer, the mechanism, physical and psychical, by which the processes of perception, thought, will and obedient motion are conducted. Soul and body, the Conscious Self and the molecular mechanism are in the normal condition of man so accurately adjusted that to himself and in outward aspect they are as one. Their relationship is so perfect, their mutual action so admirably contrived, that there is no consciousness of double action. The Will to do and the act done appear to us to be identical. Wherefore? Because the Soul has not, as is the vulgar notion, a local habitation in some special part of the molecular body, but possesses the whole being, transfusing the entire molecular struc-

ture with its own non-molecular structure. Hence the mutual action and reaction are instant and the links between them imperceptible. Of the functions of the bodily organs we have no consciousness so long as they work healthily; only when they are disordered do we learn that such processes are performed within us. Precisely so it is with the relative functions of Soul and body. In a condition of perfect health we have no consciousness of their separate existence nor of the nature of their relationship. Only when that relationship is imperfectly established by original constitutional structure, or disturbed or dislocated by disease or accident, can we discover the existence of the forces actually at work within us and learn something of their operations and functions by experience of the results of that accidental irregularity.

To this the attention of the Reader is now invited.

As the Physician learns the functions of the body, not by studying them when performed healthily but by careful and prolonged observation of them in disease, so does a rational Psychology demand that the relationship and functions of Mind and Soul shall be studied, not by noting merely the self-consciousness of the student, not by metaphysical abstractions, not by argument *à priori*, but by experimental observation of the whole mechanism of Man in its abnormal conditions, when the component parts of that mechanism are thrown out of gear and abnormal action reveals the hidden wheels of the structure and the relationship of its various parts. Psychology asserts confidently that this is the true scientific method of research, to the adoption of which Physical science has been indebted for all its triumphs.

That there are mental and psychic phenomena in abundance offering themselves to observation and experiment by Science will not be denied. The action of the disordered mechanism is plain to the most careless observer when exhibited in its irregular operations upon the external world and upon the mechanism itself.

To these the attention of the Student of Mental



Philosophy and Psychology will now be directed. The number of such instructive abnormal conditions and the abundance and variety of the phenomena attendant upon them will doubtless surprise him. But he will be more surprised to discover how intimately they are allied and how all of them combine in overwhelming proof that the Mechanism of man is constructed of *something* more and other than the material molecular body—whatever that *something* may be and by whatever name we may be pleased to call it.

## BOOK II.

### THE ABNORMAL ACTION OF THE MECHANISM.

---

#### CHAPTER I.

##### INTRODUCTION.—THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE FUTURE.

LET it be clearly understood by opponents and supporters alike that the writer of this book and the Psychologists who have formed "The Psychological Society of Great Britain" frankly avow their design to establish their Science upon a new basis. They propose to depart altogether from what they admit to have been the time-honoured method of metaphysical argument, cloudy abstractions and the study of self-consciousness and to adopt the method of exploration by *observation of phenomena and collection and collocation of facts*. This method has been successfully pursued in all other departments of Natural Science and we can discover no satisfactory reason why it should not prove to be equally advantageous in this. That the metaphysical method should be preserved in Mental Philosophy and Psychology so long after it has been abandoned in all other



branches of physics is probably due to the superstitions that have enwrapped the subject of Mind and Soul and the general assumption that there is in them something of a sacred mystery to pry into which too closely savours of sacrilege. To treat them as we treat electricity and magnetism and the other imperceptible and imponderable forces of Nature, to subject them to experimental examination and deal with them as we would deal with the phenomena of the galvanic battery—that is to say, by noting the action of *imperceptible* forces upon the molecular matter that is perceptible to us—was deemed by the Scientists a waste of time and thought, because they denied the very existence of any such entities. By the rest of the world, who accepted the existence of Soul as a matter of faith though not of knowledge, scientific investigation of it was looked upon as tainted with wickedness because inquiry seemed to question the soundness of that faith.<sup>(a)</sup>

But it was plain to the few who shared neither the scepticism of the Scientists nor the unquestioning trustfulness of the ignorant, that the confessed stationary aspect of Psychology and Mental Philosophy—their standing still while the other sciences were so rapidly advancing—must be due to some great defect in the method of study. Once emancipated from the prepossession that Mind and Soul could be examined only by the inner consciousness and the truth

---

(a) I must except from this protest against the methods of the Metaphysicians generally the works of Mr. Herbert Spencer, to whom the credit is due of being the first of the British Psychologists to depart from the ancient ways and claim for Psychology that it be erected upon a foundation of *facts*. Our Science owes to him a large debt of gratitude for having collected by unwearied industry a vast body of such facts. The only complaint to be made is that he has not sufficiently recognised the value and importance of studying the Mechanism of Man in its abnormal conditions. If this has been found to be the only satisfactory method of studying Physiology, much more must it be so with Psychology.

flashed forth in a moment. Could these not be studied after the same fashion as the other physical sciences,—by observation of phenomena and by experiment? Instead of looking into our own thoughts and feelings, might it not be practicable to observe in others the action of the Mechanism of Man and by seeing how that Mechanism is moved and directed, learn from the actions of the Machine the nature and character of its moving and directing forces? It was thus that Magnetism and Electricity had been examined and a large knowledge obtained of the nature and characteristics of those imperceptible forces. This was obvious so soon as the prejudice of study by abstractions was lifted from the mind. At once the pursuit of Psychology and Mental Philosophy passed into a new region.

The course is clear now. *The Psychology of the Future will seek truth through facts.* For this purpose it will collect all facts connected with the action of the intelligent forces upon the human mechanism. It will do so by observation and by experiment. Upon the solid basis of *fact* alone will this science be permitted to rest for the future. Our science is defined to be "*the investigation of the Forces by which the Mechanism of Man is moved and directed.*" The restricted term *Mental Science* does not properly represent the area of the subject, for it implies more or less than that which it is the business of the student to ascertain. *Psychology* is a better term, for it leaves open the question if Mind and Soul are identical. Nevertheless, a neutral name is much needed that shall carry to no mind that hears it a foregone conclusion. The existence of a motive Force (or Forces) cannot be denied. The difference is as to their number and nature. A name that would convey no prepossessed idea and imply nothing more than the Forces that move Man and direct his motions intelligently would be the greatest boon that could now be conferred upon this the most important and interesting of all knowledge. The invention of such a name would mark the starting point from which



the Psychology of the Future will advance to the victories that are certainly in store for it.

If such a neutral name should occur to any reader, he will do good service by suggesting it to us. The Germans are using the term "*Pneumatology*" for the science of Soul. Mr. Tylor has invented the term "*Animism*" to express the doctrine of Soul as believed by almost the entire human race. In such case those who maintain the existence of Soul would be properly called ANIMISTS. What say the Psychologists to this?

## CHAPTER II.

## HOW TO BE PURSUED.

How is the Psychology of the future to be pursued ?

By collecting facts and upon these facts to found a science.

What proof is requisite to establish a fact ?

The rules of evidence in scientific inquiry do not differ much from those that control legal inquiry. The most prominent difference is, that hearsay is not rejected altogether by Science. It is a necessity of science that statements of fact shall be accepted on the report of competent and credible persons. But where the reporter cannot be produced, his statement requires to be examined with the utmost care and not to be admitted until it has been subjected to strict examination. Every part of the statement must be freely questioned, and whatever fails to endure the scrutiny that is the best substitute for a *vivâ voce* cross-examination should be rejected.

But rejection does not imply that it is *untrue*, only that it is *unproved*. It is necessary to note this distinction for in controversies on alleged scientific facts it is too often forgotten. There is a wide interval between proof and disproof. Failure to prove does not mean proof of falsity, although unreflecting minds are apt to think so. Proof that an asserted fact *is not* is as much a matter of evidence as proof that *it is*. If this proof is not produced the so-called fact is not *disproved* but only *unproved*. There is another important rule of evidence, "that the burden of proof is



upon him who affirms." The person who asserts a fact must prove it—the objector cannot be called upon to disprove it. But if any proof of the assertion be advanced, the duty is then cast upon the objector to answer that proof, showing its invalidity by the production of other conflicting facts.

But all scientific investigation must be proved with reference to CONDITIONS. This is a universal law. Whatever exists under conditions. Whatever we do is done under conditions. We cannot lift the hand to the head but in strict accordance with the conditions that determine the action of the muscles. The first business of the Scientist, when experimenting on any subject whatever, is to learn the conditions under which it exists and in accordance with which alone can any change be made in it. Nature is in this an absolute despot. She dictates her own conditions. Science is her slave and can dictate to her no conditions whatever.

The investigation of psychological phenomena, equally with that of physical phenomena, demands as its first step that we ascertain the conditions requisite to their production. The first care of the Physicist about to investigate electrical phenomena is to see that the conditions are strictly observed which experience has shown to be necessary to the production of those phenomena; such as that the atmosphere of the room is not damp; that there is no moisture upon his glass; that the apparatus is perfectly insulated, and many others. Even with all precautions in the observance of these conditions, his experiments often fail from the presence of some opposing conditions that are imperceptible to him, or from the absence of some one or more of the various lesser conditions which are needful to the success of the experiment. What visitor at the lectures of the Royal Institution has not often heard Professor TYNDALL, potent master as he is over the imperceptible force we call electricity, on the failure of some experiment say to his audience, "I tried it five minutes before the lecture began and it succeeded perfectly. It fails

now for some reason I do not know. Some unknown condition has not been observed. We cannot control Nature."

As it is with all other scientific investigation, so it is with investigation in Psychology — but even more emphatically, inasmuch as the conditions are more difficult to ascertain and because they are continually varying. The Physicist deals with dead matter that is subject wholly to his will. The conditions under which it exists and is offered to his investigations are unchanging. He is thwarted by no caprices, baffled by no intelligence. He can deal with it at his pleasure, try with it any experiment, apply to it any test, handle it, carve it, dissolve it at his pleasure without complaint or resistance.

The study of the facts and phenomena of Psychology cannot be so pursued, for the subjects of Psychological Science have consciousness, sensations, emotions, intelligence and a *will*. These are conditions to be taken into account by the observer and the experimentalist. The same evidence that suffices for proof in the investigation of Physical Science is insufficient in the investigation of Psychological Science. Its subjects cannot be carved by the scalpel, dissolved in a test tube or sublimated in the crucible. They can neither be rarefied into a gas nor compressed into a metal. So far from submission to the desire of the experimentalist, their inclination is to rebel against his authority, as if to prove their own intelligence and independence by thwarting his. These are conditions to be provided for and which, if not anticipated, will assuredly lead to disappointment.

But when this special feature of Psychological research is thoroughly comprehended and the Student goes to the work, not only with knowledge of the fact but with a deliberate resolve never to suffer it to escape from his mind, but always to make full allowance for it in all his observations and experiments, it will be found to offer some compensating advantages. The *Intelligence* he is investigating, if it can sometimes thwart, can also often to some extent assist him. It



can adapt itself to the necessary conditions and even explain to him how they operate to the end.

The ignorant and inconsiderate ignore this universal Natural Law, that nothing is or can be but *according to conditions*. They argue thus in relation to an asserted fact : " If *this* be done, why cannot *that* be done ?" They would have said, and probably did say, when the power of the magnet was first discovered : " If this thing can attract the needle at a distance of an inch, it can do so at the distance of a foot or a yard. If it can draw iron, much more should it draw a feather which is so much lighter. That it cannot do this at any time and at any place proves that the asserted power of the magnet is a lie and a fraud ; that the motion is merely a conjuring trick, a delusion or an illusion, the operator a rogue, the spectators fools." The obvious answer is, that the magnet exercises this power only under certain conditions ; that these conditions are as yet but imperfectly known and the reasons for them still less known. When research shall have traced them to their sources we shall certainly find there the same law and order that we have found in all the other facts in nature whose conditions we have succeeded in tracing and which, now that we know them, we have ceased to esteem as marvels. Science itself is a long history of superstitions converted into facts and seeming miracles made familiar.

---

## CHAPTER III.

## OBJECTIONS AND OBJECTORS.

THE reader is already informed that the Materialists take a very definite position. They assert (1) that there is no cognizable existence but molecular structure, which alone is perceptible to the human senses, or, if there be, it is unknown and unknowable. (2.) That the material organism, rightly investigated, will sufficiently account for all the phenomena called mental or psychical. (3.) That Psychology is consequently a pseudo-science, having no basis in fact and therefore no subject matter upon which to employ itself. (4.) That therefore it can be nothing more than a conjectural and fanciful exercise of ingenuity. (5.) That some of the alleged phenomena can be explained consistently with the materialist theory of molecular structure of mind as well as body, that whatever this theory cannot explain is inherently impossible and may be at once pronounced a delusion or an imposture, and that no amount of evidence to the contrary, however cogent, however apparently conclusive, can be accepted against the *a priori* argument that, according to the accepted doctrines of physical science, the asserted facts *cannot* be.

Where men begin by asserting that C cannot be because it is inconsistent with D, which is affirmed to be absolutely true, it is a vain task to attempt an argument. If they choose to forget that every new fact throughout the entire history of science has been received in the like manner and if they will not see the obvious answer, that their asserted theory may be wrong, or the new fact may be found on further examination to



fit into the scheme of nature, the best course is to leave them to the certain discomfiture that time brings.

The answer that Psychology makes to these arguments of Materialism is

(1.) That doubtless there are in creation many other combinations of atoms than the special combination which forms molecules, and consequently that there must be multitudes of existing things which, not being of molecular construction, are therefore imperceptible to the human senses. These non-molecular entities are not unknown or unknowable because they are imperceptible, but their existence and some of their qualities may be learned from their action upon the molecular structure that is perceptible.

(2.) That the structure of the material organism will not explain many of its most familiar actions, such, for instance, as consciousness, will, ideas, reasoning, imagination, memory—in fact none of the phenomena of *intelligence*.

(3.) Therefore, that Psychology is neither a conjectural nor a fanciful science; that it has a definite basis in the forces that intelligently move and direct the mechanism of man and a distinct subject matter in the facts and phenomena that are exhibited by the action of these imperceptible forces upon the material structure that is perceptible.

(4.) That Psychology demands the same exercise of the faculties of observation and reflection as do the other sciences and can produce as many proved facts, supported by equally admissible and conclusive evidence, as are to be found in any of those sciences.

(5.) Psychology, also, boldly raises what the Lawyers call "the general issue" and asserts that upon questions of *fact*, to be ascertained by observation and experiment, the argument *à priori* is unphilosophical, irrational, and wholly inadmissible, and that it is and must ever be, as ever it has been, an obstacle to the progress of knowledge. It is based upon an assumption of infallibility. The mental process of its propounders is after

this fashion. "This alleged new fact is inconsistent with another fact which I believe to be true, or with a theory which I deem to be indisputable, and therefore it cannot be a fact. I have no need to inquire further." The fallacy, of course, lies in the assumption that the knowledge we possess already is absolutely correct and complete or that the theory we hold is beyond possible question. The answer which true science makes to the Scientists who so argue is short and simple. "Either the facts hitherto supposed to be real are not real, or the theory based upon them is insufficient. Or if the new fact be found, it may not show itself on close examination to be inconsistent either with the old fact or the old theory." Nevertheless the employment of that specious *à priori* argument, so loved by Scientists, has done more at all times and in all countries to impede the march of Science than have the combined forces of theological dogmatism and popular ignorance.

Let the student of Psychology begin with a resolve to banish this fallacy. But he will need continual vigilance to resist its insidious approaches in his own mind and courage to reject it instantly and boldly when wielded against him by others.

No less to be avoided is the evil influence of another formidable foe to research—*consideration of consequences*. The inquiry into nature and science has nothing to do with consequences. There is for the honest man but one thought—*is it a fact?* *A fact will always take care of itself.* A fact is sure to find a fit place in the world of knowledge and to square with all other facts. Remember, that a fact does not exist at your will nor at that of any other man. No power on earth can bid it *not to be*. No persecution nor prosecution can put it down. You cannot extinguish it by shutting your eyes. Welcome or unwelcome, there it is and there it will be with all its consequences, whether you do or do not choose to recognise it. You may object to a theory or a speculation by reference to consequences. You may answer it by forms of logic. But the existence of a *fact*



is always a question for investigation, to be determined by *evidence* alone. The assertion of it by credible witnesses cannot be answered by an argument, but only by trial and experiment under strict tests applicable to the nature of the fact to be proved or disproved.

NOTE.—That the extraordinary dogmatism exhibited by modern scientists has not been unduly censured here is shown by the following passage in the *Quarterly Review* for January, 1878:

“A dogmatic habit of mind was till lately the special reproach of the theologians. It is a fault of which they have had occasion bitterly to repent, and their temper at the present time is apt to be only too apologetic and cautious. But the dogmatic energy which has thus disappeared from their minds seems to have been transferred—perhaps by some application of the law of conservation of force—to the minds of men of science, and Professor VIRCHOW has to address to his brother professors a rebuke which a generation ago would have been deemed appropriate only to hot-headed divines.”

---

## CHAPTER IV.

## PRECAUTIONS IN RESEARCH.

PSYCHOLOGICAL research is pursued, as is Physical research, by *observation* and by *experiment*.

It may be thought, perhaps, that Psychology has a far more limited field for research than any other of the Physical Sciences. It is restricted to the action of one piece of Mechanism,—MAN. Its province is to investigate the forces that *move* and *direct* that mechanism.

But in fact the field for observation and experiment is very large. The chemist analyses some substance and with labour and skill ascertains its structure and properties. This done, his work is so far accomplished and he and all others know that every like substance will be identical in structure and qualities, must be treated in precisely the same manner and will permit of being so treated.

But although the mechanism of man is the same everywhere, the structure which it is the province of Psychology to investigate differs more or less in all Men. Knowledge of one is not necessarily knowledge of another. Why? Because the forces that direct the motions of the mechanism are *intelligent* forces, or (which is in effect the same) the Agent directing the forces from within the mechanism possesses intelligence and has a controlling *Will* and an individual consciousness. The Psychologist must observe the psychic phenomena as they are exhibited, not merely by one man at one time, but by the same man at other times and in other men in divers



conditions, of youth and age, of health and sickness, in many moods of mind, under a variety of abnormal as well as normal conditions. This it is that makes the Science of Psychology so large. The facts upon which it is to be founded are manifold and the gathering of them will be work for generations of students. Instead of three or four volumes, which hitherto have sufficed for the metaphysical form of Psychology, the application to it of the method of research by observation and experiment, that has been adopted in all other Sciences, will demand the services of a multitude of observers and the labours of many experimentalists by whom materials will be supplied for the *thinkers* to mould into a science.

*Facts* form the foundation of all true physical Science. A Science can be firmly erected only upon a foundation of *fact*. Argument may serve to indicate the pathway to discovery by showing where success is probable or improbable. But no new *fact* was ever yet found argumentatively. Indeed it may be well questioned if the tendency to substitute logic for research has not been more a hindrance than a help to Science. We know that it was not until Scientists had emancipated themselves from the thralldom of the Logicians that Science began to make way. Psychological Science, almost to our own time, has been strangled by the embraces of the Metaphysicians. The argument *à priori* has been above all mischievous, for it has been at all times and everywhere a potent weapon in the hands of the cunning to impose upon the unthinking their own conceptions of truth. It is practically a bar to inquiry and has ever been employed by those who use it for the suppression of anything they dread as endangering their own theories. Wherever the argument *à priori* is permitted progress is impossible.

And when this term "*argument à priori*" is here employed, it is intended to designate the process of contending that something is not and cannot be because it is in apparent contradiction to some other thing which the employer of the argument assumes to be true. A

striking illustration of it would be if a man who had never seen or heard of magnetic attraction were to contend that the steel could not possibly jump to the magnet because it was contrary to the law of gravitation that a heavy body should rise in the air without something attached to it to pull it up; therefore that it must be either a delusion or an imposture and that even if seen it was not to be believed. This is the argument *à priori* and doubtless it was wielded by the men of old to prove the magnet an impostor. But we know now that such reasoning was fallacious, because we have learned that the magnet exercises an imperceptible force that overcomes the force of gravitation, although we are still wholly ignorant what that force is, by what process it is exercised, or what it is that seizes and drags the steel upwards. Nevertheless this foolish form of argument continues to be employed even by Scientists in our own time. Scarcely a new fact or new discovery is announced but a hundred pens who call themselves scientific are ready to demonstrate that it *cannot* be because it contradicts some supposed established truth and the asserter of it is unceremoniously called, in plain terms or by implication, a deluded fool or a deluding knave. The discovery of the circulation of the blood was thus assailed and made its way but slowly against the batteries of *à priori* argument.

In preparing to enter upon Psychological research, you should begin, as when undertaking to investigate the facts of any other science, by banishing from your mind everything in the shape of *à priori* argument that you may have heard from others or that may be suggested by yourself.

Then make a strong effort to banish all *prepossessions*. Dr. CARPENTER has forcibly described this source of error in the remarkable paper in the *Fortnightly Review* in which, disputing the authenticity of the miracles related in the Bible, he refers to the influence of prepossession as the most potent source of self-delusion. The suggestion is not new, but it has been by him presented with



more prominence and force than by any other writer. Its influence is so immense, its effect upon the value of evidence is so great and the results are so important, that it will be desirable to direct the particular attention of the reader to the special chapter treating of it which will follow this one.

Banishing prepossessions so far as you can, you must resolve, in the emphatic language of the oath taken by a witness in our Courts of Law, to *seek* "the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth." You must not cast about to see what it may portend, nor if it squares or conflicts with any other truth or assumed truth, nor anticipate any consequences from its discovery or proclamation. You are bound by the law of honour Science professes, but not always practises, honestly to find *the very fact* according to your best skill and judgment and to proclaim the fact, when found, without asking who or what it may offend, without favour and without fear.

Perhaps you will ask what is a *fact*? You will be reminded that there are many "false facts" in the world and how are you to know a fact when you have it? "What is truth?" has been a problem of all time. But a fallacy is wrapt up in the question. A "*fact*" and a "*truth*" are not identical. A fact is something that is or has been; a truth is a deduction from facts or assumed facts. Both fact and truth can be to us nothing more than *relative*. We can only take facts as they appear and truths that are such relatively to ourselves. The ultimate fact and the abstract truth are not and never can be attainable by us. We can know nothing but according to the conditions of our own bodily and mental structure. Our senses limit our perceptions. Our minds limit our conceptions. We do not and we cannot certainly know if anything *is* as it appears to us to be, or as in our thoughts we conceive it to be. For all the practical purposes of life we must assume that things are as they appear; that there is an external world of which we can acquire some knowledge.

We must cease once and for ever to waste time and thought upon problems that are insoluble and upon speculations that cannot be proved. We must be content to accept as knowledge whatever can be taught us by our senses and by our reason and seek to know no more.

But we must also recognise the fact that the senses are fallible and the mind subject to illusion. Hence we must not be content with a single observation or experiment. Before a new fact is asserted, it should be witnessed many times, under stringent tests and various conditions. Very little experience in Psychological as in other research will satisfy the student of the value of this precaution.

For, from the nature of its subject-matter, dealing as it does with a thing having consciousness and intelligence, it is peculiarly liable to present appearances that are unreal and phenomena that are deceptive. Simulation is impossible with inert inorganic matter. Whatever aspect it presents is real. But with an *intelligent* entity there is always the possibility of simulation and against this precautions cannot be too carefully observed.

Another precaution. Let every investigation be undertaken with a firm resolve to throw aside, for the moment at least, any previous theory you may have held and to which the phenomena you are viewing may be supposed to have some relationship. There is no more frequent cause of error in observation than the strong tendency of the mind to see with microscopic eye the facts that seem to support any cherished theory and to be blind to the plainest facts that tell against it. The greatest Scientists are not free from this disturbance and every Science has felt its fatal influence. Care must be taken to view and record only the naked fact. Let not the mind stray into the region of inferences or conjectures as to causes, for these are sure to colour the view or disturb the object. An observer, when investigating a fact, has nothing to do with theories or inferences. His single business is to ascertain if it be



*a fact.* No matter to what inconvenient or strange conclusions it may appear to point, that is no concern of his. No wish of his, indeed, no power on earth can change it in the least, nor make it not to be. For good or for evil *it is*, and ever will be, let authority say or do what it will or the whole world combine against it. Theories and faiths may be extinguished by opposition or persecution. *A fact is immortal.*

Banish sternly from your own mind and reject, when asserted by others, the notion that a fact cannot be accepted unless at the same time its existence can be explained. No fallacy has been more fatal to the progress of knowledge than this. The question, "*How* can it be?" must be treated not merely as a folly but as an impertinence. The one question for the honest truth-seeker is—"Is it?"

Again, reports of scientific observations and experiments may be ranged under two obvious divisions. (1) Those which the writer reports from his own knowledge. (2) Those which he reports upon the statements of another. The first alone is recognised by the law as admissible evidence; it rejects the second as being "hearsay." But science cannot draw so stringent a line as the law has done. The law provides machinery for the cross-examination of witnesses and by that process sifts truth from error, fact from fancy. Rarely does such an opportunity offer for testing the veracity or accuracy of witnesses who report scientific facts and therefore these must always be taken with some allowance for liability to error through the influence of prepossession and the natural fallibility of the senses.

The writer who treats of scientific subjects on the plan of basing argument on facts is always subject to a cross-fire of objections which it is as well to anticipate. If he cites the evidence of others, he is charged with resting his case upon hearsay. If he reports his own experiments, their value is disputed because they are not certified by others. "Did you see this yourself?" says the doubter. "No." "Then I cannot accept what somebody has told

you." If your answer is, "Yes, I did," the ready remark is "But you may be mistaken. I cannot accept on the evidence of one witness only."

It is, of course, useless by any facts or any arguments to endeavour to convince those who are not willing to be convinced. Prepossession still is, as ever it has been, the most formidable foe to knowledge. Whatever we wish to be true is accepted on the merest shadow of proof. Whatever we do not wish to be true is summarily rejected, be the evidence ever so cogent. He only can see facts as they are who seeks for them without prejudice, without fear and without favour—looking for the truth alone, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

It is in this spirit of regard for nothing but the *very truth* that so many of the facts and phenomena reported in the following pages were observed and have been recorded.

The *precautions* actually taken by the skilled reporters of these experiments may be stated once for all, to avoid the tedious repetition of them in the reports of the experiment. They will apply to all, unless otherwise specially noted.

All reasonable and practicable tests were always used. By *reasonable* tests are intended such as are consistent with the character of the phenomenon under observation and the asserted or supposed manner of its production. For instance, it would be unreasonable to impose upon a chemical experiment the introduction of an element that would neutralize the chemicals with which the experimentalist proposed to work. Equally would it be unreasonable to impose on Professor TYNDALL the condition that his electrical experiments should be conducted in a moist atmosphere. In like manner, with Psychological experiments it is necessary to consult the nature of the subject matter with which they deal and to adapt the conditions of the experiment to the reasonable requirements of that subject. In all scientific research the first and most important business is to



ascertain the actual conditions under which phenomena can or cannot occur and then to mould the experiments accordingly.

The experiments being conducted with an intelligent entity having consciousness, will and emotions, due allowance was made for the presence of these elements. Researches that fail to take account of them will certainly be vain or worthless. But the recognition of this necessity imposes upon us the greater care in observation and demands from us more frequent and protracted trial and test.

The first step in the experiments conducted by the Scientists who have pursued these investigations was to observe without tests, taking careful note of whatever they witnessed. Having seen what was presented untrammelled, they were better enabled to devise tests applicable to each phenomenon. This rule cannot be too strongly urged upon all investigators of mental phenomena. Do not be in too great haste to apply crucial tests. Be sure that you have accurately observed the entire case before you interfere to interrupt its full development.

Having thus observed without tests, ingenuity was exhausted in devising various crucial tests to meet the various difficulties and the special circumstances of each case under examination. If the required conditions were such as to favour fraud, the tests were increased in stringency to meet that special requirement. If darkness was demanded, it was deemed to be no sufficient reason for rejecting whatever is so produced, or Photography would not now be an art as well as a science. But such a condition was properly held to call for multiplied precautions and special tests that would preclude the possibility of fraud. So tested, such experiments are as admissible in evidence as any others.

Nor were they content with one trial. Before anything was accepted as proved, the experiment was tried over and over again with various persons, in various places, and under various conditions. Note was taken of failures equally with successes, and inquiry was always

made into the causes of failures, which are often even more instructive than successes.

Such were the precautions observed by the eminent Scientists whom it was my good fortune to assist in the experimental investigation of many of the various mental and psychological phenomena reported in the following pages.



## CHAPTER V.

## PREPOSSESSION AND DOMINANT IDEA.

IN the very able essay, contributed to the *Fortnightly Review*, in which he undertakes to refute the miracles recorded in the Bible, Dr. CARPENTER describes with great force the delusive influence upon the most powerful minds of what he well terms *Prepossession and Dominant Idea*. His acquaintance is mainly with their effect upon Scientists engaged in the pursuit of scientific truth. My own experience of their presence in judicial inquiry entirely confirms the observation of Dr. CARPENTER. I have therefore deemed it desirable to devote a distinct chapter to the consideration of an influence so disturbing and distorting, that daily forces itself upon my attention.

I have had occasion to repeat more than once the admirable saying of PASCAL that "men do not believe what is true but what they wish to be true." If desire moulds belief much more does it colour the evidence upon which belief is based. All of us are prone to see things, not as they are, but as we *wish* them to be or think they *ought* to be. If we come to an inquiry with a prepossession or a dominant idea of any kind, we are sure to open our eyes widely to the smallest fact that tells in favour of our prepossession and close them to the plainest facts that tell the other way. The entire result of investigation into any matter depends upon the spirit with which we go to it. If we are prepossessed in its favour and so desire to prove this or that to be true, the evidence will shape itself to our minds in accord with that desire. If prepossessed against it, the self-same

evidence will satisfy us that it is not true. Present precisely the same facts to two minds equally competent to judge and equally *prepossessed* in opposite directions and the same fact will appear to each mind under quite a different aspect. Each will see the force of so much of it only as confirms his prepossession. Hence come the opposing conclusions which men of equal ability deduce from the same facts.

An honest and true judgment can be formed by that Mind only which proceeds to investigation in the *judicial* spirit, banishing all prepossession and going to the work, not to prove this to be true or that to be false, but abjuring all foregone conclusions, with stern resolve to learn what the very truth is. Thus and only thus can the *truth* be learned.

But such a spirit of impartial inquiry is very rare. Few minds are capable of it. It is seldom found in the witness-box among the general public. Witnesses are commonly biassed by partizanship for the side on which they are called, even if they have no personal interest in the issue. Strange to say and sad as strange, this distorting influence of prepossession prevails more powerfully with scientific witnesses than with almost any others. Judges and practising Lawyers are taught by experience that of all witnesses Experts are the most unreliable and of all Experts the most untrustworthy are Scientists. Wherefore so? It is *not* the result of dishonesty, as is commonly supposed. They are not consciously untruthful. The fact is, *prepossession* is so powerful with them that it perverts their judgments and even perverts their senses. It is not true, as is said, that for a sufficient fee they will prove one thing and for double that fee prove the opposite thing. They are, indeed, often seen to prove anything that is wanted to be proved. But it is not the fee that buys them. It is the *prepossession* with which they go to their task that really biasses their senses and their judgments. They illustrate precisely the above remark, that men will see what they wish to see and will not see what they do not wish to see. This ever has



been and ever will be the result if we go to an inquiry with purpose to prove something to be true or not to be true, instead of impartially seeking *what is true*?

This is precisely what the Scientists are expected to do when they are retained as witnesses. They are not called to discover what the truth is but to prove that certain things are true. With this *prepossession* they proceed to the examination of the facts and the deduction of conclusions from those facts. As the certain consequence they view the facts and arguments from one aspect only. Hence the painful exhibition, so frequent in our Courts of Justice, of the evidence of Experts biassed unconsciously by the interests of the party for which they are called. Every experienced Solicitor knows that any amount of scientific evidence can be easily obtained to support any side of any question, alike to prove or to disprove. In railway accidents, half a dozen medical men can be brought to swear that in their judgment the injured person will never be himself again; an equal number to swear that there is nothing the matter with him. Scientific Surveyors will prove with equal facility a scheme to be possible or impossible. According to one set of "mad doctors," (as they are familiarly called, for lack of a better name), no man is sane. According to another no aberration amounts to insanity. It is the same in patent questions. The fact is found in all legal inquiries where there are opposing interests and the opinions of Scientists are invoked. Are then all Scientists dishonest, that they prove whatever they are paid to prove? Is it because they are paid largely that they are the least reliable of all witnesses when retained by the parties, as is the unwise practice in England, instead of being called as advisers of the Court, as is the practice in France? No. The truth is that they are under the influence of *prepossession*. They look at the case submitted to them, not to ascertain the very fact, but to maintain a foregone conclusion. Hence they have a keen eye for all facts and arguments that support their proposition, accepting them with the

smallest scrutiny, and are blind (unconsciously) to the facts and arguments that point in another direction.

This experience of the influence of prepossession over the eyes and judgments of Scientists, when witnesses in our Courts, illustrates the necessity for extreme caution against the like prepossession by the Psychologist in the conduct of *his* researches. He must have no preformed desire that this or that should be true or false. He must go to his inquiries resolved to seek what is true and not with a purpose to prove this or that to be true or false. In brief, he must be the Judge and not the Advocate. This *judicial* condition of mind is somewhat rare, for it is difficult to acquire and still more difficult to preserve. Experience has proved it to be rarest among Scientists who, from the nature of their studies, are prepossessed by a large body of assumed facts and theories by which they are wont to measure all newly asserted facts. This is the mental cause of that almost unbroken series of denials of new facts which has been the shame of Science and still, in spite of experience, continues to be its reproach. Not one of the great facts which Science now accepts as incontrovertible truths but was vehemently denied by the Scientists of its time, declared to be *à priori* impossible, its discoverers and supporters denounced as fools or charlatans and even investigation of it refused as being a waste of time and thought.

The causes of this are clear. Scientists, like other men, rarely examine with strictly impartial eyes and minds, with purpose to learn what the truth is and which they can only learn by looking all round. They make search for that alone which serves to support their previous views. They have the keenest eye for anything that aids that object. They are deaf and blind to whatever tells against it. They draw the most dim and distant conclusions that favour their impressions. The most obvious adverse conclusions are passed over or set aside. The most improbable suggestions are readily accepted when they confirm a prepossession. The most impos-



sible explanations of antagonistic facts are eagerly welcomed. This weakness of our common humanity is only more notable and lamentable in Scientists than in others because it is in them the least to be looked for, their profession being pre-eminently to seek after the truth and therefore the world is the more amazed and vexed to find how their practice belies their profession. The fact is that Scientists, who should be the most free from prejudice and prepossession, with rare exceptions, at all times and in all countries, so far from having their minds open to the search after and reception of truth generally, have ever been and still are, more under their influence than almost any other men. Indeed, the history of science has been a continuous narrative of facts denied and truths denounced. Every new discovery has been combatted in turn, the discoverer denounced as a rogue and the assertors of it as fools and dupes. Religious and social prejudices have been invoked against it and persecution instead of praise has been its lot.

I repeat, that such witnesses are not consciously dishonest. They are only under the influence of that *prepossession* which Dr. CARPENTER has so ably described as the prevailing cause of error in scientific investigation and of which no more apt illustration could be found than himself, in whom prepossessions are so potent and whose mind is the slave of dominant ideas. The practical effect of prepossession with him has been to convert into an able advocate, powerful to support one side of a question, a Man of Science, whose proper duty it is to be a Judge, viewing and weighing the facts on *all* sides.

When such minds are subject to be so affected, it will not be a misplaced warning to the Student of Psychological Science to keep ever before him his great liability to this influence of *prepossession* and *dominant idea*. Let him to the utmost of his power strive to keep himself free from that besetting sin. The golden rule to be written on his memory and kept always before him in all investigations is to ask, as an upright Judge, *what*

*the truth is?* Never, like the skilful advocate, should go to them with purpose to *prove* this or that to be true or false. The lesson is hard to learn. But let him keep the danger steadily in view. On the threshold of any of your experiments, ask yourself again and again, "Am I honestly looking for the fact, or am I really seeking to find something to be true that I wish or believe to be true or something to be false that I desire and expect to find false?" If this baneful influence of *prepossession* had been as distinctly and powerfully brought under the notice of his brother Scientists by Dr. CARPENTER many years ago, as it has now been preached to them, Science would have been at this time a century in advance of its present stage. If the Scientists of our day will give good heed to the warning they have received, Science will assuredly progress hereafter with a speed it has never before known.

---



## CHAPTER VI.

## HOW WE KNOW.

HUMAN knowledge can be *relative* only—that is, according to the conditions of our earth life. We are structured in a special manner for existence in a world of a certain structure. We know and can know nothing more than is permitted by the conditions of that existence. Whether what seems *is*, whether that which presents itself to us as reality and truth is actually and absolutely such, as we cannot learn we need not trouble ourselves to inquire. We must be content to accept for knowledge that which we are constructed to know and happily that is sufficient for all practical purposes.

Positive knowledge of the external world comes to us only through the senses. Consciousness gives us knowledge of our own existence and emotions. If we could imagine a man cut off from all communication with the external world through his senses—a mind without nerves—it is doubtful whether that mind could have any sensations or any knowledge beyond the mere consciousness of being.

Our knowledge of facts outside ourselves can come to us through the senses only. Have we knowledge of anything not so brought? The office of reason is said to be to enable us from facts known to arrive at facts not known, without further assistance from the senses. This, however, is open to grave question. Reason can do no more than lead us to conjectures, more or less probable. It can merely point the way for inquiry—and we cannot affirm that the fact is known until it is proved by some evidence of the senses. The pure mathematics may, perhaps, be

deemed an exception to this assertion. But the question is too large to be treated here. For the present purpose it suffices that *evidence* of facts can be obtained only through the senses.

But Science does not require that knowledge should be procured only through our own senses. The necessities of our limited lives compel us to accept the evidence of the senses of others.

The sources of all knowledge are two only: 1. The information of our senses; 2. The evidence of the senses of other persons.

But both of these sources of knowledge are subject to serious errors alike of the senses that receive and convey the impressions and of the mind that accepts them.

The evidence of others is subject to the same errors and to the further error in the reporting of the facts observed, either through accident or by design, and this liability is multiplied with every successive reporter. The accuracy of our information and therefore of our knowledge depends upon the fullness of our appreciation of these multiplied sources of error and the precautions taken to guard against them.

It will suffice to name the principal of these fallacies.

(1.) The senses are themselves subject to deception, but more often the mind imposes upon the sense by the influence of prepossession, already treated of. Few persons are at all conscious of the extent to which the senses are affected by the mind. This is especially to be noted with objects familiar to us. We think we see with our eyes when in truth we only see with our minds. A remarkable instance of this occurred to myself. My sitting-room window looks upon a field. At the house of a friend, something was said about a large tree in that field visible from that window. I confidently asserted that there was no such tree and two of my family present supported me. My friend had been but once in the room, but he was equally positive as to his impression. On looking from the window we found that we, who had been viewing that very tree for twenty years,



were wrong and my friend, who had looked upon it for five minutes only, was right. In fact we had seen with our *minds*, he with his *eyes* only. Probably there are few who could not recall instances of almost equally signal deceptions of the senses. To the judicial experience such cases are daily, almost hourly, presented.

(2.) Where facts are to be received on the evidence of others we have to add to the sources of fallacy as affecting ourselves the further risk of an imperfect report either through the failure of the reporter's mind to comprehend or of his tongue to describe. There is also the possibility of misrepresentation through the same besetting sin of prepossession or by deliberate suppression or falsification of the facts from the bias of interest, or fear, or favour. All of these sources of error must be eliminated or nullified before a reported fact can be accepted as a fact and treated as a positive addition to the sum of knowledge.

How, then, do we arrive at a knowledge of *Truth*?

By Evidence.

So we learn what is false—by Evidence.

All knowledge consists of (1) *Facts* and (2) *Deductions* from facts.

Deductions from facts are the general rules, or principles, which by a mental operation called *reasoning* we deduce from contemplating two or more facts together and discovering relationships between them.

If a certain state of facts is seen always to follow a certain other state of facts, we think and speak of them as bearing to each other the relationship of cause and effect.

We are accustomed to think that the one in some manner produces the other and that where the one is found the other, under precisely the same conditions, will invariably follow.

But this is a fallacy. Really we have no other knowledge of cause and effect than sequence. So far as we know, B follows A. But we do not and cannot know

if it has always done so, or if it will continue to do so. There is at the best only a strong probability that what has been will be.

It is very important, in the pursuit of truth, to understand distinctly the proper province of reasoning, for it is greatly misunderstood and much abused.

*Facts* form the only firm foundation of *Truth*. No truth can be established by argument alone, save when we take facts for the basis and reason upon them. But the results of such reasoning amount only to a strong presumption, until confirmed by other facts. The existence or non-existence of a fact cannot be tried by argument alone. It is no answer to a *fact* to assert, nor even to prove by the most perfect logic, that it *cannot* be. A fact can be proved or disproved *only* by observation, experiment and test.

The province of reason and argument is to ascertain that due observation is made, proper experiments tried, and sufficient tests applied. Argument is usefully employed also in trying the validity and weight of the evidence by which an asserted fact is supported and in discovering what other probable facts may be deduced or presumed from the proved fact.

It is in the training of the legal mind to a habit of looking for *facts* and recognizing the sufficiency of the *evidence* by which any fact is proved, that the aptitude of the skilled and experienced lawyer for the discovery of truth is so remarkably shown.

It is to the entire neglect of impartiality in the search after and ascertainment of facts and its entire ignorance of what is or is not evidence of a fact, that the singular incapacity of the lay mind for the pursuit of truth is to be attributed.

No greater service could be rendered to society than to teach the youth of both sexes what is the nature of the *evidence* by which asserted *fact* is to be proved or rejected. The mind should not be taught this as an accomplishment merely, to be cultivated or neglected at pleasure. The mental powers should be directed to the



practice of weighing evidence until it becomes almost an instinctive manner of thinking. The minds of the young should be so imbued with the principles of evidence that they shall think habitually in obedience to them until it shall be an effort to think in any different manner.

## CHAPTER VII.

## SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE.

I MUST repeat yet once again the profound saying of PASCAL, so often repeated in this little treatise, "Men do not believe what is true but what they wish to be true."

Wiser words were never written. Every day's experience confirms them. The rarest of all spectacles is a man who seeks after the Truth for its own sake alone, who desires to learn the *very* Truth, and who will suffer no personal nor social influences, no prejudices, no preconceptions, no desire for popularity nor dread of unpopularity, to stifle or disguise the fact in his own mind or prevent his assertion of it to the minds of others.

Of all pursuits, that of Science is pre-supposed to be the least obnoxious to this weakness of humanity. Science is, or ought to be, pre-eminently a seeking after the Truth, the whole Truth and only the Truth. Its aims are supposed to be purely unselfish. A Scientist is preconceived to have no vulgar prejudices to betray his senses or warp his judgment.

It is far otherwise in fact. "'Tis true, 'tis pity; pity 'tis, 'tis true." Scientists generally are the most dogmatical of men. None are more prone to condemn the dogmatism of Theologists and none assert more loudly and persistently their own dogmas. But Scientists lack the excuse of Theologians. Theology is from its nature determinate. Science is essentially progressive and the new knowledge of to-day is continually refuting the supposed knowledge of yesterday.

The reason is that Scientists are but men. They have the infirmities and the passions of men. A man's nature



is not changed because he gives time and thought to the exploration of the universe or of a drop of water, the examination of worlds or of beetles. With the common herd he has at the least his full share of vanity and self-esteem. He is subject to envy and jealousy. He thirsts for public applause and dreads public censure. He loves popularity; he shrinks from unpopularity. Having proclaimed a dogma, or identified himself with a theory, or pronounced an opinion, he wants the moral courage to confess himself in error. This is the *rationale* of the refusal of Scientists to believe what they do not wish to be true and their closing of the eyes to facts it is inconvenient to recognise.

But much of scientific, equally with popular, error arises from ignorance of what is *evidence* and what constitutes *proof*. If the principles by which these are directed were better understood and more widely recognised controversy would be reduced to much narrower limits, a vast amount of toil and time now wasted in unprofitable and interminable discussion would be saved on the threshold of inquiry into the phenomena of Mental Physiology and Psychology. It may be useful to the Student to be forearmed with some of the principal rules of Evidence that should guide him in the search after the Truth, if he be sincerely desirous to find it without fear or favour.

There is a popular notion that scientific Truth is to be pursued by some different method from other Truths. Not so. All *facts* are to be proved by the same process, the difference lies only in the amount of proof demanded. This varies in various circumstances according to the purpose for which the fact is required. For the ordinary purposes of everyday existence, we are compelled to accept as facts a multitude of things very imperfectly proved, and very much that is not proved to us at all, but which we take upon trust. We should perish from mental inanition if we demanded for every asserted unimportant fact the same amount of evidence as we require in matters of great moment. In such cases

*Common Sense* comes to our assistance and by an unconscious process the mind pronounces a judgment for which it could assign no reason but what is for the most part a correct one.

And what is *Common Sense*? Only the accumulated experience we have received from others and acquired for ourselves and perhaps also something derived by inheritance. *Common Sense* is of infinite value within its own proper province. It may be safely trusted in the affairs of social life for, although sometimes erring, its failures are but few compared with its successes and when it errs it usually supplies also the remedy for its error. Its worth will be best appreciated by calling to mind some acquaintance who is known as "wanting in common sense."

But its supremacy must be recognised only within its province and that province is the circle of everyday existence. When it trespasses beyond that limit and attempts to solve questions only to be tried and determined by the stricter rules of evidence it fails and misleads. The real business of *Common Sense* is not to pronounce what is true or false in the abstract, but only what, under all circumstances, it is most expedient to *treat* as true or false. *Common Sense* has pronounced many things to be because they seem to be, when they are in truth quite otherwise—as, for instance, that the sun rolled round the earth—and a multitude of other things now known to be scientifically false. But for all the practical purposes of life *Common Sense* is right. Only when it passed beyond its proper province into the observatory of the Astronomer and told him that its own unproved dictum was preferable to his proved science did *Common Sense* deserve the rebuke it received.

The investigation of Psychological as of other scientific phenomena lies *beyond* the province of *Common Sense* and that very useful assistant in common life cannot be admitted into it either as a witness or as a judge. We are inquiring here not what *appears* to be true but



what *is* true. In such an inquiry nothing can be accepted as true without *proof*. What constitutes proof is a question for the reason. So, also, is the question, what is admissible *evidence* by which that proof is to be attained.

Science is compounded of *facts* and *hypotheses* (which are explanations of facts always more or less conjectural and consequently more or less reliable). The value of inference from facts depends, first, upon the accuracy of the asserted facts and, secondly, upon the correctness of the inference.

Thus must all science be based upon *facts*. Ingenuity may exhaust itself in spinning ingenious theories; they will be but cobwebs unless they have facts for their foundation. Thus it is that the facts may be true but the theory false and the theory perfect in structure but failing in its facts. Inasmuch as it is a laborious process to ascertain facts and a pleasant process to weave theories, ingenuity has ever preferred to present more of theory than of fact. For centuries, indeed, science was sought almost wholly in abstractions. Long after Physical Science had emancipated itself from the region of hypothesis and taken to the solid world of *fact*, Mental Science and Psychology persisted in the ancient way and Metaphysics continued to be a barrier to their progress. Only in very recent days, within the memory of this generation, has Science condescended to apply to the investigation of Mind and Soul the same patient observation of facts and phenomena that had been long ago devoted to the action of the physical forces and the phases of molecular structure.

*Facts*, then, being the foundation of all Science and of none more emphatically than the Science hitherto deemed metaphysical, namely, the Science of Mind and the Science of the Soul (or Pneumatology), to which this treatise is devoted, what are the rules by which the Student should be guided in the gathering of such *facts*?

It has been said, truly enough, that there are in the world more false facts than false theories. But are there not a million of facts to one theory? The saying

applies rather to common life, where facts are for the most part taken without test, than to the world of Science where facts are usually subjected to severe examination.

The first rule to be observed by the honest student of any Science is to *ascertain the very truth and fact*, without prejudice or prepossession, without favour or fear, with no foregone conclusions, with no shrinking from it because it seems to be in contradiction to some accepted theory or in conflict with some other assumed fact. Never must he ask the how, or the why, what it means, what it disturbs or threatens, however dear and cherished. But one question is permissible to the honest inquirer, "Is IT A FACT?"

Of this he may rest assured, that if it be a fact it will be strange and portentous to him only because it is new and that on further investigation it will be found to square with every other fact and to be in perfect harmony with all other knowledge. There is no inconsistency in nature.

The real rule to be remembered is "*to require the best proof that the nature of the case will permit.*"

This is one of the primary rules of the Law of Evidence which reason would recommend in all cases. It is especially needful in scientific inquiry and most of all in the branch of Science under consideration here. This is its meaning. You are not to be satisfied with inferior evidence if better evidence is procurable. Reference is not now made to the rule of Law that excludes what is called *secondary* evidence, meaning that what a witness has written shall not be produced if the witness can himself be called (which would be a very wholesome rule for Scientific evidence also), but that evidence of inferior value shall be rejected if better evidence could be obtained.

A third rule for scientific research has been advanced by some because it is a peremptory rule of the law, "that hearsay is not evidence." But in science this rule must be taken with so many exceptions as to render it almost worthless. It would be impossible to adopt it



in its integrity. No man could personally ascertain all the facts of any science. He must be dependent for the greater portion of his store of facts upon what the law calls "hearsay," that is to say, statements of what other persons have said. All that the student can do is to go to the best authority and when receiving the facts from this source carefully to sever fact from theory and add the fact to his store uncoloured by any hypothesis it may have been made to fit. But in trying the worth of any asserted fact he may usefully employ the rule excluding hearsay. He may question the authority how *he* obtained it, if it was the product of his own observation or merely something that he had received on the faith of others; for if any asserted fact has been transmitted through three or four reporters and the original authority cannot be found the rule that hearsay is not evidence will apply with increasing force for every transmission. The student, accepting a fact upon authority, should be content with nothing less than the original authority or the voucher of one who has tried and proved the original authority.

Having, with the application of these simple rules, accumulated a multitude of facts, then and not till then may they be marshalled with purpose to see what other facts may be deduced from these; what indications they give of the presence of some forces not perceptible to the senses; what operations of natural law they appear to exhibit; what suggestions they make to the mind reflecting upon them.

But such inferences must always be taken with the most perfect recognition that they are only theories and conjectures more or less ingenious. They may be true, but they may be erroneous and can at best be accepted only as guesses at truth, to be used chiefly as guides in further investigation.

But always you will have this consolation, that although your theory may perish *the facts* will remain. A *fact* is inextinguishable and immortal. It cannot be put down by any force, frowned down by any authority,

extinguished by any argument, suppressed by any ridicule, annihilated by any persecution. All the powers of earth, kings, priests and scientists may proclaim it impossible and declare it *not to be*. But nevertheless it *is*, and will remain. "It moves for all that," was the immortal saying of GALILEO, and this should be the motto of all who proclaim new and therefore unpopular truths.

When you have your facts, and not before, you may construct theories. The use of theory is as a guide in future investigations. It provides a map or plan by which you are enabled to direct with a definite purpose inquiries that are apt to become desultory and vague. But always you should bear in mind that theory is not knowledge but only a guide to knowledge. At the best it is probably but an approach to the truth and more commonly it will be doomed to pass away before some new theory based on a yet larger store of facts or still more ingenious conjecture. Never should a theory be asserted dogmatically.

A few remarks on a subject nearly allied to this may be useful here.

Four terms are in frequent use in scientific discussion, and in common life with conceptions of their meanings so vague that they are often used indiscriminately.

These terms are Faith, Belief, Conviction, Knowledge.

It is essential to scientific discussion that there should be a definite understanding of the relative meanings of these terms, for they are frequently in use alike in books and in the language of common life and few are more and more often abused. They are for the most part used as if they were synonymous terms, and a man will talk of his faith, his belief, his conviction, in as many successive minutes, to express the same thought. Science demands more accurate definitions, for words must express ideas and unless the ideas are definite there can be no clear conception of facts and no accurate reasoning.

*Faith, Belief, Conviction, Knowledge*, are four distinct



states of the Mind produced by four different mental processes.

*Faith* is simply acceptance of something asserted by another in whom we have confidence. It is not belief; still less is it knowledge. It is not even a mental effort. "I accept what you say because you say it, without inquiring if it be a proved truth or what were the grounds of belief." Therefore *Faith* is the lowest exercise of the mind. It demands neither intelligence nor effort. It is probably a faculty shared by man with the lower animals. It is greatest in the smallest minds and diminishes in precise proportion to the extent of mental capacity and the enlargement of knowledge.

*Belief* is a process far in advance of *Faith*. Belief is an acceptance of a fact, not upon faith of the mere statement of another but upon a distinct and definite conception of the fact itself and an assurance of its existence formed upon some *evidence* of it received by the believing mind.

*Faith* whispers, "I say it is because *you* say it is." *Belief* says, "I say it is because I have positive *evidence* that it is." But belief in no way implies that the foundation of it is sufficient. It may be formed on the most baseless testimony; it may be the result of illusion: it may be incapable of supporting itself by any valid argument or sufficient evidence. But it is a mental condition consequent upon mental action and implies at least a distinct conception of the something that is believed.

*Conviction* is yet a higher effort of the Intelligence. Conviction, properly so-called, can exist only as the result of more or less of examination and proof. It is not a voluntary condition. When sufficient proof is present conviction inevitably follows. We may endeavour to distract attention from unpleasing convictions, but we cannot remove or change them save by the same process that produced them—more proof. *Faith* on the contrary is a voluntary act. No man accepts as truth what another says without an exercise of his own Will. But *Belief* and

*Conviction* are involuntary states of mind that cannot be produced or changed by any effort of the Will.

One instance will suffice to illustrate distinctions so important to all scientific progress.

A Roman Catholic accepts the miracle of the Real Presence, not from any personal knowledge he has of it, but having *Faith* in the affirmation of it by the Church.

Our ancestors *believed* that the Sun moved round the Earth because they witnessed what appeared to them to be such a motion.

GALILEO was *convinced* that the Earth moved round the Sun, contrary to the common *belief*, because he had investigated the evidence and *proof* was thus brought to his mind that his senses were deceived.

Hence in Science *Faith* is inadmissible, *Belief* is to be viewed with suspicion, *Conviction* alone should justify an affirmation of *Knowledge*.

But the term *Faith* must be understood here as intending an acceptance of a statement without inquiry whether the person who affirms it has personal knowledge. We accept the discoveries of NEWTON because we are satisfied that he had arrived at positive conviction by proof and because others have tested his facts and found them to be correct. This is *belief* not *faith*. It is evidence on which the judgment may be founded and which even the law admits. The *faith* referred to above is acceptance from another, without inquiring if that other had sufficient or even any grounds for his assertion.

But as all Science must be founded upon *facts*, the utmost care is required to ascertain their truth. For this object all the powers of observation and reflection should be exerted. No precaution should be neglected against deceit by the senses, fallacy in argument, and in many things deception and fraud. Nothing should be taken upon trust where personal knowledge is practicable. The most perfect tests of genuineness that ingenuity can suggest should be applied rigorously and often repeated and the fact itself should not be registered in your judgment as confirmed until it has been witnessed



again and again under varying conditions and always with every safeguard against delusion in any form by your own senses or by others. Above all, resolutely insist upon having the best evidence that can be procured, and refuse to accept any lesser proof while more perfect proof is possible.

These rules are applicable in the pursuit of all Science, but in none is their observance so needful as in the study of Mental Physiology and Psychology, because the facts upon which alone they are based are associated more or less with the mental operations of intelligent beings, often in abnormal conditions, when simulation is a feature of the condition itself.

The value of this precaution will appear abundantly hereafter.

Such being the general principles that should direct the student in the pursuit of scientific truth, it may be well to remind him what the truth is that he is so to pursue, for much time and toil have been wasted and much brain power expended in a vain chase after the *unknowable*. There is a limit to the range of the human intelligence and of that limit there should be a distinct conception in the mind of the seeker after truth.

Clearly understand that absolute truth is unattainable by Man, at least in this stage of his being. We can attain to nothing more than *relative* truth—by which term is intended that knowledge which, according to the conditions of our structure, presents itself to ourselves as truth. Our senses are constructed to receive and perceive only an infinitesimal fraction of the things that exist even immediately about us. Of the far greater part of the actual being with which we are encompassed we know and can know nothing, because it is imperceptible to us. Only so much perceptive power is bestowed upon us as is necessary for existence in this world. It may be, as some Philosophers have taught, that the external fact is very different indeed from the mental conception of it. Nay, it is not impossible, although highly improbable, that

there may be no external existence at all and that nothing actually exists but in our own conceptions. These and such as these are ingenious conceits and conjectures and never can be more. They cannot be solved while we are what we are.

Practical Science thrusts aside all such inanities. It argues after this fashion: As absolute truth is simply unattainable, let us cease to seek for it. Relative truth being all that is permitted to us, let us accept the condition and for all practical purposes assume that to *be* the truth which appears to us to be the truth: which is to us truth for every use to which it can be applied—the truth upon which to build theories, or to pursue inquiry, or to base action. Let us take things as we find them, and employ the senses that have been given us expressly for the acquisition of *conditional* knowledge, placing them under the guidance of reason to direct them aright, but not in subjection to reason, so that argument shall supersede fact. When the indolent or the ignorant throw obstructions in your path of inquiry by saying “How do you know that this is what it appears?” answer by asserting that you are seeking only what *appears to be in this world*, and that you wait for another world and a new being differently structured in order to learn what *is*.

Half the controversies that waste the time and temper grow out of misunderstanding of *terms*. The same word often conveys half a dozen different meanings to as many persons. Some use them and receive them in their natural sense. Others systematically employ them in a non-natural sense. This is especially the failing of Theologians, as the history of religious controversy everywhere proves. But Scientific controversy is almost equally disturbed by this besetting sin. Hence the necessity for commencing with a definition of all terms to which different meanings are likely to be attached. *Correctness* of definition is of secondary importance to *agreement* in definition. All that is requisite is that writer and reader should understand any particular term



as conveying to both the same idea. A humble but honest endeavour is made in this treatise to observe this rule even at the hazard of tediousness. Writers often refrain from definition, imagining that the reader will resent the explaining to him of that which he should be assumed to know. Many well informed persons have very vague ideas connected with words, mistaking words for thoughts. Even the most accurate thinkers will be benefitted by the assurance that they are at one with the writer in the conception which he intended to convey. This is emphatically the case in the obscure problems of Psychology, a Science which has ever been the Paradise of indefinite words, hazy thoughts and non-natural interpretations of familiar terms. Therefore the reader is earnestly exhorted to adhere strongly and sturdily to the rule—not to enter upon a fight of *words*. Insist upon having plainly before you the precise *thing* that is in contest. Adhere to it yourself and insist upon it with others.

Prepossession is the great enemy of truth. A really open mind is the rarest of spectacles. The vast majority even of those who call themselves truth-seekers are not really seeking to find honestly and fearlessly what is true—but striving to prove something to be true or not true. They are not consciously dishonest. They deceive themselves. But entirely as is the spirit in which an inquiry is approached so will be the result. The mind unconsciously accepts evidence in favour of its prepossessions which otherwise it would reject as worthless. So it rejects evidence adverse to its prepossessions which it would embrace with eagerness if it pointed the other way or if there were a real resolve to ascertain the very truth. But difficult as the task undoubtedly is, the duty is plain for the student of Science to banish all pre-judgments and preferences, to throw aside all assumptions of pre-existing truths and all dominant ideas, and with a perfectly open mind to note facts and pursue investigations, never pausing for a moment to ask to what conclusions they point, however they may appear to be opposed to

as conveying to both the same idea. A humble but honest endeavour is made in this treatise to observe this rule even at the hazard of tediousness. Writers often refrain from definition, imagining that the reader will resent the explaining to him of that which he should be assumed to know. Many well informed persons have very vague ideas connected with words, mistaking words for thoughts. Even the most accurate thinkers will be benefitted by the assurance that they are at one with the writer in the conception which he intended to convey. This is emphatically the case in the obscure problems of Psychology, a Science which has ever been the Paradise of indefinite words, hazy thoughts and non-natural interpretations of familiar terms. Therefore the reader is earnestly exhorted to adhere strongly and sturdily to the rule—not to enter upon a fight of *words*. Insist upon having plainly before you the precise *thing* that is in contest. Adhere to it yourself and insist upon it with others.

Prepossession is the great enemy of truth. A really open mind is the rarest of spectacles. The vast majority even of those who call themselves truth-seekers are not really seeking to find honestly and fearlessly what is true—but striving to prove something to be true or not true. They are not consciously dishonest. They deceive themselves. But entirely as is the spirit in which an inquiry is approached so will be the result. The mind unconsciously accepts evidence in favour of its prepossessions which otherwise it would reject as worthless. So it rejects evidence adverse to its prepossessions which it would embrace with eagerness if it pointed the other way or if there were a real resolve to ascertain the very truth. But difficult as the task undoubtedly is, the duty is plain for the student of Science to banish all pre-judgments and preferences, to throw aside all assumptions of pre-existing truths and all dominant ideas, and with a perfectly open mind to note facts and pursue investigations, never pausing for a moment to ask to what conclusions they point, however they may appear to be opposed to



established dogmas, presumed laws of nature, or previous knowledge or experience. As yet we are but on the threshold of our knowledge of nature, her forces and her laws, and to argue *à priori* for or against the existence of any asserted fact, howsoever new and strange, is simply an act of presumptuous ignorance. The one scientific duty is to investigate with honest purpose to learn if it be a *fact*, and finding it so to be to assert it as such, even though it fly in the face of all existing theories and assumptions. To do this demands the loftiest *moral courage*, that rarest of all virtues but the more rare the more to be honoured.

There is an obstinate *rejection* of evidence equally fatal to the acquisition of truth with the too ready acceptance of it. This state of mind is the product of intense self-conceit and is usually associated with crass ignorance, the necessary consequence of shutting out wisdom by so many entrances. There are persons, not few, who positively pride themselves on this their folly. Nothing shall disturb their confidence in their own preformed opinions. They dare not say that their minds are closed against all evidence that does not square with their prepossessions. They say aloud, "I am open to conviction;" but they say mentally, "It will take a great deal to convince me." Facts and arguments are alike wasted on minds so constituted. They have ever dogged the advancing footsteps of science, meeting every new discovery with an incredulous sneer, saying, so far as looks can speak, "What a superior mind is mine to yours. I am not to be imposed upon." Eyes and ears are in such persons obstinately closed against proofs, however cogent, or if the evidence of their senses compels an admission of the fact, they offer some explanation infinitely more impossible or improbable than the fact they dispute. They deny to others the possession of the very senses they claim to have exercised for themselves. The only manner of dealing with such minds is to ignore them. Repudiate alike their testimony and their opinions. Treat them as being neces-

sarily ignorant and incompetent, from their imperfect mental structure, to be heard upon any question of science. Waste neither breath nor time in argument with them. Tell them frankly that they are incapacitated and refuse to hold with them any scientific discussion.

---



## CHAPTER VIII.

## THE PLAN PROPOSED.

INVESTIGATION of Psychological phenomena requires to be conducted upon a definite plan, so that the relationship of the various phases presented by them may be distinctly seen and how they grow one out of another. The Reader will be at once surprised and pleased to discover how nearly allied they are, how the more rare and seemingly the most strange are but gradual expansions of the most familiar and natural and how all converge upon one focus to compel the investigator to the conclusion that the Mechanism of Man is moved, and its motions determined, by an indwelling intelligent force, other than that of the material structure or of any of the known physical forces, thus giving *scientific* proof that Man is something more and other than the material molecular body; that the Conscious Self is a non-molecular being—call it Soul, or Spirit, or what you will—possessing the molecular structure, but as a distinct and definite entity capable of partial and of complete separation from it.

The plan proposed for this inquiry, conducted strictly according to scientific rule, into the psychological phenomena exhibited in the abnormal conditions of that mechanism is to begin with the most frequent and familiar, whose existence is undisputed — such as Sleep and Dream, Delirium and Insanity.

To advance from these to the unquestioned conditions, whose phenomena, being of less frequent occurrence, are less familiar and therefore excite in us surprise; but which, in fact are not more wondrous

or unaccountable than the phenomena whose greater frequency has destroyed their strangeness. Such are the phenomena of Catalepsy, Trance and Natural Somnambulism.

We shall proceed lastly to the Phenomena whose existence is disputed by some, but which are confidently asserted by scientific and other investigators, of at least equal competency, as having been proved to their perfect conviction—there being between these two parties the important difference, that the one has witnessed what it affirms and speaks from personal knowledge and positive experiments, the other has not witnessed the phenomena it denies but disputes them by *à priori* argument alone. Such are the phenomena of Artificial Somnambulism and Psychism.

In pursuance of this plan, the abnormal action of the Mechanism of Man will be described under eight classes, although, in fact, they meet and blend at so many points and pass so insensibly one into the other that it is impossible to draw any definite boundaries for any one of them. It must be understood that many of these phenomena belong to two or more of the categories into which, for convenience, they are here classified. But the general arrangement will be thus :

1. The phenomena of Sleep and Dream.
  2. The phenomena of Delirium and Insanity.
  3. The phenomena of Catalepsy.
  4. The phenomena of Natural Somnambulism.
  5. The phenomena of Artificial Somnambulism.
  6. The phenomena of Ecstasy and Trance.
  7. The phenomena of Psychism.
-



## BOOK III.

### OF SLEEP AND DREAM.

---

#### CHAPTER I.

#### WHAT SLEEP IS.

SLEEP is necessary to the health of the human organism. The Mechanism of Man depends for its sustentation and reparation upon recurring seasons of rest.

The condition of sleep is probably a requirement of organic structure. So far as we can trace it, all animal life sleeps. There is almost conclusive evidence that vegetable life sleeps also.

In this respect organic structure differs from inorganic structure. Minerals do not sleep. Only things that have *life* sleep.

But sleep is not a suspension of vital action. The processes conducted by the vital force continue their work in sleep, often more vigorously. The intelligence, also, is not wholly suspended in sleep. The functions of nutrition are performed even more perfectly than in the waking state. Rest appears to be required mainly for the muscular structure and for the nerve system that moves the muscles. The senses are often wholly, always partially, sealed in sleep. But it is doubtful if this be the result of a requirement for rest by the senses. The more probable inference is that the suspension of

the senses is necessary to the suspension of muscular action.

Sleep, therefore, may be defined in general terms as the suspension, more or less perfect, of the action of the external senses, so that they cease to convey vividly to the mind the impressions made upon them. The action of the Will is likewise suspended, so that it ceases to convey the commands of the mind to the body. Thus is the rest procured that is required for the body.

The entire mechanism of the body and mind does not sleep but only a part of it. In sleep the *body* performs all functions necessary for its continued healthy being. The *mind* dreams. The consciousness of the Individual Self is awake, for we note our dreams as they occur, believe that we are acting them and remember them afterwards.

---



## CHAPTER II.

## THE PHYSIOLOGY OF SLEEP.

VARIOUS conjectures have been advanced as to the precise physiological change that attends the condition of sleep. Some have located the source of sleep in the heart and others in the head. It was formerly a favourite theory that the action of the heart slackened and then the blood, flowing slowly through the brain, caused a kind of congestion there. This was, in fact, to look upon sleep as a species of coma that produced unconsciousness by pressure upon the fibres of the brain.

The later and better opinion is, that sleep is produced by the reverse of this process: that it is not a state of congestion but of collapse; that the blood flows *from* the part of the brain that sleeps, which is thus left in a state of depletion, with a consequent collapse of the brain fibres.

Observation of the actual brain of a man who had been trepanned and over a part of whose brain a movable silver plate was placed entirely confirmed this conjecture. In sleep the convolutions of his brain were depressed; when awake they resumed their normal form; when his mind was exerted they swelled visibly.

Any reader who has been suddenly wakened may recal a sensation as of swelling of the brain by the blood rushing into it. This sensation was probably the result of the rapid erection of the flaccid brain fibres.

Other facts strongly support this theory. When the action of the heart is stimulated by any excitement, mental or bodily, sleep will not come. So long as the

brain is busy we court sleep in vain. To induce sleep we apply remedies that tend to draw the blood from the brain to the extremities. A full meal engenders sleep; but not, as formerly supposed, by congesting the brain, but by attracting the blood to the stomach and so depleting the brain.

Note in another the process of "falling asleep." The eyes move more and more slowly, the eyelids descend, the head nods and droops, the limbs relax, the book drops from the hand. Usually before positive sleep occurs involuntary endeavours are made to resist it. The eyes open with a stare. Consciousness is regained with an effort and a start. The thread of waking thought is resumed. But for a moment only. Again the head nods, the eyes blink and close, the limbs relax. He is *asleep*.

What are our own sensations when we *go to sleep*? Thought wanders. Ideas come straying into the mind unbidden and with no apparent association. External objects grow dim to the eye and sounds fall faint upon the ear. The communications of the senses to the brain are dull and uncertain. We are conscious that the power of the *Will* is relaxed. We strive to retain it. We recover it by an effort. We resume the work on which we were engaged. Vain the struggle. The thoughts wander still. The unbidden pictures flit again before the mind's eye. We are conscious of the relaxation of the limbs and the closing of the eyelids. Then we cease to be conscious of external existence. We sleep.

But we are not conscious of *the act* of falling asleep—for itself is a suspension of consciousness. With some sleepers sleep is, as they affirm, a condition of entire unconsciousness. These tell us they have no sense of existence until the moment of waking and that, however protracted their slumber, the moment of waking is to them as the moment after having fallen asleep. It is impossible to contradict those who thus affirm, for their mental condition in sleep cannot be read. But if a judgment may be formed from their *actions* in sleep, as



talking and motions of the limbs, the probable explanation will be that they dream but do not remember their dreams. *All* dreams vanish from *their* memories as *some* dreams vanish from the memories of those who habitually dream.

If we observe the aspect of a sleeper, we note the features placid, the breathing regular, the pulse soft and even, the limbs relaxed, the skin moist. Occasionally there are quiverings of the limbs and expressions of the face which betray the presence of mental emotions.

This is the *physiological* condition of Sleep.

We turn now to its *mental* condition.

## CHAPTER III.

## THE MENTAL CONDITION OF SLEEP.

OF all the phenomena exhibited in Psychology and Mental Physiology there is none more marvellous than that which is presented to every one of us every night. It only does not astonish us because it is so familiar. Perhaps the reason why so few have given a moment of reflection to its marvels is because they are seen so often. When the attention of the reader is more closely invited to these phenomena he will doubtless be surprised to find what a world of wonder is opened to him.

The passage from waking to sleeping is momentary. The closest observer of his own mental action fails to note it. But what a change is made in that moment! A complete mental revolution has been effected. The man himself has changed entirely. He has ceased to be a rational being! He is almost wholly severed from the external world, which exists for him no longer! His *Will* (which is the name we give to the *expression* of the Conscious Self) is paralysed. He has ceased to command his thoughts and his emotions. He has no control over his limbs. With the sole exception that he dreams he is but a breathing clod. Of the forces that move his Mechanism life alone is active, working steadily and harmoniously as before. As we shall presently see, the other forces that move and direct the mechanism—the forces of *Mind* and *Soul*—are not inactive. But they have withdrawn from their waking work. They exist and their existence is manifest. But they have ceased to control and the mechanism has ceased to obey.



Some proof this—is it not?—that these Psychic Forces are distinct from the vital force and from the physical forces and flow from another source. These phenomena of sleep supply further and most cogent evidence of the fallacy of the contention by the Materialists that the vital force alone governs the mechanism of Man and that all the forces that direct the mechanism are generated by the machine itself.

In sleep the vital force continues to do its normal work. At the same moment some other force or forces are engaged in doing abnormal work, thus establishing the fact that some force or forces, other than the vital force or the physical forces, are employed in moving the mechanism of Man.

Pause to think for a moment what is this wonderful mental change that in a moment converts *the Man* into something less than a mere animal—into little more than a senseless vegetable!

What, then, is the *mental* process of sleep?

The first perceptible signs of its coming are what are well called “wandering thoughts.” The Will resigns its control, at first fitfully, then at intervals continually diminishing. Nevertheless the Will strives to retain its hold upon the brain, then relaxes, then seizes it again, but with ever lessening power. “*Attention*” to the subject before the mind wanders—is recalled—wanders again—and then ceases altogether.

With this relaxation of the *Will* and consequently of “attention”—which is an effort of the Will—ideas begin to flow unbidden into the mind. At first they are banished almost as soon as they appear. But presently they return and disturb the train of waking thought; then they mingle with it; then they put it altogether to rout and usurp its place. At the beginning, we are competent to sever the intruding ideas from the true ones and we make an effort to banish them if we desire to be wakeful. But they return ever more vividly and persistently until at length they take full possession of the mind. If we are courting sleep, we welcome the intruders

and willingly resign the control of our thoughts. In either case the state of actual sleep occurs at the instant when the *Will* ceases to work actively and *attention* ends.

Then begins the condition of *Dream*, to be treated of presently.

Our business now is to trace, so far as we can, the *mental* change that attends the condition of sleep. The phenomena just described are the action of the mind in the process of *falling asleep*. The *state of sleep* presents other features.

The mental condition of sleep, apart from dream, is very remarkable and should be carefully noted and remembered by the Student of Psychology.

The *Senses* are suspended—but not entirely. They are rather dulled than paralysed. We hear imperfectly and we are unable to measure sound. Often a loud noise is not heard when a whisper wakens; a slight sound seems to the sleeper like the report of cannon. The sense of touch is only dulled, as we know by the manner in which it influences dream. Whether the sense of sight ceases entirely we cannot know, because the eyelids veil the eyes and external impressions are consequently not made upon them. Taste and smell are dimmed but not effaced.

---



## CHAPTER IV.

## THE SEAT OF SLEEP.

THESE facts point to the conclusion that the partial paralysis to which the senses are subjected in sleep does not occur at the points of communication with the external world but somewhere between the extremity of the sense-nerves and the brain or at the point of communication between the brain and the Conscious Self. There can be little doubt that in sleep impressions are made upon the nerves as when we are awake. There is some evidence that the impressions so made are conveyed by the afferent nerve to the ganglion at the base of the brain hemispheres. The experiments of Professor FERRIER have proved this ganglion to be the centre upon which the sense-nerves converge; that to this centre those impressions are conveyed and thence are transmitted to the brain hemispheres, or that at this point the hemispheres of the intelligence receive notice of their presence.

In Sleep the brain is unable to convey its commands to the body. The nerves do not obey. Something that operates between the brain and the nerves, and which was active in the waking state, is inactive in sleep. What is that *something*? It is the *Will*. The Will has wholly or partially ceased to act and thus the body has ceased to be controlled by the mind. This is the process by which the needful rest of the body is brought about.

Here the question comes, in what part of the mechanism does the change occur that thus causes the suspension of

the power of the Will and the partial severance of the Conscious Self from its normal control of the body? *How* does sleep accomplish so great a revolution? If the whole mental mechanism were inactive in sleep this question would be answered easily. We should say, "the entire of the brain is sleeping and therefore the whole mechanism is at rest. The motive forces that move and direct the machine in its waking state have ceased for a time from their work and the structure stands still."

But that is *not* the condition. All the forces have not ceased from their work. The vital force continues in full activity, keeping the machinery in motion and performing the work of nutrition, reparation and growth. The *mind* is not at rest; the phenomena of dream directly contradict such a conclusion. The whole mental mechanism is certainly not at rest. A part of it is very busy. The hemispheres of the brain are not sleeping—or sleeping but partially. They are enacting dreams. They are in truth working with infinitely greater speed and power when we are asleep than when we are awake!

If, then, the brain hemispheres are waking above and the body is sleeping below, the communication between them must be severed by sleep at some part of the mechanism below the brain hemispheres (which are the mechanism of the Intelligence) and the point where the brain branches into the nerve system—which is the mechanism by whose action the vital force forms and sustains the organic structure.

*That point is obviously the point at which the Will exercises its power of control over the body.* Thus does this inquiry into the Psychology of Sleep and Dream promise to throw light upon that mysterious part of the mechanism of man. Professor FERRIER has proved that the Will is exercised through the brain hemispheres, which are the organs of the Intelligence. In the waking and normal condition of the structure the Will commands and controls the body. In sleep and other abnormal



conditions the Will ceases to command the body. Between the brain hemispheres and the nerves that move the body something seems to be interposed which either paralyses the Will or ceases to transmit its commands. What is that *something*? Anatomically we find two ganglia, one being the centre upon which the nerves of the senses converge. We know, also, that in sleep the senses cease to transmit their impressions or do so but dimly. The conclusion is that the seat of sleep is in this ganglion. Because that is slumbering the commands of the Will cannot be conveyed from the brain to the body nor can the messages sent by the senses from the body be conveyed to the brain.

It is a moot point if the entire of the mechanism of the brain, or parts of it only and what parts, fall into the condition of sleep. But, however that may be, there can be little doubt, from the facts stated above, that the ganglion at the base of the brain hemispheres is the seat of sleep. It is certain that the entire of the two brain hemispheres does not always sleep, or dream could not be. We have no certain knowledge if the ganglion that interposes between the cerebral centre and the body and whence streams the nerve system succumbs to sleep. The presumption is that it does not, for the nerves whose office is to sustain the functions of the vital organs do not sleep. Why they need not the rest that is required by other parts of the mechanism we do not know. Rest appears to be necessary for that portion of the mechanism only that is subject to *voluntary action*. Where *the Will* controls, the repose of sleep is required for all structure subjected to it. Why?

Does the nerve system that moves the mechanism of the body sleep? The bonds that link brain and body are relaxed. The Will has ceased to control either of them. The material form is at rest. But it rests only because the power of the controlling Will is paralysed. All *involuntary* actions continue and with the more regularity and efficiency because they are not subjected to the disturbing influences of the Will.

And what is this potent Will?

*The Will* is merely the expression of the Conscious Self—the power which the Conscious Self exercises over the material mechanism of the body and through the body upon the material world without.



## CHAPTER V.

## OF DREAM.

As already stated, at the first approach of sleep we are conscious of inability so to control our thoughts as to keep them in the orderly train they had been pursuing previously. Ideas come uncalled for. Pictures rise before the mental eye and vanish instantly. Other pictures intrude having no apparent association with their predecessors. They enter and pass before us unbidden. The mind falls into confusion. There is entanglement of the threads of thought. Even while the eye is yet open the objects on which it gazes fade and vanish. Sounds fall faintly upon the ear and die away. The vision of the mind grows dim or is eclipsed by other unsummoned pictures, often altogether incongruous, which blend with the picture present, then melt into it, then usurp its place and then are in their turn displaced. We are conscious that we can no longer control the movements of the mind. Momentary resistance to the influence of the coming sleep but provokes its more vigorous return. For an instant we wake with a start to consciousness of the external world. If we desire to be wakeful we exert the Will fitfully, revive to waking life for a moment, contract the relaxed muscles, open the drooped eyelids, stare with a peculiar expression of imbecile amazement and strive to look as if we had *not* been surprised by sleep. For awhile the mind resumes its normal action. But soon the thoughts are once more dislocated and replaced by a swarm of yet more dissevered ideas. We exhibit again the dropping lid, the relaxing muscle, the nodding head. Strive as we may, we are unable to note the moment

when unconsciousness begins. We remember *falling asleep*, but we do not remember, and no human being has ever yet remembered, the very act of *going to sleep*.

The mental condition of *falling asleep* resembles very closely the dissolving views at exhibitions. So do the pictures of the mind steal into the field of view and mingle and melt away, nor can we discover where one ceases and the other begins, so imperceptibly do they glide in and blend.

We sleep.

What is then our *mental* condition?

It is a condition of *partial* unconsciousness. In this respect it differs from the condition of coma and of trance, in which there is *entire* unconsciousness. In the most profound sleep perfect unconsciousness never prevails. Impressions may be made upon the senses of the soundest sleeper that will waken him. The degree of oblivion caused by sleep varies immensely with various persons and with all persons at various times. Some are "light" and others "heavy" sleepers. Some are wakened by the slightest noise or the gentlest touch. Others will slumber though rudely shaken, or while cannon are roaring. It is a remarkable fact, not yet sufficiently explained, that a whisper will often waken a sleeper by whose side a gun might be fired without disturbing him. Others answer aloud to questions whispered to them when sleeping and there are recorded cases of conversations being thus sustained and inconvenient revelations made by the sleeper which have astonished him on their subsequent repetition—there being in such case no after memory of the dialogue so strangely conducted.

The *senses*, therefore, are but partially sealed in sleep. They are dulled, not paralysed. They convey imperfect sensations—or the sensations conveyed are imperfectly perceived—we know not which. As will be shown presently, they more or less influence mental action. They suggest dreams. But their reflex action has ceased. The nerves that convey the messages to the brain are



sluggish. The nerves that convey the consequent message from the brain to the body are for the most part inactive.

The aspect of the sleeper to the observer is that of unconsciousness. Motions of the limbs occur at times, but they are involuntary. He seems dead to the external world and to have ceased from active life.

Nevertheless, while that form is so still and seemingly so senseless—while consciousness of a world without is suspended—in this sleep that has been called the twin brother of death—the senseless sleeper is making a world and living a life of his own within himself. That brain is not sleeping with that body. It is awake and busy—often more busy than when the body is awake. It is enacting whole dramas—living new lives—wandering away among worlds of its own creation—crowding into an hour the events of years—doing, saying, seeing, hearing, feeling, even while we gaze, a hundredfold more than the waking senses could possibly convey or the waking frame perform.

Is it not marvellous when we thus think of it? Would it not be pronounced incredible—impossible—the narrator a “rogue and vagabond”—the believer a credulous fool—were it not that it is *a fact* familiar to all of us? Is it not in itself as marvellous as any of the phenomena of other abnormal mental conditions, which are received with incredulity and ridicule only because they are of less frequent occurrence and less familiar?

But before we pursue the inquiry into the phenomena of Dream it will be necessary to describe the material mechanism by the operations of which they are produced.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

## THE MATERIAL MECHANISM OF DREAM.

It is difficult to describe, without the use of technical terms, the structure of the mechanism by which Dream is produced. But as these are at once unintelligible and repulsive to the non-scientific reader, indulgence is entreated for an endeavour to present the subject in shape and language that may be understood by everybody.

It must be premised that this description is partly derived from the recent treatise of Professor FERRIER on "The Functions of the Brain,"\* in which he details the experiments that have thrown so much light alike upon physiology and psychology.

The spinal cord expands at its upper end into a ganglion or cluster of nerves called the *medulla oblongata*.

At this point the brain is said to cease and the nerve system to begin. But there is no perceptible beginning nor ending either of the brain or of the nerves. The entire nerve system is, in fact, only an extension of the brain. When a nerve is irritated at the point of the finger the brain as well as the nerve is affected. The nerve transmits the sensation and the brain feels it. Psychologists would venture a step further and say, "It is not the brain that feels, but the intelligent individual entity, the living *soul* or *self*, of whom the brain is only the material transmitting organ."

---

\* *The Functions of the Brain*. By DAVID FERRIER, M.D., F.R.S. London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1876.



It is at the extremity of this ganglion that the cords wrapped within that great bundle of nerve threads which constitutes the spinal cord cross each other and pass into opposite sides of the brain and of the body. The nerves that control the left side of the body pass into the right side of the brain and those that control the right side of the body pass into the left side of the brain. As the consequence of this exchange, the right side of the brain controls and directs the left side of the body, and the left side of the brain the right side of the body.

Above this basal ganglion, but connected with it, is a ganglion which anatomists have divided into two parts, but which for the present purpose it will be convenient to recognise as one whole lying at the base of the brain and crowned and inclosed by the cerebral hemispheres. From this great basal ganglion small white threads radiate into the two cerebral hemispheres, in the form of a hollow cone.

Above the basal ganglion lies another great ganglion (the *cerebellum*), also divided into lobes, and which is connected with the basal ganglion by two bands (or peduncles). It is connected also with the two cerebral hemispheres by two bands. It is connected with the central ganglion by a thin lamina, which stretches to the other ganglia, thus connecting all the ganglia with the centres of the senses and the centres of motion—that is to say, with the centre that receives the messages of the senses and with the centre that conveys the commands of the Will to the body.

Above and extending in front of these is the *cerebrum*, the organ of the intelligence, composed of *two* hemispheres which crown, inclose, and overlap the ganglia at the base of the brain.

These two great hemispheres are distinct bodies, each complete in itself. They are united by fibres that pass from one to the other and thus secure joint and co-ordinate action. These fibres are observed to connect together corresponding regions of the two hemispheres.

At their bases the two hemispheres are in direct

contact with the ganglion above described as the central ganglion, but which has been anatomically subdivided into two pairs of ganglia. For the purposes of this treatise, however, notice of the more minute subdivisions of the brain mechanism is not necessary.

This ganglion is the centre upon which all the nerves of the senses converge. Each of its divisions is supposed to be appropriated to a distinct sense. But even if each part has its own work to do, it is not less a whole than are the cerebral hemispheres, which are now proved to be a machine, various parts of which are devoted to various mental operations.

The cerebral hemispheres are formed of great bundles of fibres, in the shape of rolls, plainly visible on the outside, but which baffle the attempts of the most dexterous anatomist to unfold them below the surface.

And the whole brain is covered with an extremely delicate and highly sensitive membrane.

The substance of the brain itself is insensible, although it is the recipient and supposed seat of the pains and pleasures of the body—or rather of the nerves, for what we call the body is only the *insensible* clothing of the sensitive nerves. The *nerves feel*; the flesh and bones do not feel.

Is not this fact another powerful argument *against* the doctrine of the Materialists, that consciousness and mind are only states of brain or conditions of matter? If the brain is not conscious of injuries done to itself, if it is insensible even to its own destruction, how can it be the "*Conscious Self*"?

But the enveloping membrane of the brain is exquisitely sensitive. It is the seat of headache, of *delirium tremens*, of brain fever, of hydrocephalus, and probably of many more diseases which we are wont to refer to the substance of the brain.

It is probable that this envelope of nerves unites all the parts of the brain and by transmitting to each part the condition of all the other parts produces that co-ordination of parts and unity of action so necessary to



healthy life. But this membrane of nerve cannot surely be deemed by the most bigoted Materialist to constitute the Conscious Self.

Professor FERRIER has proved, by a multitude of minutely detailed experiments, that not only has each ganglion its proper function, but that each part of each ganglion is devoted to some special duty, thus completely shattering the theory that holds every mental operation to be an act of the whole brain. He has established the grand basis of modern mental Science, the recognition of the fact that the brain is the material organ of the mind; that distinct parts of the brain are devoted to distinct mental operations; that not the whole brain, but only parts of it, are employed in any mental operation. But it is yet for observation and experiment to ascertain what are the parts of the brain so appropriated to mental functions, and what is the precise function of each part.

Professor FERRIER has made considerable advance towards the determination of this question. His experiments have demonstrated what are the functions of the ganglia at the base of the brain, not being the seat of the Intelligence. His experiments were attended with more cruelty than I could excuse even for the important accessions they have brought to knowledge. But they are not therefore the less valuable as contributions to Physiology and Psychology. I can but briefly describe the *results* of such of them as bear immediately upon the subject of this inquiry.

Let me, however, first confirm, by the authority of Professor FERRIER, the proposition that various parts of the brain have various functions.

"That the brain is the organ of the mind," he says, "and that mental operations are possible only in and through the brain is now so thoroughly well established and recognised that we may, without further question, start from this as an ultimate fact." He proceeds:

The physiological activity of the brain is not, however, altogether co-extensive with its psychological functions. The brain as an organ of motion and sensation, or presentative consciousness, is

a single organ composed of two halves; the brain as an organ of ideation, or re-presentative consciousness, is a dual organ, each hemisphere complete in itself. When one hemisphere is removed or destroyed by disease, motion and sensation are abolished unilaterally, but mental operations are still capable of being carried on in their completeness through the agency of the one hemisphere. The individual who is paralysed as to sensation and motion by disease of the opposite side of the brain (say the right), is not paralysed mentally, for he can still feel and will and think and intelligently comprehend with the one hemisphere. If these functions are not carried on with the same vigour as before, they at least do not appear to suffer in respect of completeness.

As the object of this treatise is not anatomy but psychology, it will be unnecessary to describe minutely the entire of the brain structure. It will suffice for the present purpose to view the brain, above roughly sketched, as having *three* well marked divisions, each with definite and distinct functions.

(1.) The ganglia *at the base* of the brain govern the actions of the body. (2.) The ganglia *in the centre* of the brain are the recipients of the impressions made upon the senses and thus are we connected with the external world. (3.) The two hemispheres *at the summit* of the brain are the organs of the Intelligence.

Professor FERRIER's experiments were made with a view to ascertain whether the theory of Dr. CARPENTER is true, that the whole brain works in each mental action; or if the opposing doctrine be the true one, that the several parts of the brain have several and distinct functions. Dr. CARPENTER had prematurely boasted that he had killed this doctrine of brain division. But Professor FERRIER's experiments have decisively *disproved* the doctrine of Dr. CARPENTER and killed *his* theory of mental unity.

The experiments were conducted chiefly with monkeys and dogs. The former were the most valuable, because the brain structure of the monkey is almost identical with that of man.

The experiments were performed by producing insensibility by chloroform and then extracting in mass certain



portions of the brain, or by destroying parts of the brain by the actual cautery. Electrodes were applied to the parts to which access had been thus obtained and the effects of their stimulus upon the actions of the animal were carefully observed.

I will not attempt to detail these experiments—but merely state some of the results. For the many important facts that were discovered by them reference must be made to the valuable volume in which they are reported.

He found the entire brain to be connected with the body by interlacing of the nerve system. Excitation of the right brain was shown by the left side of the body; of the left brain by the right side. So it was with the nerves of the senses. Whether the like structure exists in the duplex organ of the Intelligence he could not trace, because the mental results were incapable of being expressed by experiment upon animals who cannot tell us what are their emotions. But he entertains no doubt that the same structural scheme exists also in the action of the two hemispheres of the Intelligence.

The great ganglia at the base of the brain, whether excited by electricity or destroyed by cautery, yielded the same result. They proved beyond doubt that *their* function is to direct the actions of the body under the peculiar conditions of its duplex structure—a formation by two distinct and not wholly similar halves joined together and requiring community of action. This process of separate action for each part, combined with motion in *co-ordination*,—that is to say, the regulation of the motions of the limbs so that the two halves of which the body is builded may act in definite relationship—was found to be the special business of those basal ganglia, any disturbance in them being attended with imperfect movements of the body, even to the extent of causing the animal to walk in a circle, having lost entirely the power to “walk straight.” The results of this ingenious experiment are extremely curious and throw great light on the physiology of locomotion.

The second division of the brain, lying in its centre, overlapped behind by the cerebrum, resting on the centres that direct bodily actions and dominated by the hemispheres that are the organs of the Intelligence, is shown by these experiments to be the centre upon which the senses converge. To this common centre the impressions made upon the senses by the external world are conveyed. The Professor's experiments seemed to indicate that a distinct ganglion is devoted to each sense, although all the ganglia are united in one mass for the common purpose of reception of the information brought to them. The destruction of different parts of this brain centre was found to be followed by the loss or impairment of different senses. It was found, also, that this part of the brain was duplex, like the other parts, for destruction of the right side of the ganglion caused paralysis of the senses on the left side of the body, and *vice versa*.

A question of much interest arises here. What is the precise function of this sense-receiving portion of the brain? Is *itself* perceptive of the sense-impressions brought to it or is it merely the medium for transmitting those impressions to the hemispheres above? There is no doubt that in health the same ganglion communicates to the organs of the Intelligence the same impressions that it receives, for we take cognisance of them in almost every mental act. We know also that when the brain is diseased false sense-impressions are conveyed to the Intelligence. But in exploring the psychology of sleep and dream, it would be very advantageous to ascertain if the sense portion of the brain that is recipient of the sense-impressions be an active or merely a passive agent.

The experiments of Professor FERRIER are almost conclusive upon this most important point. He removed the brain hemispheres of a monkey and of a dog. The animals lived and appeared to enjoy health; but *they had lost intelligence*. They had not, however, lost the use of the *senses*, and they were manifestly conscious of the



impressions brought by the nerves of sense. The external world continued to exist to them and was perceived by them as before the organs of the Intelligence were removed. But when the central division of the brain was taken away, and nothing left but the lower lobes that govern muscular motion, all the senses ceased to act, or consciousness of their action had ceased. Nevertheless the power of locomotion and the co-ordinate action of the limbs was preserved with very little loss of power. Removing the basal ganglion, the power of locomotion was lost and co-ordination of muscular action ceased.

Above the central sense-organ tower two hemispheres—*two* brains, in fact—each distinct and complete in itself and each competent to act without the other. The function of these brain hemispheres is to execute the processes we term *mental*. Hence they are the organs of the intellect and of the sentiments. Through them we think, reason, and feel. Injury to parts of them injures more or less, *not the whole mind*, but *parts of the mind*—certain mental faculties only. Destruction of the entire of these hemispheres is not death but idiocy, as proved by Professor FERRIER's experiments.

Let it then be clear in the mind of the reader, when surveying the phenomena of sleep and dream and inquiring into their causes, that for the purpose of such an outline of the Physiology of the Mind as this, the brain is to be viewed by him as having *three* marked divisions (1) the organ of the *Intelligence* at the summit, (2) the organ of the *senses* in the centre, (3) the organ of *bodily motion* at the base.

There are many sub-divisions of the brain known to anatomists and necessary to be known by the student of physiology. But these will suffice for the student of Psychology. They are easily understood and readily remembered.

In the waking and normal state the whole brain is awake, all its parts acting in concert and preserving strict co-ordination. The reasoning faculties correct the senses; the senses correct the imagination; the intelli-

gence controls the emotions; the emotions give vigour to the Will; the Will commands the entire mechanism of the body and expresses upon the external world the results of that combination of intelligent actions and emotions which we term "*the mind*."

In sleep this relationship is changed. The reasoning faculties cease to correct the senses; the senses no longer correct the imagination; the emotions are unable to influence the Will; the Will loses almost entirely its command of body and mind alike.

However it may be in dreamless sleep, in the condition of dream the *entire* mental mechanism certainly does not sleep. Some part of it is awake and active. What is that waking part?

It is beyond question that the cerebral hemispheres are wholly or partially awake in the process of dream. In deep sleep the sense-ganglia are wholly asleep. In all sleep the senses sleep, only sometimes not so profoundly as completely to exclude cognizance by the Conscious Self of the sense-borne impressions. Sleep affects also the ganglia at the base of the brain that control the action of the body. This, indeed, would appear to be the primary purpose of sleep. Sleep is obviously designed to give rest to the *material structure*—time for its growth and renovation. It is for this reason that *the Will*, which in the waking state directs the motions of the structure, ceases to control it during sleep. The Will itself wakes—for we are self-conscious in dream. In sleep, the material mechanism does not obey the command of the Will because itself is sleeping.

We arrive thus at the conclusion that the *central* and *basal* portions of the brain are the seat of sleep. Unless *they* sleep we do not sleep. If they sleep we sleep, even although both brain hemispheres should be wide awake.

And this raises the question, so important in the Psychology of Dream. Do the brain hemispheres, that duplex organ of the Intelligence, sleep wholly or partially, or do they continue to be awake while the sense-brain and the body-moving brain are sleeping?



This problem can be solved only by careful examination of the phenomena of dream. Suppose that Professor FERRIER could do with us as he did with the monkeys and dogs—take out a portion of the brain and so remove altogether its middle and basal sections, leaving the hemispheres alone in the skull. Would the hemispheres sleep wholly or in part? Or, if awake, would they exhibit the phenomena of dream as now?

Contemplate then, if you can, a duplex intelligent brain, in a state of activity but cut off from all communication with the external world through the media of the senses and from all control over the body;—in fact, an isolated, self-acting, self-contained mechanism, the organ of intelligence and emotion.

How would it work?

First, it must be set in *motion*. Thus we are brought directly to the problem, "What moves the mind?" Why does *this* particular thought or feeling rather than some other come into my mind?

The solution commonly accepted is that ideas come by *suggestion*. This means that ideas are, as it were, linked together and consequently that when one idea comes it is followed by certain other ideas which at some former time were connected with it. Probably the greater portion of the ideas that come to us, apparently without such association, are suggested by some impression brought by the senses but received by the sensorium unconsciously to ourselves and that thus the "train of thought" is started.

If it be so in our waking time, when the mind is busy with a multitude of impressions flowing in upon it from every sense, much more is it likely so to be when the impressions made by the senses are few. The experience of every reader will assure him that so it is. In sleep, a slight sound falling upon the ear will often suggest a dream of rattling thunder.

But the idea, once suggested, draws after it whole trains of associated ideas and these ideas excite the *emotions*, precisely as they would have done had each

idea been brought by the senses in the waking state. Thus far, then, we learn that the mental mechanism which produces what we call *ideas*, *sentiments* and *passions* are not asleep. Some if not all of them are certainly awake and as active as in waking life.

The Will, too, is not asleep although powerless to command. In dream we *will* to speak and do, but the body does not obey the Will, or obeys but partially. The efforts of the Will to command the limbs to move—as to escape from dreamed-of danger—and the failure of the limbs to obey are often attended with consciousness of painful efforts made in vain.

So far the phenomena of dream are consistent with the entire of the duplex organ of the Intelligence being awake while the lower portions of the brain are sleeping. Certainly it is difficult to conceive of parts of such a structure as the two brain hemispheres being asleep, relaxed and insensible, while other parts of it are awake and active.

For, if Professor FERRIER is right and distinct functions belong not only to each ganglion but to various parts of each ganglion, the brain hemispheres, which are the material mechanism of the Intelligence, must consist of many parts having different duties. We know that anatomically these parts, if they exist, are in intimate connexion, lying closely packed together, if not actually interlacing, and it is difficult to suppose that one part can be sleeping while its neighbour is awake, especially as sleep is attended, if not caused, by a depletion of blood from the fibres of the brain.

Nevertheless there are characteristics of Dream which appear to indicate a suspension of activity in some parts of the mental mechanism. Although perfectly conscious of the presence of the dream, we are unable to discover that it is not real; we cannot discern incongruities nor recognise impossibilities. The dead of long ago come to us and we are not amazed. We walk the waters and float in the air and are not astonished. Nothing is too impossible to be done and nothing too monstrous to be



implicitly believed. We are, in fact, *insane* in dream. Some faculty that corrects the action of the mind when we are awake is certainly absent or paralysed during dream. Upon waking, something must come to us from without or operate upon the mind within that restores us in a moment from the insanity of dream to the sanity of our waking lives, enabling us then to discern the false from the true, the shadow from the substance, the impossible from the possible.

What is this faculty present when we are awake, absent when we dream?

The solution most favoured by psychologists is that in sleep we lack the correcting influence of the senses. The mind, they say, having nothing wherewith to compare its own creations necessarily accepts them as realities. It puts implicit faith in the pictures of the dream, however monstrous, simply because they are presented to it precisely in the same manner as facts are presented when we are awake.

I confess to great doubt if this explanation be adequate. True, we believe the impossibilities of our dreams *to be* because they appear to the mind to be. But that does not explain the strange absence of perplexity and wonder when we witness (as we then verily believe) the dead alive, the distant near, and impossible things performed with ease. In our waking state, if the like dreams come into the mind at some moment of idleness, they are never mistaken for realities. Reason rejects them. If entertained for awhile it is but as a pleasant vision. Nor is the problem solved by the suggested slumber of the reasoning faculties. These are not always asleep in dream, for often we dream that we are exercising them readily and effectively. The power of reasoning employed in dream is, however, very limited. It can exercise itself on the *subject* of the dream but not upon its surroundings. It is not uncommon for the sleeper to dream that he is making a speech or preaching a sermon. The discourse is argumentative and logical. It is not merely that he dreams

he is logical. He is so in fact, for the dream is often remembered and no flaw is found in the argument. Nevertheless, at the moment our reasoning faculties are constructing a strictly logical and perfectly rational discourse—they are unable to inform us—as when we are awake they would—that the place where we suppose the speech to be spoken, the occurrence and the occasion, are not merely fictitious but attended with the most palpable absurdities.

Contemplating the structure of the brain hemispheres, it is difficult to infer that one or more parts of them only are sleeping while the other parts are awake. May not the solution of the problem be found in the fact that we have *two* brains? Is it not possible that, in the condition of dream, one hemisphere—that is, one mind—may be awake while the other is asleep and that thus the phenomena of dream are produced?

To answer this it is necessary to inquire what must be the action of *two* brains working, like the two eyes, together or separately?

For the common purposes of life the two brains, like the two eyes and the two ears, act in complete accord. As with the two nerves of vision, they co-ordinate. Either can act alone for the ordinary uses of existence, just as one eye will do the usual work of sight. But as we see more perfectly, extensively and roundly with two eyes than with one—so it may be reasonably concluded that we think more truly and clearly and feel more strongly when the two brains act together than when one is working alone. The faculty of *comparison* is one of the most important of the mental powers, for it is the basis of accurate knowledge. But it may be doubted if this faculty in one brain can do its work unless assisted by the action of the other brain, for this reason: Unlike the other mental faculties, “comparison” can only exercise itself upon *two* ideas. Its special function is to make us conscious of the resemblances and differences between any two or more ideas presented to it. Consequently its office cannot be performed unless there is presented to it



two ideas to be contrasted. But our perceptions are successive. One brain presenting only one idea at any instant of time is incompetent to provide the materials wherewith comparison can work. The act of *comparison* cannot, therefore, be done without the co-ordinate action of both brains. This, in healthy waking life is effected instantly, perfectly and unconsciously, by means of the power of co-ordination possessed by the two hemispheres. But if one hemisphere is sleeping, the faculty of "comparison" in the waking brain is thereby disabled from the exercise of its function of *comparing*.

Such being the action of the waking brain, does sleep present any conditions that might be explained in like manner? Suppose the state of dream to be the slumber of one hemisphere only, the other being awake; may not this solve the problem? I suggest it merely.

In dream, believing shadows to be substances, ideas, things, incongruities natural and impossibilities realities, we are not surprised and reason is not shocked.

Nothing of these results presents itself when we are awake. Why?

Waking, the faculty of *Comparison* is enabled to do its work. It compares the idea with the reality, the shadow with the substance, the dream within with the impression without, the present picture of the mind with the stored knowledge of the past. The *differences* being thus discovered, the mind dismisses the ideal pictures as being the mere visions that they are.

But inasmuch as two ideas cannot be presented at the same instant of time by one brain hemisphere, the presence of the two ideas requisite to the process of comparison can be had only by the combined action of *both* hemispheres. Hence the usual inability of persons afflicted with hemiplegia to compare or reason accurately.

But, however this may be, it does not disturb the conclusion that the *seat of sleep* is in the ganglia at the base of the brain. That portion of the brain which directs the motions of the body sleeps always. Sleep reigns more or less perfectly in the central portions of the brain

that receive the impressions of the senses. Sleep is very partial in the hemispheres that form the duplex organ of the Intelligence, and *probably*—(for it is as yet only conjectural)—partial sleep prevails there, if at all, by the contrivance of slumber of the whole or parts of one hemisphere while the other is wholly or in part awake.

Such being the *Physiology* of Dream—so far as science has yet succeeded in tracing it—we proceed now to investigate its *Psychology*.

---



## CHAPTER VII.

## THE PSYCHOLOGY OF DREAM.

THE base of the brain being quite asleep, the central ganglia being partially asleep, the cerebral hemispheres, or some parts of them, being awake, we have the *physiological* condition in which the phenomena of Dream occur.

The first coming on of Dream is found at the moment of "falling asleep," before actual sleep has begun. *Then* we *are* conscious for an instant that we are dreaming—that the mental impressions are not external realities. But this consciousness is for a moment only. Either we start into waking life and the incipient dream is banished, or we fall into actual sleep and the condition of complete dream is established.

The process is worthy of note. You are engaged in some occupation; say, you are reading a novel. You "feel sleepy;" your eyes continue to pass over the page; your mind pictures the persons, actions and emotions of the story. By degrees the ideas become dim and shadowy and the *attention* flags. Then your mind wanders away to other scenes and persons which come into it uncalled for and even against your Will. But the power of that Will is lessening also. At first it is strong to banish the intruding thoughts; but as "the attention" relaxes more and more, so more and more does your Will cease to control the now thick-coming fancies. In that incipient stage of dream you know that these dream-pictures are only dreams. Never do you mistake them for realities. Soon the influence of sleep steals over the mind. The eyelids close and exclude the impressions of

the external world that are made through the sense of sight. The other senses are paralysed also. The creations of the brain take full possession of the mind. You are now *asleep* and *dreaming*.

If the condition of dream were not so familiar—if it did not occur to all of us, but only to some few persons in abnormal conditions, it would appear to the whole world as very wonderful. Suppose that dreaming were a faculty possessed only by persons of a certain constitution; that a Dreamer had told you how, when he was asleep, he saw and conversed with the dead, beheld distant places, lived another life, walked upon water, flew through the air, performed impossibilities, felt passions and sentiments, exercised intellectual powers far exceeding those of his waking life, should we not say of him that he was a madman or an impostor? Would he not be prosecuted by the High Priests of physical science as “a rogue and vagabond,” and sent to prison by the Scientists or to an asylum by the Doctors?

But because all of us do these things nightly the wonder of them does not strike us. We do not pause to think how great the marvel is nor how it comes *to be*. May I venture to hope that the reader will be induced to look upon this marvellous mental phenomenon with some curiosity and hereafter to recognise, in the phenomena of dream, not only something to awaken curiosity, but something to command his serious attention, as being peculiarly fitted to reveal to the inquirer much of the mystery of Mind, its structure, its faculties, the manner of its action. The phenomena of dream open to us the path by which we may hope to make the first advances into the science of Psychology, for they are *facts* known to all, disputed by none, and which even the Materialists cannot deny. Happily, neither their vocabulary of abuse, nor their weapons of prosecution and persecution, can be directed against those who investigate the phenomena of dream. The existence of those phenomena cannot be denied, nor can they be explained away by attributing them to imposture or delusion.



How comes this transformation from sanity to insanity, wrought in a moment when Sleep has closed upon the mind the portals of the senses and left it, isolated from the real material external world, to revel in its own imaginary world?

Some rein that held the mind in check when awake has certainly been taken from it at the instant sleep occurs.

What is that lost rein—that paralysed power?

It is not *Consciousness*. We do not lose our individuality in dream. Never does the dreamer suppose himself to be another person. He may dream that he has assumed other characters,—that he is a king, or a beggar. But it is *himself* who has become a king and is *acting* king.

Nor is *the Will* absent. The dreaming mind is conscious of the exercise of its Will and believes that its commands are obeyed. But the Will is powerless to compel action. Its commands are *not* obeyed. In dream we *will* to speak, to run, to do what the body does freely when in our waking state we *will* to do. We *will* in dream as we *will* when awake; but the mechanism of the nerves that move the body refuses to obey the mandate of the Will, however strenuously exerted.

*Imagination*, on the other hand, is even more lively in dream than in our waking time.

The *Reasoning faculties* are not asleep, for we *argue*, often rightly—only we reason upon wrong premisses. We accept the visions of the mind—the ideas presented to the Conscious Self—as being *real* and then we reason upon them rationally. What Lawyer has not often dreamed that he was addressing a logical legal argument to an approving Court and, when wakened, remembering and reviewing that argument has found it to be without a flaw?

The *Emotions* are not extinguished when we dream. The presentation of imaginary incidents which, if they had been real, would have kindled the passions in waking life, rouse the self-same passions to equal if not to greater fury in dream. Nor is the *passion* fanciful. We do not

merely *dream* that we are angry. Very real and hot anger is kindled by the fancy-born picture of the dream, as the reader will readily discover if he recalls the sensation that attends upon being awakened at the moment of irritation in a dream. It is with the other passions and emotions as with anger. They are excited by the events of the dream precisely as if those events were real. Wherefore? Because the incidents appear to the mind to be *real*.

Thus by a process of exhaustion we may hope to arrive at some knowledge of the cause of the most remarkable and inexplicable characteristic of dream—that is to say, the *absolute belief we have in its reality during the enactment of the drama*. The inquiry cannot fail to throw a great light upon mental structure and upon the relationship of the mind (or soul) to the body and to the external world.

The first fact we learn, noting the action of the mind, when thus severed from communication with the external world, is its perfect independence, its entire unconsciousness of the loss of its customary informants, the capacity of the Conscious Self to create a world of its own and live a self-made life. If such a condition could be imagined as a mind continuing to live in a dead body, this phenomenon of sleep would show us how that mind could exist in the same state of activity as now, feel the same emotions of pleasure and of pain, and enjoy an existence, as real to itself although imaginary in fact, as is the actual existence of the living man.

But it teaches a lesson yet more important. If the mind can and does in fact thus live a life of its own when severed from the influences of the body by the temporary paralysis of a section of the brain in sleep, is not the presumption strong that this intelligent *something* (call it "Mind" or "Soul,") that does *not* sleep with the body but preserves an individual consciousness, that has *memory* and a *Will*, that can create a world of its own and live and act in that world with entire belief in its reality, that preserves the sense of pleasure and of pain, is not



the material brain merely nor a secretion of brain, but something other than the brain and of which the brain hemispheres are but the material mechanism? If the Conscious Self lives and works thus when the body is dead to it in sleep, may it not well be — (nay, does it not suggest even the probability?)—that when permanent severance by death is substituted for temporary severance by sleep, the same Conscious Self may continue to exist, possessed of other perceptive and receptive powers adapted to new conditions of a changed state of being? If not so, inasmuch as nothing perishes, but only *changes*, what becomes of this non-corporeal entity when the molecular body is resolved into its elements?

Why, then, are we in dream so credulous as to believe implicitly that the visions presented to us by the busy fancy are realities? Why do we accept impossibilities and incongruities without a question of their truth and scarcely with a sense of surprise? We have seen that it is *not* because the *reasoning* faculties are asleep,—for often they are very active in dream.

It is because we accept, as real and sense-conveyed and therefore as representing external objects, the ideas that are in fact created by the mind itself.

And wherefore do we thus accept them?

The answer throws a flood of light upon the mechanism of mind and the Mechanism of Man.

All our sensations are mental. Whether self-created within or brought from without by the senses, we are *conscious* only of the *mental* impression. That alone is *real* to us. That alone *exists* for us.

But by what faculty do we, in the waking state, distinguish between the self-created and the sense-borne ideas and impressions, so as to recognise the former as *ideal* and the latter as *real*?

For instance; you think of an absent friend and you have in your mind a more or less accurate picture of him. You see your friend in person and then another picture of him is in your mind, brought to it by the sense of

sight. Your perceptions of both are equally mental. Nevertheless, you readily distinguish them and call the mind-created image *ideal* and the sense-borne image *real*—meaning, by these phrases, that the former has no objective existence, but that the latter is actually existing without you.

By what process is this result obtained? What enables you so to distinguish them?

There is but one explanation. You are *conscious of the action of the senses*. You feel that your eye or some other sense is employed in the process. You have learned by *experience* that the actual presence of an external object is only to be accepted when the information of it is brought to you by one of your senses.

Thus it is that, when we are awake, the senses correct the action of the mind. Our capacity to distinguish the real from the ideal is due to the information given to us by the senses.

It is plain now why in dream we believe the ideal to be real. The *senses* being severed from the Mind by sleep, it has lost the instrument by which, when awake, it learns what is shadow and what substance. As the necessary consequence, *all ideas* appear to be real because all are *alike*. Inasmuch as all the pictures that throng the mind were originally brought to it by the senses, the Conscious Self has no means, when an idea is presented to it, of discerning whether it is a new sense-borne idea or only the revival of an idea already existing in itself. Hence it is that the Mind, deprived by sleep of the mechanism by which, when the body is awake, it is enabled to distinguish the ideas brought from without from the ideas created within, is *compelled* to accept its self-creations as realities. When these are combined in a connected drama, the whole is viewed by the Conscious Self as an actual adventure of the body and not, as in the waking time it would have been viewed, as merely a creation of the busy fancy. This is the rationale of the delusion of dream.

But the conclusion from this is that *there is a Conscious*



*Self* distinct from the brain whose action it contemplates and criticises.

That in fact we *have* Souls.

Or rather, that we *are* Souls, clothed with a molecular mechanism necessary for communication with the molecular part of creation in which this stage of being is passed.

## CHAPTER VIII.

## THE PHENOMENA OF DREAM.

SUCH being the *Physiology and Psychology of Dream*—that is to say, the conditions of the bodily and mental mechanism under which the phenomena of Dream are presented—let us observe those phenomena and from the facts noted endeavour to learn what light is thrown by them upon Psychology. A mental state so strange and abnormal cannot fail to assist in the solution of that great problem of the *Mechanism of Man* which it is the vocation of Psychology to solve. Is that Mechanism moved or directed by any but a self-generated force? Is it compounded of any but the tangible material structure? Does *Soul* exist and, if it exists, what is its relationship to the body?

A Dream is not a confused crowd of disconnected ideas. It is a succession of associated incidents, more or less orderly even when incongruous, improbable, or even impossible. The mind of the sleeper constructs a drama, often having many parts played by many persons; but always himself is one of the actors. *Suggestion* is the process by which the mind works in waking life—one idea suggesting another with which it had been at some past time associated and then another linked with that, and so forth. Thus in dream the imagination of the unsleeping mind presents to the Conscious Self a succession of suggested pictures. These are by the other waking mental faculties woven into a drama that is enacted before the Conscious Self with all its scenery and machinery! And this drama is not performed in



dumb show or in pantomime merely. It is a drama spoken as well as acted by the players—men, women or animal—who appear to the dreamer to play before him and with him their several parts as perfectly as they would have been enacted in actual life.

Hence we learn that in dream, as in the waking state, the mind acts in obedience to the laws of mind. The various mental functions are not exercised vaguely, but in more or less of orderly relationship to one another. The imagination presents pictures which are accepted as having been brought from without by the senses and therefore to the sleeper are as real as if they had been objects of sight. These ideal pictures, thus received as real, according to their various characteristics excite precisely the same emotions as they would have excited had they been real. But although the *picture* is imaginary the *emotion* is *actual*. We do not merely dream that we are angry or fearful; we *feel* actual anger and real fear. The reader may remember that often the emotion excited by the dream has continued to be felt after waking and when the dream itself has vanished. Indeed we know not how much the mental character of the day is influenced by the passions and emotions that have been stimulated by the dreams of the night, the brain excitement often continuing long after the cause of it has vanished and is forgotten.

The most wonderful of the many wonders that attend the condition of dream is the development of the *inventive* faculty so far beyond its capacity in the waking state. Reflect for a moment what that performance is. Every dreamer, however ignorant, however stupid, however young, performs a feat which few could accomplish in the waking state when in full command of all their mental faculties. Every dream is a story. Most dreams are dramas, having not a story merely, but often many actors whose characters are as various as on the stage of real life.

What does the dreaming mind?

Not merely does it invent the ideal *story*, it invents

also *all the characters* that play parts in it! Nor this alone. It places in the mouth of each of those characters speech appropriate to the character of each! Yet are all of these dialogues *invented* by the mind of the sleeper! In a restless night many such dream-dramas, each having its own distinct plot and actors, will be *invented by the dreamer* and a dialogue will be constructed by himself in which each of the actors will play his proper part. Strange as the assertion may appear, it is *a fact* which a moment's reflection will confirm, that the ignorant ploughboy in his dreams has made more stories and invented vastly more characters to enact them and constructed more appropriate dialogues for those characters than the most copious dramatist or novelist—aye, more than Shakespeare himself!

Another suggestive feature of the phenomena of dream is the *marvellous speed* of the mental action. Working untrammelled by the slow motions of the body, the dreaming mind sets at defiance all the waking conceptions of time. A dream of a series of adventures which would extend over many days is by the mind enacted in a few minutes. Yet all is performed—all is perfect—all is minutely perceived, said, and done—proving that when the mind is released to some extent from the slow mechanism of the body it has other very different conceptions of time. May it not be that time, as counted by our waking thoughts, is in truth the *ideal* time and that mental time, as conceived in dream, is the *real* time?

Not long ago I was enabled to apply some measure to this remarkable difference between the action of the mind independently of the body and its action when conducted through the slow-moving mechanism of the body. Called at the usual hour in the morning, I looked at my watch and in about two minutes fell asleep again. I dreamed a dream of a series of events that in their performance occupied what the mind conceived to be a whole day—events in which I was an actor and played a part that would have occupied a day in actual doing. Waking



suddenly with the influence of the dream upon me and the memory of it full before me, I looked at my watch again, thinking that I must have been sleeping for an hour and had lost the train. I found that, in fact, I had been asleep but *four minutes*. In four minutes my mind had passed through the history of a day, had invented that history and contemplated it as a whole day's action. It was in fact a whole day's body work done by the mind in four minutes. This may give us some conception of what must be the capacity of the Soul for perception and action when, if ever, there is a falling away from it of the cumbrous bodily material mechanism through which alone, in its present stage of evolution, it is adapted to communicate with the external material world.

Another phenomenon of Dream is *exaltation of the mental faculties* generally. Often there is an extraordinary development of special faculties in special dreams. A proof of this is found in the fact, already noted, that dream itself is an invention of the mind, whose then capacities far exceed anything of which it is capable when the body is awake and imposing upon it the conditions of its own slow, because material—that is, molecular—action. Not only do we *invent* the dream but we *act it* in thought. Not merely do we act in it ourselves, but we paint the scenery, construct the dresses and decorations, conceive the characters, and put into their mouths the language that would properly be theirs had they been beings of flesh and blood instead of shadows summoned by the fancy. Almost every faculty of the mind must be exercised upon such a work. Even the waking mental condition will not enable us to do this. If you doubt, try it. Set yourself to invent a dream and describe it on paper, making each one of the personages with whom you have peopled it talk in his proper character. Unless you are a skilful and practised dramatist you will find yourself wholly at fault. Remember that what you, in the full possession of your intellect, have failed to do, the most ignorant and stupid do

every night. You will then begin to measure this marvel of the exaltation of the mental powers attendant upon the condition of dream. If you indulge in the pleasant but dangerous practice of reading in bed, have you not often, on closing the book, extinguishing the candle and turning to sleep, continued, in a state of dream, to *read on*, believing that you were still reading the book. But what was the fact? Your mind was then composing all you dreamed that you were reading. It was inventing a continuation of the argument, or narrative, or whatever you may have been perusing when sleep stole upon you and you lapsed into dream. Have you never dreamed that you were preaching a sermon, or making a speech, or reading aloud, or composing music, or singing a song? Probably, in your waking state, you could do neither. In dream, your mind does it all without a conscious effort. Nor is it, as some have suggested, merely a fancy that the mind is so acting and not a positive action of the mind. If wakened while so dreaming, the argument, the speech, the song, will recur to the waking consciousness and become a positive memory capable of being subsequently recalled. Sometimes the dream vanishes after an interval and cannot be recollected by any effort of the Will, although it may recur in dream long years afterwards. In this manner COLERIDGE composed that beautiful fragment of a poem, "Kublai Khan." His mind had wrought the whole in a dream. Suddenly waking with a vivid impression of that dream, he grasped a pen and began to write the remembered rhymes of what had been a long poem, although composed in dream with the speed at which the mind works when untrammelled by the conditions of its material mechanism. He seized pen and paper and had set down the beautiful lines that have been preserved, when he was interrupted by some matter of business. On his return to resume the work, the dream had vanished and the world, to its great loss, has received nothing but the exquisite fragment we read now.

This mental exaltation, so frequent in dream, is recog-



nised in some familiar practices the *rationale* of which is, perhaps, not known to those who resort to them. In our schooldays a lesson was best learned by reading it when going to bed. It was then easily remembered in the morning. The advice so often given, when a matter of moment is presented, to "Sleep upon it" is a recognition of this higher mental action in sleep. The Mind seems in sleep unconsciously to work upon the idea presented to it and we wake with clearer conceptions and larger views of the *pros* and *cons*. I have known cases in which a doubting mind has thus been "made up" without conscious perception of the convincing argument.

Although in dream the mind works with such wonderful rapidity that the events of a day may be enacted in a few minutes, it has not quite lost its consciousness of the measure of external time. A desire to wake at a particular hour will often be followed by an actual awakening at that hour. Continued mental consciousness of the desire is unintelligible. But in what manner does the mind count the flight of a time whose measure is so different from its own conceptions of time?

Say, that you want to wake at six o'clock. You fall asleep with this impression upon the mind. But you fall also into the condition of dream and in that condition your mind is engaged in inventing adventures that are the business of a long day. Nevertheless, it preserves the consciousness of the time as it is in the external world and you wake at the desired hour. I can suggest no other solution of this than that the brain that dreams and the Conscious Self that perceives the dream are *two entities*, and that it is the Conscious Self (or Soul) that notes the flight of time in the external world, while the dreaming brain is revelling in its own conception of time as measured by the flow of its own ideas, and not in hours measured by the motions of the earth and moon. Another solution suggests itself. May not the *duality of the mind*, that action of the *double brain* which

explains so many other mental phenomena, account also for this ?

Further ; these phenomena of dream prove that to the mind "time" is more ideal than real ; that the measure of it may differ in individuals and still more in races. May it not be that thus lives are equalised and that to the ephemeris its one day of life may appear as long as our lives appear to us ? A life is practically as long or short as it *appears* to the mind to be.

Dreams are rarely, if ever, without foundation ; that is to say, they are the product of some *suggestion*, although it may be difficult to trace them to their sources. Very slight suggestions suffice to set the mind in motion, as is proved by a multitude of recorded cases which the memory of every reader will present to him. The senses are not wholly paralysed in ordinary sleep. They carry to the mind impressions varying in power and acting with more or less of force according to the condition of the recipient ganglion. Sounds are heard and suggest dreams. But the loudest sounds are not always the most readily perceived. It is the unaccustomed sound that most startles the consciousness. Often a whisper will waken when the booming of cannon makes no impression upon the sleeper. The dweller in a noisy street sleeps soundly amid the roar of carts and carriages and is wakeful in the country by reason of the silence. Habit governs this as so many others of our sense impressions. We learn *not* to hear. Hence the influence of trifling impressions upon the sleeping senses when powerful ones fail to reach us. Very slight sense-impressions suffice to suggest the *subjects* of dreams. Then the mind, having taken the direction given by that impulse, forthwith employs its inventive faculties in the construction of a story based upon the faint lines of that suggested subject.

Even when awake we are ignorant what impulses set up trains of thought. We know not why this or that idea "comes into the head." The suggesting cause is often so slight as to be imperceptible. The brain is an organ of inconceivable sensitiveness. Its fibres



are so delicate that millions are packed into the circumference of a sixpence. Yet has each fibre its own function and each is a musical chord competent to catch and to vibrate to motions of the ether which the senses cannot perceive. It is probable (not proved) that in sleep, when not distracted by the claims of the nerve system and the thronging impressions brought by the senses, these brain fibres are vastly more sensitive and moved by vastly slighter action of the ether than in waking life.

In Dream we do not lose the consciousness of our own identity. We retain our individuality. You dream often that you are *something* other than you are, but not that you are some other *person*. Does not this indicate the existence of an entity, other than the dreaming brain, which preserves its oneness and its sanity while the material organ with which it is associated and through which it communicates with the external world is, as it were, forgetting its reason, its experience and itself and so becoming in very truth *insane*.

And here we touch upon the most perplexing characteristic of dream. We are conscious of existence, of individuality, and in a slight degree of sense impressions. We have ideas, reflections, emotions, sentiments, passions. We can invent stories, construct characters, endow them with dramatic language, paint ideal pictures, make speeches, compose music and conduct a train of argument. But withal we are not *rational*. We can *think* wise things, but we *are* the veriest fools of nature. Every mental faculty is awake and alive—save one—namely, the faculty, whatever it be, that enables us to distinguish between fancy and fact, between the possible and the impossible, the congruous and the incongruous; the faculty, in brief, which separates sanity from insanity.

In dream, with rare exceptions, we are not conscious that we are dreaming. Fancies are accepted as facts, shadows as substances, the ideal as the real. And they are so accepted without suspicion or doubt. We *see* them, *hear* them, *feel* them. Nothing in our actual waking life is more real to us than are the *unrealities* of

dream at the moment of dreaming. Probably there are few readers who have not occasionally dreamed that they were dreaming, and while noting the drama have said to themselves "this is a dream." But these are rare exceptions to the rule that a dream is accepted by the sleeping mind as an event of actual occurrence and the scenes and persons implicitly believed to be objective and not subjective; that is to say—as being then actually existing in the external world.

So believing, what are the materials to which this implicit credence is given? Here we arrive at the most perplexing of the problems presented by the phenomena of dream.

We accept without hesitation, or questioning, or even a suspicion of its unreality, that which in waking life would have been banished instantly as "the baseless fabric of a vision." We believe implicitly in objects and actions which, when awake, we should have pronounced to be impossible. Moreover we contemplate the wildest conceptions of the fancy without the slightest consciousness of their incongruity or folly. Nothing is too impossible or unreal for acceptance by the dreamer as *facts* that cause him neither surprise at their presence nor wonder how they come to be.

What is the change in the mental condition that has wrought this mental revolution—not slowly and by degrees, but wholly and in a moment? At this instant, the mind is competent to discern the ideal from the real, the shadow from the substance, the practical from the impossible. At the next moment it can distinguish neither—all appears to itself to be equally possible, probable, real. Starting from sleep, the normal state is recovered, but not so speedily as it is lost. The dream itself sometimes continues after the senses are restored. The memory of it remains longer and its unconscious influence longer still. Passions and emotions which the dream has kindled do not subside at once. Often the agitation continues to disturb the mind long after the cause of it has vanished from the memory.



Two answers present themselves.

1. This marvellous character of dream may be consequent upon the severance of the mind from its communication with the external world by reason of the partial paralysis of the senses.

2. Some one or more of the mental faculties may be sleeping while others are awake and active.

The first is the solution commonly accepted. It is contended that the senses correct the vagaries of the mind; that we are enabled to distinguish between the creations of the mind and the impressions brought to it from the external world solely by the consciousness we have, when we are awake, of the action of the senses and the knowledge we have that the impressions borne to us by the senses are *objective*—that is, produced by something existing without ourselves. If, for instance, you close your eyes and give rein to the imagination, streams of ideas—pictures of persons and places—flow before the mind's eye. You do not mistake these for realities. You are conscious that they are born of your own brain. Had you been asleep and dreaming, instead of being awake and using your senses, you would not have discovered that these mental pictures were *subjective* only. You would have accepted them implicitly as *objective* impressions brought to you by your senses.

This, however, explains but a portion of the phenomenon. Even if it be a true solution, it accounts only for the acceptance in dream of the ideal as real. It leaves wholly unexplained the more remarkable feature exhibited in the entire unconsciousness by the dreamer of the absurdities and impossibilities presented in the dream and the absence of surprise and wonder how such things can be. In the waking state, the mind would reject them instantly as the illusions they are. Hence the reasonable conclusion that, in addition to the sleep of the senses and of the *will*, some part of the material mechanism of the mind is also sleeping or its activity is suspended during dream.

The investigation is of serious moment, for it raises

other questions of even greater importance. If the explanation be sufficient, it determines some moot points in Mental Physiology. It proves that the mental machine, the brain, is *not* one and indivisible—that the *whole* brain is not employed in each mental act—as contended by Dr. CARPENTER.

To what mental faculties are we indebted for our waking consciousness of incongruity, impracticability, absurdity, irrationality? Obviously these faculties must be slumbering in dream. To *their* temporary paralysis this most remarkable phenomenon of dream is certainly due.

The popular notion is that *reason* is the slumbering faculty. We talk of reason as being the special attribute of Man. In fact there is no such faculty. There is a mental process we call reasoning; but it is performed by the joint action of various mental faculties. One presents the things to be reasoned upon; another compares them and presents their resemblances and differences; a third enables us, by the process we call *reasoning*, to apply these resemblances and differences to some third subject and thus from the known to predicate the unknown.

It is familiar to every reader that this process of reasoning is not always suspended in dream. On the contrary, it is sometimes abnormally active. We *reason* rightly often, but on wrong premisses. What we are unable to discover in dream is the unreality of the subject matter upon which we are reasoning.

If, for instance, you dream that you are making a speech or preaching a sermon. In your dream you pursue a logical argument. But you found it upon imagined facts that are untrue and improbable, which the waking mind would not entertain for a moment, but which in your dream you accept as true and implicitly believe to be real.

We shall, perhaps, arrive at the solution of this problem by the process of exhaustion.

The faculty of imagination, that shapes to the dream ideal pictures of things, is not sleeping. The faculties



that perform the process of reasoning are not sleeping. *Comparison*—the power to compare the ideal with the real—alone is wanting. We mistake the shadows of the mind for substances. We accept the brain-born visions as realities. Why? *Because we are unable to compare them.* In brief, Comparison is the faculty, paralysed in sleep, whose absence causes the *credulity* of dream.

Of this fact there can be no doubt. But a very formidable difficulty here presents itself. How and why is it that this faculty alone is found to slumber when the greater part of the mental mechanism is awake and active?

It has been one of the most perplexing problems of Psychology. A solution of it has occurred to me which I submit to the consideration of the reader, but as a *suggestion* merely. It is too novel to be offered as anything more than a suggestion.

Each mental faculty can perform but one act at the same instant of time. It is one of the conditions of existence here that all consciousness shall be in *succession*. Hence, indeed, our conception of *time*. If any intelligent Being could obtain many perceptions simultaneously (not in succession) to that Being there would be no *time*, in our sense of the term. But the process of comparison involves the contemplation *together* of the two things (or ideas of things) to be compared. This difficulty is removed by the *double brain*. Each brain presents one of the ideas to be compared and upon these the faculty of comparison employs itself, discerning their resemblances and differences. If so it be, the obvious cause of our incapacity to discover the absurdities of dream is the partial paralysis (or sleep) of one of the two allied mental faculties that present the ideas of objects and the consequent incapacity of the faculty of comparison to discharge its proper function of informing us what of our mental impressions are real and what illusory.

And this raises a curious question as to the relative functions and operations of the *two brains*. In profound slumber, when both brains are sleeping, there is no con-

sciousness. Time is annihilated to such a sleeper and awakening seems to follow immediately upon falling asleep, although in reality many hours may have passed. When the brain is sleeping but partially, there is some consciousness of time in sleep and of the lapse of time upon awaking. Is such partial sleep the slumber of *one brain only* and are these phenomena of dream due to the action of that one brain deprived of the correcting influence of the other brain? Is not the failure of the faculty of *comparison* to show us in dream that our mental impressions are subjective and not objective consequent upon the absence of aid from the sister faculty of the other brain? Comparison is the foundation of the process of reasoning. It has been noticed that persons suffering from hemiplegia—that is, from paralysis of one brain only—often lose the power *to compare* and consequently the capacity for reasoning readily and correctly. May it not be that a similar condition is produced by the temporary paralysis of the brain in sleep? As already stated, the power to *reason* is not absent in dream. We often reason elaborately and well, accepting the ideal pictures as real incidents. We take as objective facts what are merely mental impressions and thus build a correct argument on an incorrect assumption. The reasoning is right but the basis of it is wrong. Question each mental faculty in turn and it will appear that but one faculty is at fault in dream—namely, *comparison*. We are unable to discern the difference between the mental and the sensual impression—the self-created and the sense-borne idea—*because we are incompetent to compare them* and it is by comparison alone that we can distinguish the false from the true. I throw out this (but as a suggestion merely) to Mental Philosophers and Psychologists.

Indeed, the fact that we have *two* perfect brains, with every mental faculty in duplicate, (as contended by Sir HENRY HOLLAND and now conclusively established by the experiments of BROWN-SEQUARD and Professor FERRIER,) has opened a new field to the Mental Philosopher and Psychologist. It must have the most



intimate relationship, not to the phenomena of Sleep and Dream alone, but to all the phenomena of Mind. In this great fact will doubtless be found the obvious solution of many problems hitherto insoluble. Foremost among those philosophical puzzles has been the instantaneous lapse of the Mind into *insanity* in dream, and the no less marvellous manner in which, upon waking, we pass almost as quickly out of that insane condition into sanity.

The painful affection called *nightmare* is marked by an undefined terror, accompanied always with a sense of suffocation, which appears to the patient to be caused by pressure upon the chest, a sensation converted by the dream into some hideous object from which he strives in vain to fly. This sense of weight is in popular belief the direct result of an overloaded stomach. The process is indirect. The nerves that conduct the work of digestion are affected by the pressure of the undigested food. These, by a reflex action at the nerve centre, influence the nerves that maintain the action of the heart, which consequently beats irregularly. The irregular action of the heart, pumping the blood by irregular strokes, produces the irregular action of the brain. So, likewise, the disordered nerves of the stomach disturb by sympathy the nerves that keep the breathing apparatus in regular action. Hence the sense of suffocation; hence the impression of weight which the dream converts into the hideous phantom of a fiend who sits upon the chest and deprives the sleeper of the power to move or to shriek, strive though he may, and overwhelms him with an agony of terror.

But there is a still more remarkable proof of the manner in which dreams may be moulded by external influences. It is not presented by all sleepers, but it may be observed in many and especially in children. Mark a sleeping child. Note upon his features the expression of fear or of anger—the flitting frown, the contracted lips. Listen to the subdued scream, the stifled moan. These are the outward indications of the

troubled dream that is being enacted within. While these signs are upon him, gently place the open hand upon the forehead. Sometimes in a moment, sometimes after many minutes, you will see the frown fade, the lips relax, the expression of pain, or rage, or fear, pass away. Gradually a smile steals over the face and breaks into a laugh. After a few experiments you will discover that by touching certain parts of the head certain characteristics of the mind are expressed by the body. We have no certain knowledge that this is the external language of a dream then actually floating before the mind within, because the sleeper cannot tell us at the moment what is passing in his Mind. But there can be no reasonable doubt that, in some unknown manner, the touching of the head without excites the brain within and sets up an action, not in the whole brain, but in that part of it only upon which the finger is placed, and thereupon the dream is modified by the new influence affecting it. From experiments often made I am satisfied that dreams may be thus directed with many sleepers, probably with all. If this should be confirmed by the observation of others, it may obviously be turned to practical use for the relief of those painful dreams so common in sickness and in certain conditions of the digestive organs. Through this simple process we may excite to action the parts of the brain that are the prompters of the more pleasing emotions.

As yet we can only conjecture *how* the effect is produced. But I venture a suggestion. In sleep, as we have seen, portions of the brain are awake and working without the control of the Will. Whatever excites any part of the brain sets it in action. There is much evidence that when one human being comes within the range of "*the Nerve Atmosphere*" (so called by Dr. RICHARDSON) or the *Psychic Force* (as I have proposed to term it) of another human being, the nerve force of the one influences the nerve force of the other, either by attraction or repulsion, as the case may be, according to some law, probably of polarity, that yet remains to be investigated. This Force is ever flowing from the nerve centres to the extremities



of the nerve system and to varying distances beyond the material structure. Contact either attracts the nerve force from the patient to the person touching or the nerve force flows from the person touching to the patient. We do not yet know the laws by which this attraction or repulsion of nerve force is governed. The direction in which they should be sought is probably that of magnetism. So far as the facts point, I am inclined to the conclusion that in the cases where the mental organs can be excited in sleep by the touch, the result is not produced by an influence transmitted from the operator to the patient, but that the operator attracts the nerve force of the patient from the nerve centre at the base of the brain. The force thus attracted passes through the fibres of the brain and in that passage excites to action the parts through which it passes and consequently the mental organ to which that portion of the brain is assigned. This solution will be found hereafter to receive strong confirmation from some phenomena of Somnambulism that will then come under notice.

Two cases will suffice to illustrate the Phenomena of Dream. As will be seen hereafter, there can be no doubt that, under some very rare and as yet unknown conditions, the human mind has a power of perception far beyond the range of the senses and apparently through some other medium to which distance and the interposition of molecular matter are no impediments—conditions such as those under which the Soul might be supposed to perceive when severed from its alliance with body. If this condition occurs sometimes in sleep, as in other abnormal states of the organism, the mind would be then actually *perceiving* and not merely *dreaming*, and thus the few recorded cases of perceptive dreams would be accounted for, such as the following, narrated by Dr. ABERCROMBIE in his famous treatise on “The Intellectual Powers.”

The gentleman to whom I am indebted for the following case was born in Madras, and was brought from thence at the age of three years to be educated in England, where he grew up without

the least recollection of anything relating to Madras, or to his parents, who remained in India. At the age of fourteen he dreamt that he saw his mother sitting in the dress of a widow, and apparently under deep distress; and he gave a distinct account of the apartment in which he saw her, with the position of various prominent articles of furniture, which he described minutely. It afterwards turned out that his father died about the time of the dream; and that he had correctly described a drawing-room in the house at Madras in which his mother was in the habit of sitting. This last feature of the case, I think, we may fairly consider as the revival of an old impression respecting the drawing-room, though it had long ceased to be an object of memory; of the other part I do not attempt an explanation.—(p. 219.)

A more extraordinary instance is reported by the same author, which strongly supports the explanation suggested above, and the more that nothing came of it. It is obviously a case of mental sympathy, frequent enough between persons who are near one another, the remarkable feature of *this* case being the distance by which the sympathetic minds were separated. But not knowing the *modus operandi* of such perception, it is impossible to say to what extent the process may be independent of the material conditions of space and substance.

An instance of a very singular kind is mentioned by Mr. Joseph Taylor, and is given by him as an undoubted fact. A young man who was at an academy a hundred miles from home, dreamt that he went to his father's house in the night, tried the front door, but found it locked; got in by a back door, and finding nobody out of bed, went directly to the bedroom of his parents. He then said to his mother, whom he found awake, "Mother, I am going a long journey, and am come to bid you good-bye." On this she answered, under much agitation, "O, dear son, thou art dead!" He instantly awoke, and thought no more of his dream, until a few days after he received a letter from his father, inquiring very anxiously after his health, in consequence of a frightful dream his mother had on the same night in which the dream now mentioned occurred to him. She dreamt that she heard some one attempt to open the front door, then go to the back door, and at last come into her bedroom. She then saw it was her son, who came to the side of her bed and said, "Mother, I am going a long journey, and am come to bid you good-bye;" on which she exclaimed, "Oh, dear son, thou art dead!" But nothing unusual happened to any of the parties.—(p. 215.)



These are the principal phenomena of Dream and the study of them cannot fail to throw a flood of light upon mental physiology and psychology. In them we are enabled to view the operations of the mind and the relationship of soul and body under conditions that reveal to us parts of the Mechanism of Man that are wholly concealed from us in the normal state of that relationship. The strange neglect of such an obvious means of knowledge is doubtless due to the fundamental error that has excluded Mind and Soul from the category of physical sciences and consigned them to the hopeless region of metaphysics, persisting in their pursuit by abstractions, argument and conjecture and refusing to study them by investigation of *facts*, as the other sciences are now investigated. If the phenomena of dream were strange and rare as are those of somnambulism they would as much excite our curiosity and strike us with equal amazement. But they are not wondered at only because they are familiar. If dream, instead of being common to us all, were developed only in a few, the persons subject to it would certainly be denounced as impostors and probably prosecuted as "rogues and vagabonds." But the very facility for examination of the mental condition of dream should induce those who really desire to promote the most important of all knowledge—the knowledge of ourselves, our constitution, our mechanism and our destiny—to seek it where we may most reasonably expect to find it—in the wonderful condition that nightly severs the Mind more or less from its connection with the body and enables it to work by its own impulses, without the aid or incumbrance of the senses and without the directing power of the *Intelligence and its Will*.

Always and everywhere Superstition has dallied with Dream. The notion that dreams are sometimes *prophetic* is still so widely diffused and so often made the theme for gossip and material for fiction that there are few, even among the educated, who can wholly divest themselves of the influence of a startling dream.

Neither evidence nor argument has been adduced to support this claim of the sleeping mind to prophetic power. There are no natural means by which *new* impressions can be conveyed to the mind in sleep and we have already seen that in this condition the mind is less, not more, capable of reasoning out the probabilities of the future.

It will be said, perhaps, that prophecy is not an act of reason but a gift of inspiration; that the prophet only *speaks*—his are not the *thoughts* uttered. But in what manner is this gift made more easy by sleep? It *should* be more active in the waking state. The prophetic dream is either a creation of the sleeping mind or it is brought into the sleeping mind by a miracle. It is highly improbable that the mind should have superior wisdom when in its most imperfect condition. It is still more improbable that a miracle should be wrought for such a purpose. Moreover, the information alleged to be imparted thus is always of something *to come*, while there is no instance of a revelation in dream of things that *have been* done in the past and therefore capable of being tested. A gift to tell what *has been* would surely be more easy than a gift to tell what *is to be*. It is strange and suspicious that none are seers of *the past*.

The widespread notion of prophetic dream is probably based upon a belief, almost as widely diffused, that in sleep the Soul can and sometimes will pass out of the body and obtain information by impressions received directly by its own vastly extended power of perception, without the intervention of the material mechanism of the senses. It is not uncommon to hear an assertion, when a place is seen for the first time, that there is a memory of the same place having been seen before and there are some curious reports of cases of this kind that deserve to be investigated. But many of these apparent marvels may be accounted for by memories of which the link has been lost. When the multiplicity of dreams that occur in a lifetime are taken into account, occasional resemblances of external objects or events to some portions of former



dreams are by no means improbable. The same explanation applies to many dreams that are supposed to have been prophetic because something afterwards occurs bearing some resemblance to the dream. Memory also has a large share in these recognitions. Memory may exist without recollection. Thousands of things are stored away in the memory, which we cannot recall even if we try to do so, but which come back to us suddenly, at unexpected times, for no cause that we can trace although certainly suggested by something associated with the revived idea. Thus the eye may well recognise a strange place as having been seen when, in fact, the memory has unconsciously received some picture of it, or of some place very like it, and which is now revived by the suggestion of the place itself.

*Somnambulism*, although commonly supposed to be a phase of sleep, has really no relationship to it. Its physiological and psychical conditions are entirely different. There is the aspect of sleep, but nothing more. The somnambule is not sleeping, for he performs often the work of his waking life although with certainly closed eyes and probably sealed-up senses. The somnambule has no memory of the doings of either mind or body during his trance existence. The sleeper is conscious at the time of dreaming and remembers his dream. As there is *Somnambulism* without sleep, so there may be *Somnambulism in* sleep. Indeed, with a constitutional tendency to it, the state of sleep is so favourable to the inducement of the condition of *Somnambulism* that the one may readily lapse into the other. But for these phenomena the reader must turn to the chapters that treat of *Somnambulism*.

Many of the authentic cases of cognizance of the distant in dream may be thus accounted for. The sleeper has lapsed into *somnambulism*, and is then, in fact, a somnambule and not a dreamer.

Dream is not merely a reproduction in new combinations of impressions made upon the mind unconsciously as well as consciously, forgotten as well as remembered.

The fact must also be taken into account that in dream mental action is vastly increased and the flow of ideas so accelerated that, if life be measured, as it should be, by the number of ideas that are presented by the mind, the life of dream is vastly longer than waking life. If the ideas that would occupy many waking hours are compressed into a sleep of one hour, the whole dream-life must have presented to the mind infinitely more ideas than the whole waking life. The wonder would be if, of this vast multitude, many were not found to be coincident with events of actual occurrence afterwards. A further explanation of dreams that appear to convey information from some external intelligence, or to be prophetic, will be found in this—that many things impress themselves upon the mind when we are not giving attention to them, and, therefore, unconsciously to ourselves. We thus lose some of the links of association which, if they had been perceived, would have revealed to us the connection between the dream and the incidents to which the dream related, and which, if we had known, would have stripped the coincidence of its marvellousness. Yet a further explanation will be found in the exaltation of the mental faculties in dream, which enables us often then to perceive, more clearly than in our waking state, ideas and chains of ideas and to “think them out” more correctly than is practicable in waking life, when the influx of external impressions represses to some extent the independent action of the mental faculties.

There is a popular belief that in sleep the Soul sometimes quits the body and personally visits the scenes and persons of the dream which, in truth, is not all a dream. This is nothing more than a poetical fancy. There is no evidence of such journeying. The proof of it would be if the dreamer could tell us of actual occurrences passing elsewhere at the moment of his dream. There is, indeed, abundant evidence of *mental communion* in sleep, and this might readily suggest a dream having relation to the distant person. But there is no satisfactory evidence of a positive per-



ception of an event then passing far off. It is remarkable, indeed, that dreams to which this solution has been applied usually refer to something that is *to be*, and not to events actually happening at the moment and which could be positively *proved* by reference to the persons whose sayings and doings are supposed to be seen, heard and reported. The same remark applies to this as to prophecies and supernatural communications generally. Why do they not tell us of something that is *doing* far away or something that *has been done* in the distant past? These would at least be capable of verification. Surely the power that could prophesy the future—the dreaming that foreshadows what *is to be*—could with vastly more ease tell us what *has been* done or what is *being done* elsewhere at the moment of its exercise! Why is so simple a test invariably avoided?

*Sympathetic* dreams admit of another explanation. Two persons dream the same dream at the same time. They may be in the same room, in the same house, or far apart. The two dreams are not always identical in their details, but the main incident is substantially the same in both. The instances of this are too many to be accidental coincidences. The explanation is to be found in that *mental sympathy* the existence of which cannot be doubted by any person who investigates psychological phenomena and which is already treated of here (*ante*, p. 22). The limit to which that sympathy extends is not yet measured. We know only that it is not bounded by the narrow range of the senses. Perhaps it is a purely *psychic* faculty. If it be, we know as yet so little of the nature and powers of the Soul that it would be vain to speculate in what manner the operation is performed. But we may be assured that, whatever the capacity of the Soul when we are awake and the external world is, as it were, pressing in upon us at all sides and occupying more or less of the entire mental mechanism, those powers are vastly extended when the material mechanism is at rest, and the sleepless

Soul alone is busy. If there be, under *any* conditions, communication between minds without the intervention of the senses, we may reasonably conclude that these would be greatly facilitated in the time of sleep, when the Soul is less subjected to the restraints of that mechanism by means of which it communicates with the *material*—that is to say, the *molecular*—world.

The proofs are many that dreams may be suggested by the influence of other minds in unconscious communication with the sleeper. If the finger be placed upon the head where, according to the phrenologists, is the seat of the mental faculty of mirth, a smile will be seen soon to steal upon the sleeping face. Touch in like manner the asserted seats of combativeness or destructiveness, the features assume an aspect of excitement which will be removed by touching the asserted seat of benevolence. The explanation of this phenomenon is that the brain, thus excited to action, suggests and moulds a dream in accordance with the emotion so denoted. This fact has been advanced by the Phrenologists as proof that they have rightly mapped out the brain. But such is not the necessary conclusion from the fact. It may well be that it is the *mind*, and not the finger, of the waking operator that directs the mental action of the unconscious sleeper. The waking *Will* possibly controls the sleeping Will. We know that it does so in Somnambulism and there is no reason why it should *not* do so in ordinary sleep.

But, explain it as we may, the fact remains.

Direct suggestion of dream by external causes is less disputable. So sensitive is the mind in sleep, when relieved from the thronging impressions of the senses, that impressions so slight as to be wholly unnoticed in our waking state are doubtless perceptible, and operate as *suggestions*, when we are asleep. A slight touch or sound often serves to change the entire character and direction of a dream, the mere sound giving rise to the train of new ideas thus suggested. The surest method of banishing an unpleasant dream is to turn in the bed.



Continuance in the same posture preserves the same conditions of brain action and consequently of the same dream, which is disturbed at once by directing the flow of blood to another part of the brain. If a sleeper is seen to be agitated in his sleep by painful dream, exhibited in moaning, restlessness and expression of distress upon the features, a remedy may be found in gently moving the head into another position—if the body cannot be moved and it is not desired to waken.

It is said that musicians are very prone to the composition of music in dream. It was thus that TARTINI wrote his "Devil's Sonata." The most unmusical are often haunted by scraps of tune that no effort will banish. *Airs* are composed in dream which are remembered after waking. Perhaps it is not that music is more the subject of dream than other mental creations, but it is the most capable of being retained by the mind and expressed after the dream has vanished. My own experience of this capacity of the dreaming mind has been to myself very surprising; but perhaps the like may have occurred to others, although not recorded. Some time ago I dreamed that I was present, and heard as well as witnessed, the performance of an entire opera of my own composing. The strange part of it was that I am not a musician and never composed a bar of music in my life. I have a bad musical ear and no musical memory. Yet did my utterly unmusical mind in the dream compose the whole of an opera in two acts, overture and all, with a full band and half a dozen characters, each acting his own part, and the stage, the scenery, machinery and decorations, apparently as perfect as any I have ever beheld and enjoyed at Covent Garden. Certainly it was not a mere dream of a dream. What other solution is there than this—and it is sufficiently marvellous—that my mind, free to act without the incumbering trammels of the sleeping body and exercising its unfettered faculties far beyond their capacity in waking life, had made me a musician, a dramatist, an actor, a painter—for all these that mind

was in the invention and performance of that dream? If that Mind (or Soul) be nothing more than the material form, or a function of that form, how comes it that it is more active and its faculties are more exalted, when the body, of which it is said to be a part, is asleep? If Mind or Soul be a part of the body, or, as the Materialists contend, a mere *function* of the body, it ought, according to all known laws of science, to be sleeping with the body, or at least its activity and capacity ought not to increase in proportion as the activity and capacity of the body decrease.

I have here used the term "Mind" because it is familiar to the reader and any other name would mislead by the prejudices that attach to it. But I must be understood as intending by that term *the thing*, whatever it be, which, in the Mechanism of Man directs and controls it intelligently, whether it be called *Soul* or *Mind*, and if it be a distinct entity, as Psychology contends, or only the product of the molecular structure, as the Materialists assert. This, indeed, is the great problem of the age, to be solved, not by dogmatic *assertion*, but by scientific *proof*.

There are many other Phenomena of Dream of less interest or importance, the description of which would occupy many pages. But those above reviewed will suffice for the purposes of this treatise.

---



## CHAPTER IX.

## THE PHILOSOPHY OF DREAM.

DREAM is essentially a psychological condition and therefore an important study for the Psychologist, for in dream we learn not only what is the mechanism of the Mind but also much of the manner in which the mental operations are performed. Dream teaches us what recent physiologists have by their experiments confirmed—that the Mind is not structured as one homogeneous entity, the whole of which is employed in every mental act, but that it is a machine composed of parts, each of which has its own special function, exhibited in the various expressions which we call ideas, sentiments and emotions.

It is conclusively established that the *Individual Self*, in its normal state of relationship to the body, can receive and convey impressions only through the medium of the brain. Remove the brain and *mind* ceases to be, although life may linger long. Extract a part of the brain and a part of “the mind” goes with it. In fact the Conscious Self has lost wholly or in part the mechanism through which alone it can act upon and be acted upon by the external world. This result is sometimes obscured by the fact, not sufficiently recognised by the Physician and the Mental Philosopher, that we have *two brains—two organs of Mind*—one of which can act alone when the other is wholly or partially disabled. If a Dream be analysed, it is not difficult to trace the action of each separate mental faculty. The imagination supplies the picture, which we mistake for a reality because we have lost the means by which, when

awake, we distinguish the mere mental creation from the impressions borne to us by the senses. Thereupon mental action follows, precisely as if the ideal picture had been *real*, as it is believed to be. The other mental faculties are called into play by the drama of the dream as they would have been by a living drama. It is not an *imagined* anger, or fear, or hate that we feel in dream. The passions, emotions and sentiments are actually excited, as they would be by the same objects presented when we are awake; only they are kindled by shadows created within and not by substances existing without.

But Psychology will gather from the phenomena of dream some very important conclusions. In dream, the Mind is awake and at work, but it works wildly, insanely, without self-control. Something is absent or partially paralysed in sleep that controls its action when we are awake. That absent controlling and directing force is the WILL.

What is THE WILL?

The WILL is the expression of the SELF—of the INDIVIDUAL BEING. It is the “I”—the YOU—that commands, controls and directs thought and action.

This Conscious Self, which possesses the power we call the *Will*, is not, and cannot be, the material brain, nor the product of the brain, as the Materialists assert, for we see that in dream the brain is in part awake and working without the assistance or control of the Will; proving that *the Self*, of whom the Will is the expression, is *not* identical with the brain.

Moreover, the Conscious Self, although taking cognizance of the action of the mind in dream, is nevertheless unable to direct its action; thus affording another *proof* that the Conscious Self and the material molecular mechanism are not identical.

The phenomena of Dream, then, are the *facts*, first presented in the scientific investigation of Psychology, from which we derive *physical proof* of the existence of a *Soul in Man*, not as a vague theory merely, but as shown by the positive *evidence of his mechanism in action*.



## CHAPTER X.

## CONCLUSIONS.

THIS view of the Physiology and Psychology of the very familiar but very marvellous condition of Sleep and Dream seems to conduct the inquirer to some conclusions, whose importance and interest it would be impossible to exaggerate. If there be any truth in them, they point directly to revelations of the actual structure of the Mechanism of Man, hitherto taught as a dogma and accepted as a faith, but for the *proof of which by Science, as a fact in nature*, evidence has been wanting.

The condition of Sleep indicates a *dual* structure—that the Conscious Self and the body are not one, as the Materialists teach, for when the body sleeps the mind (which is merely the Soul expressing itself through a material mechanism) is awake and often more active and more able when it is thus partially released from the burden of the body.

In sleep, the phenomena of dream exhibit this independence of the body yet more powerfully. The mind lives a life of its own, with its own measurements of time and space, so different from those to which it is limited by the material structure of the body.

Self-consciousness is preserved in dream, while the mind is inventing a whole drama of events and persons, so that we contemplate the work of the mind as if it was something existing without ourselves. This proves that the contemplating consciousness is something other than the thing contemplated. The "I" that views and remembers the action of the brain (which is the material organ of

the mind) cannot be the brain itself, nor the mind itself, but must be something distinct from either, although intimately associated with both.

That conscious and contemplating something is the *thing*—the entity—the “I”—the “You”—the being—the individual—which may be called “Soul” or “Spirit,” or by any other name—but which *thing* we intend to designate when we use either of those terms.

These phenomena go far to prove that Man is a “living Soul” clothed with a material body—that this Soul is in fact the person—the individual—the being—of whom the molecular body is but the incrustation. May not what we recognise as “body” be the atoms agglomerated into molecules at the point of contact with the molecularly constructed world in which the present stage of existence is passed and to which the beings “I” and “You” must needs be adapted.

True it is that the phenomena of dream, while throwing so much light upon the structure of the mind and the manner of its action and going far to prove the *being* of Soul, does not impart to us any knowledge of the *structure* of Soul. But we may learn this much. Although it is imperceptible by any of our senses, which are constructed to perceive only that one of the countless combinations of atoms we call *molecular*, it is not therefore unknowable, as the Materialists contend. The existence of Soul can be *proved* in precisely the same manner as the existence of electricity, magnetism, and heat are proved, which also are imperceptible by our senses but not therefore unknowable. We learn *the fact* of their being by their operations upon the molecular structure our senses are constructed to perceive. In like manner we learn something of their qualities and powers. The process of proof of the physical and psychic forces is identical. That which is admissible evidence for the one is no less admissible for the other. To what extent it goes in the way of proof of the existence of Soul is, of course, a fair question for argument and investigation. My contention is only that the inquiry



“If Soul be?” cannot be summarily disposed of by any such dogmatic dictum of Physicists as that Soul, not being perceptible to our senses, is incapable of proving its existence and consequently is, and must ever remain, *unknowable* and that, therefore, Psychology is a vain pursuit and an impossible Science.

In the phenomena of dream we find abundant *scientific proof* of the existence of an unsleeping something other than the sleeping molecular structure. The individual “I” preserves its consciousness of identity, its sense of oneness, in dream and that *something* cannot well be the body contemplating itself—at once the actor and the spectator. Reason thence concludes that one entity must be contemplating another entity, and Psychology contends that this contemplating entity, that wakes and dreams when the body is asleep, is what has been called by many names, but which here is designated as “Soul” simply—without affirming anything of its structure, its nature, its qualities, or its destiny.

---

## BOOK IV.

THE PHENOMENA OF DELIRIUM AND  
INSANITY.

## CHAPTER I.

## DELIRIUM.

DELIRIUM has been termed a temporary insanity.

But it presents most of the characteristics of dream and some only of the features of insanity. The Will is paralysed, as in ordinary dream. The patient has no control over his mental actions. He has lost the command of his thoughts. Disease has thrown him, *waking*, into very nearly the same mental condition into which sleep has cast the sleeper. In delirium the patient partially acts his dream by mutterings and motions, *believing* that he is acting it entirely. In sleep, awakening is easily and speedily produced and there is a rapid recovery by the Conscious Self of the reins over the mental faculties which slumber had caused it to drop. In delirium, the awakenings from the state of dream are few and far between. In sleep, each awakening is usually followed by a new dream. In delirium, the dream is continuous.

Delirium usually commences with an *exaltation* of the mental powers. It passes afterwards into the depressed condition that in fever follows a protracted period of brain excitation. But at the beginning, when the blood is



coursing through the veins and stimulating every nerve of the body and every fibre of the brain, before lapse into congestion with its paralysing pressure, there is marked mental excitement, amounting at times to a state of ecstasy that appears to the patient like inspiration and to the spectator like madness.

Unlike insanity—which usually expresses itself so that its mental character can be discovered—the mental condition of delirium can be learned only from the patient. Having suffered delirium in the course of an attack of scarlet fever, many years ago, I was enabled to take careful note of the mental phenomena attendant upon its coming on and progress until it passed into the condition of unconsciousness. A short sketch of that experience will throw some light on a familiar, but rarely noted, form of an abnormal action of the mental mechanism which is fraught with instruction in Mental Physiology.

The first consciousness was of general exhilaration and enhanced activity of the whole mind, with very rapid flow of ideas. This gradually increased, until there was an almost sublime sense of mental exaltation. These sensations were very pleasant—for the thick-coming fancies were visions of beautiful landscapes, brilliant skies and glowing colours—such as I had never before conceived. Then countless comical faces seemed to stream before my eyes and I remember wondering, as each one flitted by, what oddity would come next. I was, indeed, greatly amused at the procession, which seemed endless in number and variety. All the corbels in Europe would not have supplied such a succession of queer features as did that delirious vision. After awhile, this gave place to a flow of silent eloquence. Imaginary poems, speeches and “leading articles” were constructed in my mind, with a seeming force of thought, fervour of original ideas and facility of expression such as I had never experienced.

At this stage of the malady I sent for my clerk and requested him to write at my dictation. I was then

contributing "leaders" to a newspaper. I dictated one which appeared to me, as I uttered it, to be by far the most eloquent "leading article" I had ever composed—the argument powerful, the language glowing. It was written as repeated by my lips and I directed that it should be sent to the office for publication. I believed it to be a paper that would make a sensation. My clerk prudently did not send it. On my recovery from the fever, he showed me the essay I had deemed so wise and beautiful. It was simply a confused mass of disjointed and incoherent sentences, with no perceptible argument, a hotch-potch of words wholly disconnected. This fact is interesting as throwing much light on the mental condition of Delirium and its next-of-kin Insanity.

Soon afterwards that stage of mental exaltation passed and pleasure was changed to sensations the horror of which haunted me long after and sometimes still, in dream.

The faintest odour became an overpowering stench and seemed to stifle me. The sense of touch was affected so that anything on which my finger rested appeared to grow beneath it until it was as a mountain. The fingers and indeed every limb seemed to swell until each was bigger than my whole body. The slightest sound was as thunder. Every sense nerve was in abnormal activity and the impressions brought to the mind were so exaggerated that I was thrown into an agony of pain and terror. After a while Consciousness gradually departed and the second stage of delirium commenced.

To this point the condition of dream was but partial. I was not asleep. I was conscious of all surrounding objects and motions. I had a perfect memory of every occurrence and talked sensibly, though excitedly, to those about me.

Of the second stage of delirium I am not competent to speak from personal recollection, for consciousness was suspended. It was restored for a moment when I was rudely roused, but as speedily it lapsed again into oblivion. For these phenomena of delirium I must refer



to my observation of them in another. A very remarkable case occurred in my own family.

The patient had been afflicted with rheumatic fever. Delirium had supervened and rapidly passed into the second stage, as indicated by occasional mutterings and by apparent insensibility, from which external voices could rouse him for a few moments only.

At this stage there occurred (and I have received similar reports from others) a very curious and interesting phenomenon.

Instead of the ever-changing visions that throng the mind in the early stages of delirium, there is a *continuous dream*. The mind invents and enacts a complete and consistent drama. It creates a world of its own and lives in it. This phenomenon differs from the ordinary dream of sleep inasmuch that a sleep-dream is rarely continuous even in the one slumber, which is usually occupied with many dreams wholly disconnected and even inconsistent. Still more rare in sleep is the continuance of a dream after waking to consciousness or the return of it when again falling into sleep.

But the dream of the low stage of delirium is continued not merely for hours but for days. It is not disturbed even by the occasional recall of the patient to consciousness. He returns to waking life for a time; but when he relapses into the delirium the drama of the dream is continued as if it had not been interrupted.

And this continuous dream of delirium is even more vivid and real to the mind of the patient than are any occurrences of real life. They live in his memory as things actually seen, heard, and felt. If the story so invented and enacted be one that after occurrences or the facts of waking life do not contradict, he never again loses the conviction that they were real. If they are inconsistent with subsequent experience, they are slowly and reluctantly abandoned. As a patient who had experienced such an affection remarked to me, "It is hard to discredit all this. It is more real to me than anything I have seen—more true to my mind than any truths."

In the instance of my relative, the dream of his delirium was that a gold mine had been discovered in one of his fields. On his recovery from the fever he narrated to me the whole story, as it was presented in the dream, extending over months in imaginary time, over ten days in real time. It was a reasonable and consistent story, assuming that a gold mine could exist in an English meadow. For weeks after he had quitted his bed and a healthy condition of the brain had been restored, he sent his servant daily to the bank to inquire if some money, the product of the imaginary mine, had not been paid to his account, and it was not until he was able to leave the house and visit the field in question that he could be convinced that it was a dream and not a reality. Psychology was then almost unknown as a *practical* Science. The patient, although a very intelligent man, like all of his generation, was utterly ignorant of mental physiology and could not conceive how it came to pass that a vision of the mind should be brighter than any adventure of his life. I am not sure that he was not inclined to look upon the delirious dream as his sane and upon his waking senses as his insane condition.

Observe, that in the progressive stages of the abnormal conditions of the mental mechanism that begin with the phenomena of dream and culminate in the phenomena of psychism, delirium is the next in degree of dislocation of the mechanism beyond that exhibited in the condition of dream. In delirium, a stage of excitement is followed by a stage of depression. In the stage of excitement, the mental faculties, as well as the senses, are stimulated to greatly increased action. The senses are vastly more acute. The mental faculties work with more power and activity. Ideas are generated with great rapidity. To the Conscious Self they are presented as being vastly greater and grander than in fact they are, and this is accompanied with incapacity to compare those ideas and reason upon them, similar to that which attends upon the dream of sleep.



But in the depressed stage of delirium all these phenomena are reversed. The senses are sealed, as in sleep, conveying external impressions but faintly to the brain. Then the mind, limited to its own brain-born ideas, undisturbed by the influx of sensations from without, works with those ideas (*a*) and constructs a vision, which it mistakes for a reality because it is not corrected by the senses. They are paralysed in delirium as in dream.

In what manner the *continuous* character that marks the dream of delirium is brought about we have no knowledge. But it is an important feature of that dream, as will be seen hereafter, when other allied abnormal conditions, presenting very similar phenomena, come to be treated of.

(*a*) The term "idea" is here used solely to denote things pictured to the mind's eye.

---

## CHAPTER II.

## INSANITY.

THE next stage of departure from the normal condition of the mental mechanism is the malady too familiar to us by its title of Insanity. It differs much in its nature and phenomena from dream and delirium, but presents some of the characteristic features of both.

*Dream* is insanity in sleep. *Delirium* is a temporary waking insanity. *Insanity* is a waking dream and a protracted delirium.

But insanity differs from dream in this—that it prevails when the senses are awake and at work, when the Will is in full activity, when more or less of the mental faculties are in sound health and capacity.

Insanity has been described as “a waking dream.” It is so in part, but not wholly. As in all other abnormal conditions of the mental mechanism, the patient mistakes his mental conceptions for objective realities. All of us do this in dream and in delirium; but when we pass out of these abnormal conditions into waking and healthy life we learn to discriminate between fancy and reality, between the ideas self created within and impressions brought to the mind from without. Insanity is marked by the loss of this capacity to discover the subjective from the objective and consequently the Insane awake are very nearly what we are when asleep. To understand something of the condition of an insane mind, it is only necessary to recall the state of your own mind in a dream



and imagine yourself to be *acting* among your fellow men the same parts that in your dream you *imagine* that you act.

It is difficult to realise to the imagination the state of a mind that could take objects of *sight* to be quite other things than they are. But it is easy to comprehend the condition in which fanciful *ideas* may be mistaken for *realities*. All our knowledge is in fact *mental*—that is to say—all we *know* is that the mind presents to us an idea. We do not and cannot know that a thing corresponding to the idea actually exists, or that it is as it seems to us to be. With the Insane, an impression is made upon the sense—say, of sight—by some external object. An abnormal state of the brain deforms or transforms that impression and the Conscious Self receives the deformed image precisely as if it had been a veritable sense impression. If the other mental faculties are sound, they accept this false impression and treat it as true and we have the insane condition known as *hallucination*. In such case the patient reasons rightly from wrong premisses. Assuming his conception of the object to be the true one, he thinks, acts and speaks with perfect consistency. This is the Psychology of the condition known as *Monomania*.

But when other important faculties are diseased also the phenomena become more complicated. Insanity may be of one, or two, or more of the mental powers, and according to these combinations so will the malady manifest itself. Hence the wonderful variety of forms which madness assumes, insomuch that the most experienced doctor has never seen two cases having precisely the same features. There is no part of the mental mechanism that is not liable to be thus disorganised. The intellectual faculties are as subject to dislocation by disease as are the sentiments and the passions. A further element of difficulty in the diagnosis of Insanity is the duplex structure of the brain—the fact that we have *two* brains and consequently two material organs for the expression of each mental faculty. For it may well be,

and often it is, that disease is limited to one brain, the other brain being quite healthy. In such a condition, madness presents the most strange and seemingly unaccountable forms. The diseased and the healthy faculty may be observed as acting together, but not in concert. Then comes the same kind of mental obliquity which we discover in the sense of sight when we thrust one eye out of its focus. The product in such case is that we mildly call "*eccentricity*;" but it is Insanity really.

Insanity is disease of the brain, not of the Soul—of the molecular mechanism, not of the non-molecular thing of which that mechanism is but the organ. The Conscious Self is not mad. The mechanism only is dislocated through which alone it can express itself to, or be itself impressed upon by, the external world. It is as with a player on a musical instrument that is out of tune. Although himself designing harmony and striking the true string, he can present only harsh discords to the listening ear. It may as well be said that the steam engine is crazed because the power it transmits to the disjointed mechanism of the loom issues in a chaos of tangled webs.

*The brain only is diseased.* The minister and not the master is at fault. Insanity is damaged brain. There may be excitation without lesion, or depression from lack of stimulus. Each has definite and distinctive features readily to be discerned by the Psychologist. Such cases are curable by removal of their causes. Otherwise it is, if there be lesion. Where positive destruction of the brain fibres has taken place no skill nor care can cure. The utmost that can be accomplished is to arrest the progress of the malady. But even in such a case there is no cause for despair. The mental faculties are all in *duplicate*. We are gifted with *two* brains, doubtless as a provision against the contingency of fatal injury to one of them. Unless the same parts of both brains be disorganised, the mind will not be wholly incapacitated in respect of the particular faculty, although its power will be diminished and its capacity for combined action disturbed.



The student of Psychology will understand now why it is that Insanity is so very various in its aspects; how false is the vulgar notion of insanity, which assumes that if the patient be partially "*out of his mind*"—he has ceased to be a human being. Probably few, if any, are insane altogether—that is to say, are diseased in every part of *both* brains—for the result of such a condition would not be insanity, but *idiocy* or death. In *all* other cases there is more or less of the sound brain and therefore of the sound mind. The first duty of those who have care of the insane is to ascertain *what* of the mental faculties are diseased and what continue sound. Treatment should then be directed to restraining and modifying the action of the one and strengthening and confirming the action of the other.

There are phenomena of Insanity the description of which would worthily occupy more pages than can here be given to the entire of the Mechanism of Man. For its physiology and treatment generally the reader is referred to the works of Dr. CONOLLY and other experts who have conducted extensive asylums in which a vast variety of its phases have been committed to their care.

The lessons *Psychology* gathers from the phenomena exhibited when a diseased brain induces *Insanity* may be briefly stated.

1. They supply conclusive proof that the mind—using that term in the popular sense—is *not* one homogeneous whole, acting as one entire entity in all its operations, as asserted by Dr. CARPENTER and others; but that it is composed of parts, each part having its own proper function. The action of each part is exhibited in that expression of the intelligence we call a "mental faculty."

Insanity proves a diversity of parts of the brain, as associated with diversity of function, by the fact that some functions are seen to be diseased while others remain sound. Thus comes *partial* Insanity or *Monomania*.

2. Insanity indicates that which has now been proved conclusively by Professor FERRIER, and which was long ago demonstrated by GALL, SPURZHEIM and COMBE, that

various parts of the brain are appropriated to various mental functions, each distinct mental faculty having its own special place in the mechanism of the brain. But what are the precise parts of the brain so occupied is as yet unproved.

Insanity demonstrates this by the direct relationship it exhibits between disease of a certain part of the brain and disorder of a certain mental faculty. Nor is this relationship rare or accidental. Disease of the same part of the brain in two or more patients is always attended with disorder of the same mental faculties. Conversely, by observing what faculties are disordered, the seat of the brain disease may be accurately ascertained.

3. Insanity exhibits some further phenomena that support the theory of *Pneumatology*—the “Science of the Soul.”

The Insane never lose the consciousness of their own individuality. As with the sane in dream, the insane do not lose their *identity*. They believe themselves to be some other *character*, not to be some other *being*. It is ever himself who has become a king. John Smith does not think that he is George Rex but only that John has been exalted to the state of George. He is John playing George.

The consciousness of identity remaining, after the material machinery of the mind has been so disordered and dislocated that all mental action is a chaos and the usual evidences of actuality destroyed, can be explained only by this—that there is something other than the disordered mechanism which preserves its sense of identity and individuality. That *something* which does not become insane with the insane mind is the non-molecular entity we call “the Soul.” Insanity—which is *brain disease*—that is, some injury to the brain structure—cannot touch the Soul. True, the Conscious Self is deprived of its power to receive from or convey to the external material world correct expressions and impressions; but it preserves its own power unimpaired, in despite of the abnormal conditions by which it is



encompassed. *The Soul* is not insane, only the mechanism through which it works. If that diseased mechanism be repaired, healthy intercourse with the world is renewed. If it be diseased beyond recovery, the shattered molecular mechanism perishes, but the non-molecular being—the “you” or “I” survives, or *what becomes of it?*

## BOOK V.

## THE PHENOMENA OF SOMNAMBULISM.

## CHAPTER I.

## INTRODUCTION.

THE conditions of Sleep, Dream, Delirium and Insanity are familiar to every reader. Their existence is not denied and the simple business of the Psychologist is to observe the undisputed phenomena and try to trace them to their sources. Readers who had patience to peruse attentively the preceding chapters were doubtless surprised to find how much of the popular prejudices on the subjects there treated of had taken possession of their own minds and how difficult it is to divest themselves of those prejudices. Dreamy conceptions of the constitution and mechanism of Man, of the nature of Mind and Soul and of their mutual relationship, could not fail to have coloured the facts and "cribbed, cabined, and confined" all efforts of thought. We can sympathise with the student, seeking honestly the very truth, but finding himself involved in a maze of fanciful conjecture. Yet how few, plain and simple are the explanations of that which he had learned to look upon as profoundest mysteries it was profanity even to endeavour to explore! If so it be with subjects familiar to ear and mind as Sleep and Dream, Delirium and Insanity, he will not be surprised to learn that the comparatively rare abnormal conditions



now to be examined are still more encompassed with prejudices and demand for the investigation of their phenomena an equally clear conception of the human mechanism. Many of those phenomena are apart from everyday experience, of infrequent occurrence, therefore affording but few opportunities for test examination by the Psychologist and Physiologist.

We are reviewing still the *abnormal* mental conditions the existence of which is undisputed, taking them in the order of their familiarity to ourselves rather than with reference to their intrinsic importance.

In truth, the phenomena of Dream, although presented to us during a considerable portion of our lives, are quite as marvellous as any that are exhibited in the other allied psychical conditions. The subject has been thus arranged with further purpose to show how intimately these various mental affections are related, insomuch that, as we view them in succession, we shall find each to be little more than a further development of its predecessor, and that all have their origin in a few familiar and undisputed physiological and psychological conditions.

It is worthy of note by the Student how in this, as in other departments of Science, the popular mind is more impressed by the *strange* than by the wonderful. It accepts with complacency whatever is familiar, however full of marvel it may be, and rejects with unreasoning obstinacy, as impossible or improbable, things far less marvellous that have the discredit of *novelty*. The reader is requested to keep watch and ward against this common weakness, while pursuing the Science of Psychology. At every step he should ask himself, *not* is it *strange*, but is it *true*? If it be *true* it will soon cease to be *strange*.

In *Dream* we have seen the mind working without the aid of the senses or the control of the *Will*. In *Delirium* we have seen it dreaming when awake. In *Insanity* we have seen it mistaking its subjective for objective impressions, in full possession of Will power, *acting* its

mental conceptions, but unable to distinguish the ideal from the real.

In *Somnambulism* all the features of these abnormal conditions are present, but developing some further special conditions to which the attention of the student is earnestly invited, for they are calculated to throw a stronger light still upon the Mechanism of Man, upon the being of Soul, and upon the relationship of Soul to body.

---



## CHAPTER II.

## SOMNAMBULISM.

THE name given to this remarkable and profoundly interesting abnormal condition of the Mechanism of Man would imply that it is a form of Sleep. Such is, indeed, the popular notion, for it is commonly known as "sleep-walking." Probably this is still the conception of it by the majority of the Doctors who have examined its physiology only and not its psychology.

But Somnambulism is *not* sleep and has no alliance with sleep, other than closed eyes. The Somnambule, as will be seen presently, can perceive external objects, can converse rationally and *act* sensibly, which the sleeper cannot.

It is, in fact, a distinct and definite physical and psychical condition.

The aspect of the Somnambule resembles that of the sleeper. There is the same placidity of feature. The eyes are closed, save in very rare instances. The breathing is slow and regular, the pulse betraying no excitement. The eye alone exhibits a distinguishing characteristic. The eyelids are closed with almost spasmodic energy, insomuch that muscular effort is required to open them. They are incessantly quivering, with a rapidity impossible to be maintained by any effort of the waking Will. When force is used to separate the lids, the eyes are found to be turned upwards and inwards, so that no direct ray of light from without can possibly fall upon the retina. They also are quivering. This is the feature by which the condi-

tion of Somnambulism may always be readily and certainly distinguished from the condition of sleep and from all other conditions. It is of much importance, for it is an absolute security against imposture. *Neither of these convulsive actions can be assumed or imitated by any voluntary effort.*

What is the condition of the BRAIN in Somnambulism differing from its condition in sleep we are as yet wholly ignorant. It is not even known what part of the brain structure is the seat of the affection. It is certainly the result of an unhealthy state of the mental mechanism. Some great psychological changes are exhibited and these imply corresponding physiological changes in the mechanism of the brain. The normal relationship of the Conscious Self to the mechanism of the mind is manifestly disturbed and more or less in a state of dislocation.

Somnambulism occurs *naturally*. It may also be produced artificially. From the many persons who are found on trial subject to Somnambulism, it may be presumed that it occurs naturally much more frequently than observation has recorded. From the nature of the affection it is likely to come and pass away when there is no spectator of the actions of the Somnambule. But the cases are so many and so well authenticated by competent observers and within the personal experience of so many readers, that *Somnambulism* may be accepted as a *fact in nature* whose existence is neither disputable nor disputed.

This is a truth of much import to Psychology. The unquestioned phenomena of natural Somnambulism are quite as wonderful as any that are exhibited in artificial Somnambulism and other allied abnormal psychical conditions which are absolutely rejected because of their seeming strangeness. The very persons who admit, because compelled by overwhelming evidence, the super-sensuous perceptions of the *natural* Somnambule, reject the super-sensuous perceptions of the Somnambule whose condition is *artificially* induced, upon the distinct ground that the acts alleged to be done are impossible.



Such are the melancholy inconsistencies of Scientists, who claim more freedom than other men from prejudice and prepossession and boast a freer exercise of reason!

Artificial Somnambulism is *identical* with natural Somnambulism. But it possesses this great advantage for the student of psychological science, that being produced and removed at will, it affords means for observation and experiment, the value of which has been as yet but imperfectly recognised. The patients can be subjected to *conditions*. Tests may be freely applied. Careful record can be kept of phenomena and they can be confirmed by frequent repetition. Indeed, it is by the means thus provided for observing the action of the mental mechanism in its abnormal conditions that Mental Physiology and Psychology may hope to achieve hereafter their grandest discoveries.

Hitherto the just objection made to Psychological and Mental Science has been, that it rests upon no solid basis of *facts capable of proof* (as are the facts of physical science) by observation and positive experiment. Its basis was said to be more or less problematical and conjectural. Introspection was consequently substituted for observation and self-analysis for experiment. It was assumed that, because Mind and Soul were incapable of being seen, handled, carved, weighed and analysed, they could not be the subjects of tangible science. Therefore they were remitted to the limbo of fancy and treated as topics for ingenious conjecture and argument only. But Somnambulism, with its capability for ready reproduction, with the control the investigator possesses over the patient, in this respect almost rivalling the command which the Physiologist has over the organic matter that is the subject of *his* experiments, has happily opened to Science the same means for investigating Mind and Soul (or whatever may be the forces that move and direct the body intelligently) as the Physicist enjoys for the investigation of matter and the physical forces by which matter is moved.

## CHAPTER III.

## NATURAL SOMNAMBULISM.

ALTHOUGH the aspect of the patient in Somnambulism so far resembles Sleep that the popular name was given to it on the assumption that it was only a form of Sleep, it must be distinctly understood that *Somnambulism is not Sleep*. It is in fact a condition, both mental and physiological, quite other than that of sleep. Sometimes it attacks the patient subject to it in his bed and during the state of ordinary sleep. But there is a distinct passage from one condition into another condition. Its character is different, it has other causes and produces other effects.

Fortunately for Psychological Science, *Natural Somnambulism is an undisputed fact*. Doubtless it would have been denied by the Materialists if denial were possible. But its recurrence is too frequent and too familiar to be denounced as imposture on the part of the patient or delusion on the part of the observer.

The phenomena exhibited in natural somnambulism are also admitted to be facts, but with a reluctance not surprising. The phenomena of natural somnambulism are quite as wonderful and inexplicable as are those exhibited in somnambulism artificially produced and in other abnormal conditions, which are disputed and denied because they are strange, the patients called impostors and the witnesses dupes! That the same phenomena *can be and are* exhibited naturally is an awkward fact



for those who contest their *possibility* when produced by art.

NATURAL SOMNAMBULISM, taken alone, could accomplish little for mental science. Not that cases of it are few, but that from their nature they are difficult of access and when seen still more difficult to investigate. In the majority of instances the condition occurs at night, when the patient is in his bed and the room is dark. A certain amount of awe is felt by the spectator, however familiar may be the spectacle, and few have the courage, and fewer still the patience and intelligence, requisite for close and continued observation of the actions of the Somnambule. Moreover, there is reluctance, on the part alike of the patient and of his friends, that his infirmity should be known, associating it, as some have ignorantly affected to do, with insanity present or threatening.

Somnambulism differs from sleep in many important features.

The aspect of the patient is that of one plunged in profound slumber. It is a popular belief that the eyes are open, the eyeballs fixed and staring, but with no intelligence in them, the eyelids never winking. Such was Shakespeare's notion, as shown in the powerful picture of this malady in *Lady Macbeth*, the general accuracy of which is as admirable as is its artistic effect. Trite though it is, it describes the mental phenomenon now under consideration with a truthfulness no language of mine could embody.

*Doctor.*—When was it she last walked?

*Gentlewoman.*—Since his Majesty went into the field, I have seen her rise from her bed, throw her night gown upon her, unlock her closet, take forth paper, fold it, write upon it, read it, afterwards seal it, and again return to bed; yet all this while in the most profound sleep.

*Doct.*—A great perturbation in nature. To receive at once the benefit of sleep and do the effects of watching.

*Gent.*—Lo you, here she comes! This is her very guise; and upon my life fast asleep. Observe her.

*Doct.*—You see her eyes are open.

*Gent.*—Aye, but their sense is shut.

*Doct.*—What is it she does now? Look, now she rubs her hands.

*Gent.*—It is an accustomed action with her, to seem thus washing her hands. I have known her continue in this for a quarter of an hour.

There may be, and indeed some reported cases seem to show that there are, instances in which the eyes of the Somnambule are wide open and staring, as with Lady Macbeth. But these cases are very rare. With the vast majority of Somnambules the eyes are firmly closed, so firmly that considerable force is required to open them. The countenance is extremely placid, the face very pale, the extremities abnormally cold and clammy, the breathing regular and full, with frequent sighing, or rather, deep inspirations that make the sound of a sigh, but are not, like sighing, expressions of mental emotion.

But here the resemblance to sleep ends. The conditions differ from those of sleep in many particulars. The muscles are not flaccid, but retain all, and often more than, the ordinary tension of waking life. The limbs are not relaxed, but in energetic action. The head does not droop. If the eyelids be forcibly raised (and they are always lifted with difficulty, so firmly are they pressed together), the eyeballs are found in an unnatural position, drawn upwards and inwards, so that the direction of the line of vision would fall within the upper orbit of the projecting frontal sinus—a position in which the exercise of sight would be impossible, even if the eyelids were raised. This remarkable position of the eyes is especially to be noted, for it is *the characteristic of the somnambulist condition* and distinguishes it at once from ordinary sleep, in which the eyes always preserve their natural position. It is important also in this respect, that *it cannot be voluntarily assumed*. No effort of the Will can place the eyes in the position exhibited by a Somnambule. It will be noted also that, when the eyeballs are in this abnormal position, they are not still, as in sleep, but in a state of rapid and constant quivering.

All the senses appear to be closely sealed. No sounds



startle, however loud or sudden. The patient is insensible to pain. Taste, touch and smell are paralysed. The strongest snuff does not cause sneezing. There is not the slightest wincing from the application to the nostril of the most powerful ammonia. Sight is impossible, for in the position of the eyes no ray from any external object can fall upon the retina.

Nevertheless, in this apparently helpless state, deprived of the assistance of *all* his external senses, the patient rises from his bed and walks with facility and firmness in the dark as well as in the light, avoiding obstacles as readily as if he could see or feel them. Thus he passes, without fear and with perfect ease and safety, over places dangerous even to the waking footstep—on the ridge of a house roof; across a narrow plank above a stream; down a steep and perilous path by a precipice over which he would be hurled if the footstep erred but a few inches; through rooms crowded with furniture, threading his way without stumbling or mistaking.

Nor this only. The Somnambule, with his eyes closed and all his senses sealed in the darkness of the darkest night, will perform his daily work, however intricate—write, read, thread a needle, draw and paint, and do other acts requiring keen sight, manual dexterity and delicate touch. During the entire of this, all his external senses are paralysed. He neither sees, hears nor feels with the bodily organs. *The Mind only is awake.* Manifestly *the Mind*, in this condition of somnambulism, *receives impressions of external objects and guides the actions of the body without the assistance of its usual informants, the senses.* And these things are done, not tentatively nor with hesitation, as by one feeling his way or seeking for something in darkness, but firmly, unhesitatingly, easily, perfectly, and without mistakes, as if he had been awake and was acting in the daylight instead of in the dark. If the affection occurs in sleep and the patient is undisturbed, he usually retires again to his bed. Somnambulism gives place to sleep. The eyes resume their natural position. The

limbs relax. Dreams come and go and are remembered. Finally, he wakes from slumber without the slightest recollection of anything that had happened during the period of his somnambulism.

Nor are these phenomena all that is strange in a natural condition not now disputed by Physiologists or Physicians. Although the Somnambule has no memory, when awake, of anything that occurred during the paroxysm,—when a similar fit recurs, he usually resumes the dream life that had been interrupted when he passed from it into sleep and continues the work upon which he had been engaged, at the very point where he had left it.

It is as if the Somnambule possessed two lives, one his waking life, the other his somnambulist life, each independent of the other, each having its own life drama and neither having any knowledge of the history of the other.

There are further differences between *Somnambulism* and *Sleep*. Sleep seals the external senses but partially; Somnambulism seals them perfectly. Impressions made upon the senses in sleep modify dream by suggestion. The Somnambule appears not to be thus affected. We are unable to *act* the dreams of sleep, although presented to us as realities and believed at the moment to be real, but we *think* we are acting them. The rationale of this is that the link is severed between the Conscious Self and the nerves that, in the normal condition of the mechanism, are obedient to it. The Will also is paralysed. As the consequence of this, the body does not receive the commands of the Mind, nor does it deliver to the Mind the impressions made upon itself.

In *Sleep*, also, the self-produced idea dominates the whole Mind, which unhesitatingly accepts the impossible, the incongruous and the absurd as being not only possible but practicable and proper. And it is not dreamed of as *contemplated* merely, but as being *done*.

By the Somnambule *the dream is acted*. It is never either impossible or absurd. On the contrary, his action



is a rational direction of appropriate means to reasonable ends—as much so, at least, as are the promptings of his mind, his motives and his actions, when he is awake.

The difference between the *mental* conditions of the Sleeper and the Somnambule appears to be as thus. With the *Sleeper*, the senses are dulled, not suspended; he has lost control over the action of the brain and he has lost *also* the power by which the brain commands the actions of the body. In this condition the various faculties act, each according to its own impulses, in strict obedience to the law of association. The Mind is unable to discern incongruities, to recognise the impossible and impracticable, or to distinguish self-produced ideas from impressions actually made upon the external senses by objects without. In sleep, the most sceptical philosopher rivals the devotee he derides when awake and is himself an example of the creed thus tersely expressed; “I believe in all impossible things.”

But with the *Somnambule* the external senses only are sealed. *All* the faculties of his mind are wide awake. He has perceptions of external objects, although certainly through some other medium than the five senses, and he *acts* upon the impressions so abnormally received as perfectly and as rationally as when he is awake.

The *Sleeper* dreams, but he does *not* act the dream, although at the moment of dreaming he firmly believes that his body is actually engaged in the performances that are pictured to the eye of his mind. The *Somnambule* dreams; but, unlike the Sleeper, *he acts the dream*, preserving still a consciousness of the external world, dealing with it in a manner that proves him to have distinct mental perceptions of surrounding objects, although they are imperceptible to his bodily senses.

We are wholly ignorant (and this is another of the many confessions of ignorance the Psychologist and Physiologist are continually compelled to make) of the *causes* of this remarkable affection. We have but partial acquaintance with its phenomena. Better knowledge of these could not fail to throw a blaze of light upon

many of the more obscure operations of the Mind and the *relationship* of Body, Mind and Soul. It is indeed marvellous that the opening of a mine so rich in the most important of all knowledge as is provided by these abnormal mental conditions should have been so long neglected by Physiologists and Psychologists. The recent revival of the public interest in Psychology and all that relates to it may, perhaps, induce some Philosophers to turn from the vain endeavour to advance psychological and mental science by abstract metaphysical argument to the more tedious, but more profitable, investigation of the positive *facts* that belong to it.

Cases of *Natural Somnambulism* being rarely accessible, our knowledge of it would have been limited to the few that have been reported by competent observers, chiefly medical, were it not for the comparatively recent discovery, that the *condition itself can be produced artificially* in a great number of persons and that thus observation and experiment can be conducted in almost any manner and to any extent required for the extension of psychological science.

To this, therefore, we will presently turn. But here let me submit to the reader some of the best authenticated cases of *Natural Somnambulism*, that he may compare them with the cases of *Somnambulism artificially produced*, which he will find hereafter recorded. The resemblances he cannot fail to note will serve the important purpose of assuring him that the phenomena are substantially the same in both. If, therefore, in the one they are undoubtedly genuine, the reasonable inference is that they are equally genuine in the other, and that the imputations of fraud and delusion, so freely cast upon investigations of all new regions of science, are in this instance altogether unsound, illogical and unjust.

Dr. ARNOLD WEINHOLT reports the following, on the authority of Dr. SCHULZ, the famous physician of Hamburgh:

A girl between twelve and thirteen years of age, belonging to a family of some distinction, was afflicted with a violent nervous



complaint, in which strong convulsive motions alternated with catalepsy and syncope. Besides, she frequently had paroxysms, during which she conversed with much liveliness and ingenuity. In this state, she distinguished, without difficulty, all colours that were presented to her, recognised the numbers of cards and the stripes upon those which were variegated. She described the colour of the binding of books, when shown her. She wrote in the same manner as usual, and cut figures in paper, as she was accustomed to do, for pastime, in her waking state. Her eyes at this time, were firmly closed. But in order to be assured that she made no use of them, a bandage was placed over them on the approach of the paroxysm.

The following case is recorded in the "Breslau Medical Collections :"

A rope-maker was frequently overtaken by sleep, even in the day-time, and in the midst of his usual occupations. While in this state, he sometimes recommenced doing all that he had been engaged in during the previous part of the day ; at other times he would continue the work in which he happened to be engaged at the commencement of the paroxysm, and finished his business with as great ease and success as when awake. When the fit overtook him in travelling, he proceeded on his journey, with the same facility, and almost faster, than when awake, without missing the road or stumbling over anything. In this manner he repeatedly went from Naumburg to Weimar. Upon one of these occasions, he came into a narrow lane where lay some timber. He passed over it regularly, without injury ; and with equal caution and dexterity he avoided the horses and carriages which came in his way. At another time he was overtaken by sleep just as he was about to set out for Weimar on horseback. He rode through the river Ilme, allowed his horse to drink and drew up his legs to prevent them from getting wet ; then passed through several streets, crossed the market place, which was at that time full of people, carts, and booths, and arrived in safety at the house of an acquaintance, where he awoke. These, and many similar facts, requiring the use of the eyes, he performed in darkness as well as by daylight. His eyes, however, were firmly closed, and he could not see when they were forced open and stimulated by light brought near them. His other senses appeared to be equally dormant as were his eyes. He could not smell even the most volatile spirit. He felt nothing when pinched, pricked, or struck. He heard nothing when called by his name, or even when a pistol was discharged close beside him.

The next is the case of a student observed by Professor and Aulic Councillor FEDER :

He would go from his bed-room to his parlour and back, open and shut the doors, as well as his closet, and take out of the latter whatever he wanted—pieces of music, pen, ink, and paper—and all this with his eyes shut. From among his music he selected a march from the opera “*Medea*,” laid the sheet in a proper situation before him, and having found the appropriate key, he played the whole piece, with his usual skill, upon the harpsichord. In the same manner he also played one of Bach’s Sonatas, and gave the most expressive passages with surprising effect. One of the persons present turned the notes upside down; this he immediately perceived, and when he recommenced playing he replaced the sheet in its proper position. While playing, he remarked a string out of tune, upon which he stopped, put it in order, and again proceeded. He wrote a letter to his brother, and what he wrote was not only perfectly rational, but straight and legible. While Professor FEDER was upon a visit to him one afternoon, he (the somnambulist) observed that it was snowing, which was actually the case. On the same occasion, notwithstanding his eyes were still completely closed, he remarked that the landlord of the opposite house was standing at the window, which was true, and that hats were hanging at the window of another room, which was also the fact. He opened Professor FEDER’s “*Compendium of Logic and Metaphysics*,” and pointed out to him several passages which he thought interesting, as also some of his own written notes of the Professor’s Lectures in a volume which had been recently bound. He pointed out to another of his teachers the exact place where he had left off in his last theological lecture.

A trustworthy physician, Dr. KNOLL, recorded the following of a young gardener, who was a Somnambule :

He generally fell asleep about eight o’clock in the evening, and then began to utter devotional sentences and prayers. Afterwards, he went out of the house, clambered over a high wooden partition and a still higher wall uninjured, passed through several streets and returned. At another time, he climbed up to the roof of the house and rode astride upon the gutter, as if upon horseback, clambered about for some time upon the roof and at length descended in safety. With a view to prevent accidents, he was locked up in a room and watched. When he became somnambulist at the usual time he began to perform all sorts of operations upon his clothes and the furniture of the room. He climbed up to the window sill, and from thence to a stove, which was much higher and at some distance, and rode upon the latter as if upon a horse. The height of the stove, its distance from the window and its small breadth were such that a person awake would scarcely have ventured to attempt these operations.



After descending from the stove, he knocked a large table about hither and thither and finding that it was likely to fall upon himself, he very dexterously contrived to evade it. He gathered together all the clothes he could find in the room, mixed them together, then separated them carefully and hung them up, each article in its proper place. The old stockings and shoes he endeavoured to arrange in pairs, according to their shape and colour, as if he accurately saw them. He laid hold of a needle, which he had struck into the wall some weeks before and sewed his small clothes. Besides these, he performed a variety of other operations—all requiring light and the use of the eyes, with which, it would appear, he was enabled to dispense.

MEINERS, in his collection, has given place to the following extract from MORITZ's *Magazine*. The patient was a girl aged sixteen :

The paroxysm generally attacked her in the morning and consisted of a profound sleep. In this state, she would jump, with astonishing activity, upon tables and chairs, run, when permitted, and with great activity, out of the house—generally to a particular place in the neighbourhood; and when she did not awake, she would return immediately, but sometimes by a different road and in a different direction. She not unfrequently left the high road and ran straight through the fields. She never fell nor injured herself, however rough her path might be, or however fast she might run; and her speed was sometimes so great, that her much stronger and more active brother could not keep pace with her. She frequently mounted upon the garden wall, upon the uneven top of which she continued to run; nay, she even went upon the edge of the house-roof without once stumbling, much less falling. During all these hazardous operations her eyes were fast closed and she appeared to be deprived of all her other senses.

The *French Encyclopædia* has preserved a very remarkable case, accurately noted by the ARCHBISHOP OF BOURDEAUX. It is that of a young ecclesiastic in the same seminary with the Archbishop :

He was in the habit of getting up during the night, in a state of somnambulism, of going to his room, taking pen, ink, and paper, and composing and writing sermons. When he had finished one page of the paper on which he was writing, he would read over what he had written and correct it. Upon one occasion he had made use of the expression, *Ce divin enfant*. In reading over the passage, he changed the adjective *divin* into *adorable*. Perceiving, however, that the pronoun *ce* could not stand before the word *adorable*, he added to the former the letter *t*.

In order to ascertain whether the somnambulist made any use of his eyes, the Archbishop held a piece of pasteboard under his chin, to prevent him from seeing the paper upon which he was writing; but he continued to write on, without appearing to be incommoded in the slightest degree. The paper upon which he was writing was taken away, and other paper laid before him; but the somnambulist immediately perceived the change.

He wrote pieces of music while in this state, and in the same manner, with his eyes closed. The words were placed under the musical notes. It happened upon one occasion that the words were written in too large a character and did not stand precisely under the corresponding notes. He soon perceived the error, blotted out the part and wrote it over again with great exactness.

The *Memoirs of the Upsal Academy of Science* contain the following case, reported in the year 1741. It is that of a young lady who fell into a condition of Somnambulism similar to those already described. With her, however, the eyes were wide open, but she was wholly insensible:

SAUVAGES, who suspected deception, made use of several means of ascertaining the truth. He caused her arm to be deeply pricked with a needle, the soles of her feet to be gently tickled with the points of the fingers—poured spirits of hartshorn into her mouth, held it to her nostrils and blew Spanish snuff up her nose. He caused her to be addressed unexpectedly in a loud voice. A person, who had been concealed, suddenly uttered a piercing cry close to her ear and, at another time, he suddenly threw a stone violently against her bedstead. But all this produced in this otherwise so excitable person not the slightest mark of feeling and occasioned no motion. The attempts, too, made by Sauvages to produce some effects upon her eyes were quite as ineffectual. In vain did he unexpectedly aim a blow at her with his hand. She made no effort to evade it, nor did she interrupt her discourse; and the eyelids did not move in the slightest degree. He held spirits of hartshorn before her eye; moistened a feather with it and applied it to the *cornea*; suddenly touched one of the eyeballs with his finger; nay, at last he held a lighted candle so close to her open eye that her eye-lashes were burnt. During this insensibility of her eyes, she rose from her bed, walked about the room, kept the middle way between the bedsteads, as well as she could have done when awake, turned round at the proper time, did not once stumble against anything, although several things were placed in her way; and all this she did without touching the objects. These experiments and obser-



vations were repeated at various times, in presence of several competent witnesses.

To these I may be permitted to add a scarcely less remarkable case of Natural Somnambulism that came under my own observation, being daily presented to my notice for a period of more than twelve months.

The patient was my sister, a girl of fifteen, of hysterical temperament and somewhat deficient in intelligence. I was six years her senior. I had then no knowledge of the phenomena of Somnambulism beyond the uses made of it by the novelist and the dramatist. I had never even heard of Mesmerism. I was, therefore, a perfectly unprejudiced witness.

The form presented by the malady was principally that known by the name of *Catalepsy*, but of which condition also I was then wholly ignorant. She passed usually from Catalepsy to Somnambulism—that is to say, the paroxysm began, without any premonitory symptoms, by a sudden arrest of the action of all the limbs, the entire muscular system becoming as rigid as if she had been instantly turned to marble. Whatever was her attitude at the moment of the attack, in that position she stiffened, and so remained, stone-like, for periods of time varying from ten minutes to half-an-hour. I have seen her thus suddenly changed into a living statue as she was ascending the stairs, with one foot on the stair above, the other foot on the stair below, remaining fixed thus for many minutes. At the dinner table the same phenomenon occurred many times, and if at the moment the fork was being lifted to her lips, the raised hand and the open mouth continued until the affection changed its phase. As the catalepsy relaxed, usually but not invariably, she passed into a condition precisely resembling that exhibited in Natural Somnambulism, and which I have since often witnessed in Artificial Somnambulism. Her eyes, which in the catalepsy were for the most part open wide and painfully staring, but with an evident absence of perception, gently closed, and this was the first sign that the rigidity of the Catalepsy was subsiding. The stiffened limbs resumed their natural postures. She did not speak. Her senses were dead to external impressions. The eyelids were then firmly set and force was required to separate them. When thus lifted, the eyes were seen to be directed in the manner stated to be observed in Somnambules, namely, upwards and inwards. She had, nevertheless, a Will and wishes, which she communicated by signs, the power of speech being apparently suspended. No sound startled her. No touch seemed to be felt and vision with the eye was impossible. In this condition, which, if not Somnambulism, resembled it closely, she reclined for the most part upon the sofa with the aspect of profound sleep, but

occasionally making signs which the family learned to interpret. Sometimes, but seldom, she would rise and go about her ordinary employments, but still with her eyes firmly closed.

It was in this condition of *Natural Somnambulism* that the phenomena were exhibited which I am about to describe, and which are not less remarkable than those above recorded of other Somnambules. I can vouch for the accuracy of this report, for I personally witnessed all, with curiosity and wonder, but without the slightest knowledge then of their source or connection with any problems in Physiology or Psychology. Nor were they hastily or partially observed. They were seen by myself and the whole family almost daily for nearly two years. I inquired of the Doctor who attended her, and who witnessed them also, if these phenomena were not very strange? I asked him what was the cause of them, and how the girl's mind could so perceive beyond the possible range of the external senses, and so forth? I received from him this sage answer, "My good fellow, it is a case of hysteria, and in hysteria people can do anything!"

I fear many of our Doctors would not now answer more intelligently.

And *this* is what she did.

She was very fond of her father. In her somnambulistic condition she perceived his coming, while he was yet far beyond sight or hearing—distant often more than a mile. The expression of pleasure was unequivocal and we always knew that he was coming by her indications of his approach long before his appearance.

If, as she lay upon the sofa, her eyes firmly closed, I opened a book having pictures in it and sat *behind her* in a position where it was physically impossible that she could see what I was doing, and I looked at one of the pictures, she forthwith exhibited, in pantomimic action, the posture of each person there depicted. It was perfectly manifest that she had the image of the engraving impressed upon her mind as distinctly as if it had been conveyed to it by the sense of sight. Nor is it to be explained by the suggestion that the engravings were familiar to her and that she guessed upon which of them I was looking, for it was the same with books and pictures purposely tried which she had never seen. But whether that impression was obtained through *my* mind, in which the image also was, or that her mind perceived the picture itself directly, although out of the range of vision, is the problem to be solved. If the servant who attended her, obedient to her signalled desire, went to her bedroom *on the floor above* the room in which she was lying entranced, she expressed the most obvious signs of annoyance if the servant above touched the wrong thing, and of satisfaction when she touched the right one, precisely as if the search had been made in the same room and she saw what was going on. The experiment



was purposely tried many times, with various tests, so as to leave no doubt of the fact upon any member of the family who witnessed it. Noteworthy, also, it is that in the somnambulist condition she played cards skilfully with her eyes closed, while in her normal condition she knew nothing whatever of the game and had but an imperfect acquaintance with the cards.

It should be stated that when a part of the picture was covered so that I could see but a part, her perceptions were limited to the part seen by me. I was, indeed, unable to trace any power of perception of anything not seen by the person with whom her mind was not at the time associated. She perceived behind her so much of the picture as was seen by me and impressed on my mind. She perceived the objects seen and touched by her servant upstairs and so impressed upon her mind. I had given no thought to the subject at that time; but taking it with much subsequent experience of similar phenomena, I am satisfied now that it was a case of what is erroneously called "Thought-reading," which will be fully treated of hereafter.

These phenomena continued for nearly two years, so that there was ample opportunity for observing them. Imposture was out of the question. Delusion was impossible. The occurrence was in a private family and witnessed by none but themselves and the attendant physician, whose sagacious explanation of it I have narrated.

I accepted his solution of the phenomenon, although not altogether satisfied with it, and some years elapsed before accident brought under my notice a case of *Artificial Somnambulism*. Then I discovered instantly the relationship, if not the identity, of the condition presented to me with that I had seen in my sister.

The cases may be multiplied into a volume, but in the small space that can be given here to any one branch of a great subject these must suffice. The *facts* of *Natural Somnambulism*, indeed, are not and cannot be disputed. Instances have been selected with purpose to show that the phenomena presented by the conditions, when occurring naturally, are identical with those exhibited when the condition is produced artificially. With their customary dogmatism, the Scientists denounced as imposture and delusion that which was familiar to all Doctors of large experience in cases of natural infirmity. Instead of availing themselves eagerly of such an easy method of investigation as was provided by the discovery

that Somnambulism may be induced in a great number of persons under conditions that permitted of experimental examination, as complete and satisfactory as that by which physical science had achieved its great discoveries, they sought to deter from inquiry by vilifying the inquirers; to discredit discovery by discrediting the discoverers; to denounce as dupes or as impostors all who dared to proclaim the finding of a new fact in nature not in strict accordance with their own narrow knowledge of nature's laws. Even the writer can remember the time when the facts and phenomena of Somnambulism were denied as vehemently, and with precisely the same arguments, as other facts and phenomena closely allied with somnambulism are denied now. He remembers when they who had investigated and asserted them were visited with the like torrents of abuse and ridicule, by precisely the same class of opponents, in precisely similar language, in the same journals, and with the same arguments. Yet he has lived to see these abused and ridiculed facts universally admitted into science as a part of its store of truths. Nor this alone. These very facts and phenomena are now actually cited to explain and discredit another series of equally allied phenomena, which are as vehemently disputed at this time as were the phenomena of Somnambulism then.

But so it has ever been—so probably will it ever be. Scientists are but men and partake in full measure of the weaknesses common to humanity. Dogmatism only appears in a more hateful aspect in them than in theologians because they *profess* perfect freedom of inquiry. To try to put down inconvenient facts and phenomena by persecution and prosecution compels the public mind to observe with sorrow the conspicuous difference between profession and practice, just where it would have been the least looked for.

---



## CHAPTER IV.

## ARTIFICIAL SOMNAMBULISM.

SOMNAMBULE is the name given to the subject of somnambulism.

Somnambules are really more numerous than the recorded cases of sleep-walking indicate. But few of the cases actually occurring are reported, for the Doctors have noted such only as presented some remarkable features. It was not until the discovery was made that Somnambulism may be induced by *artificial* means that it was found how many were the persons subject to this abnormal physiological and psychological condition.

Not only may the condition of Somnambulism be thus induced, but its phenomena also may be exhibited. Nothing, however seemingly marvellous, has been recorded of *Natural* Somnambulism which is not readily reproduced in *Artificial* Somnambulism. Its importance, therefore, in the investigation of Mental Physiology and Psychology will be apparent at a glance. In no other form are the forces that move and direct the Mechanism of Man placed so entirely under the control of the experimentalist and the student. It may be said, without exaggeration, that a *mind* is given to him for dissection. He may subject it to any test-examination he desires. The value of such a subject is incalculable. It opens to mental science that path of experimental research to which physical science is indebted for its progress and its prospects. It enables us to procure the

same ends by the same means and doubtless with the same profitable results. We are not presuming too much when we assert that the philosophy of all that part of the Mechanism of Man which is non-molecular, but which gives to the molecular structure intelligence, consciousness and individuality, may be learned by patient and painstaking examination of and experiments with Somnambulism, alike in its natural and in its induced condition.

Somnambulism, then, may be induced *artificially*. In whom? A Somnambule.

Although Somnambulism may be produced by contrivance, a *Somnambule*, like a poet, is born not made. He is possessed of some peculiarities of nerve structure, not yet sufficiently investigated. The brain is the bodily seat of the affection, and the condition exhibits an abnormal relationship of the Conscious Self with the mechanism of the body. Somnambulism is not a disease nor the result of disease. It varies in intensity under various circumstances of the general health; but it is not a malady that comes and goes through external causes. It is a constitutional condition.

Experience has proved that about one person in four is subject to this affection. It bears no relation to sex, males being as sensitive to it as females. Age, however, has a manifest influence. The young are more sensitive than the old, children than grown persons. The period of puberty and the early years of maturity exhibit the most remarkable phenomena in both sexes.

A Somnambule cannot be discovered by any external sign. There is nothing in his aspect to indicate sensitiveness to the affection. No temperament, nor complexion, nor degree of intelligence, nor manner, nor state of health, is proved to be more liable to the influence than any other. The most experienced find themselves continually at fault in their estimates of a patient. The least promising are often the most susceptible.



Somnambulism may be induced artificially in many ways. However induced, the physiological process is the same.

It has been called by many names—as Mesmerism, Hypnotism, Animal Magnetism—but neither is unobjectionable. *Animal Magnetism* is a misnomer for, whatever the operating force by which the phenomena are produced, it is not magnetism nor has it any relationship to magnetism. The most delicate instruments have failed to show a special magnetic state in the most sensitive Somnambule. *Hypnotism* was the name given to it by Dr. BRAID, who maintained a theory as to its cause to which I entirely subscribe, while dissenting from his choice of a designation. “Mesmerism” was the name given to it after MESMER had revived its practice and startled the world by his discovery. But the Doctor was assailed as an impostor or a dupe and his patients as rogues or fools. Science denounced him and his investigations and would cheerfully have sent him to the stake as a wizard or to imprisonment as “a rogue and a vagabond.” Fortunately he did not live in free England. Science has accepted now as truths and wields for its own purposes the very facts it then denied and denounced. But prejudices still linger about the name. A much wider application of its facts has been made by subsequent discoveries. A new name was desirable that should imply nothing as to causes, while giving to it a strictly scientific title. “Artificial Somnambulism” exactly describes the phenomena, without in any manner seeming to affirm their causes. But it is inconveniently long, and some misconceptions may attach to it.

To designate the condition itself I propose, therefore, for convenience of brevity, to adopt the shorter, though not quite satisfactory, name of *Hypnotism*.

---

## CHAPTER V.

## THE PHENOMENA OF ARTIFICIAL SOMNAMBULISM.

I. THE HYPNOTIC STATE.—II. CATALEPTIC PHENOMENA.—III. WILL POWER.—IV. COMMUNITY OF SENSATION.—V. ELECTRO-BIOLOGY.—VI. INFLUENCE OF METALS.—VII. SUPERSENSUOUS PERCEPTION.—VIII. PHRENOLOGICAL PHENOMENA.—IX. DOUBLE CONSCIOUSNESS.—X. MENTAL TRAVELLING.—XI. ACTION AT A DISTANCE.—XII. MENTAL EXALTATION.—XIII. MEDICAL USES.

## I.—THE HYPNOTIC STATE.

THE means are various by which the condition of Hypnotism may be artificially produced. Formerly, the opinion was universal, that it was due to some mysterious power or influence proceeding from the operator and the process was adapted to this assumption. Some employed motions of the hand, called "passes," without actual contact, directed from the head downward and continued until the signs of sleep appeared. Others were content to poke their fingers almost into the eyes of the patient, bidding him to stare at their tips. Dr. BRAID, a Physician of eminence, found it sufficient for the patient to fix his gaze steadily upon some one object, as a wafer on a wall. After a period of such fixed gaze, and consequent concentrated *attention*, varying from ten minutes to an hour, the eyelids slowly fall and then close. The breathing becomes deep, regular, and slow. The head droops. The limbs relax. There is all the external aspect of profound sleep.

*But it is not sleep.* The senses are *wholly* suspended. In sleep, they are only dulled. In sleep, the nerves show



signs of sensitiveness. Impressions on the senses modify dreams. But by the Somnambule a pinch is not felt; a pistol discharged at the ear causes no emotion and is evidently not heard; the most powerful snuff may be applied to the nostril without a sneeze; the most nauseous flavour upon the lips causes no show of aversion. The eyelids are closed with a firmness not found in ordinary sleep and they can be raised only by great force. The eyes are then seen to be in an abnormal position, turned upwards and inwards, in a kind of inverted squint—a position in which no voluntary waking effort could place them and as they are *never* found in ordinary sleep. It is further important to note, that in such a condition of the eyes vision would be impossible, even if the lids were lifted, for the retina is removed out of the range of *any* ray of light reflected from an external object.

If the patient be now left to himself, he will continue in this state of insensibility for a time, varying with each experiment, occasionally even for six hours or more. Then he starts, opens his eyes and consciousness returns.

But he retains no memory whatever of anything that has occurred during the condition. Awakening from sleep, we have commonly, for a time at least, some memory of dreams that have attended the slumber. But the Somnambule is *never* conscious, in his normal condition, of anything without or within that attended his insensible and abnormal condition. It is to him an absolute blank. He is only not conscious that it is a blank because the moment of recovery seems to him but as the moment following the loss of consciousness, however long may have been the interval of oblivion.

Nevertheless, his mind was not a blank, nor was his memory altogether idle, as will be shown presently.

But if, instead of leaving the patient to waken at leisure from his seeming sleep, you intimate to him, by waving your hand before his face, blowing in his eyes or touching his forehead, that it is *your Will* he should awake, he starts, opens his eyes, stretches his relaxed

limbs and is himself again. But there is the same entire unconsciousness of the incidents of his hypnotic state.

Here we have the physical condition of natural Somnambulism produced artificially and so far there is nothing very remarkable. The difference between Somnambulism and sleep is, however, of great importance as a physiological fact, for it proves that there is a state, outwardly resembling sleep and therefore easily mistaken for it, which is not sleep. It is doubtless to the absence of recognition of this fact, and the consequent supposition that nothing was to be learned from it not already found in the phenomena of sleep, that the condition now under consideration has been so strangely neglected, alike by physiologists and psychologists, and that more advantage has not been taken of the light its remarkable features could not fail to throw upon those obscure problems in the Mechanism of Man, the existence of Soul, and, if it exists, its relationship to mind and body.

But if, instead of restoring the patient to consciousness, you by voice or touch merely indicate to him your *Will* that he should bestir himself, the condition changes. From a seemingly sound and senseless sleep he passes rapidly into a state of *apparent* consciousness. His muscles regain the natural tension of waking life. He moves and performs bodily actions as when actually awake. But withal he is not awake in fact. His eyelids are still firmly closed. His eyes preserve their unnatural position and are incompetent to perform the act of vision, even if the lids be lifted. The eyelids and eyeballs continue to exhibit the quivering movement described.

This is the peculiarity of the condition of Somnambulism, whether natural or artificial. This is the state that has been popularly termed "sleep," and which some physiologists and many doctors have really mistaken for sleep, but to which it has only the remotest affinity. It is a special condition of the brain and nerve system, to which the convenient name of *Hypnotism* has been given, and by that name it will be designated here.



When "Hypnotism" is spoken of, the Reader will remember that it is the name of the condition seen in *Artificial Somnambulism*. The term SLEEP will be henceforth strictly limited to that which is properly so called and of which we have nightly experience.

In this condition of *Hypnotism*, a series of phenomena are exhibited which have been the subject of fierce controversy while passing through the phases of hostility that are the invariable fate of *new* truths. When first asserted, they are vehemently disputed,—not after investigation, experiment and test—but by *à priori* argument to prove that they *cannot* be. But a fact remains a fact, in defiance of any quantity of mere argument, and will assert itself, how reluctant soever Scientists may be to admit that there can be any natural law or force not known to them. Thus the phenomena of Somnambulism, at first fiercely disputed and their assertors abused as knaves or ridiculed as dupes, have come to be accepted by Science as substantially true. They are, however, declared not to be *new* truths but to have been familiar to Physiologists under other names. But they have taken their place in Physiology among the recognised incidents of a rare and remarkable condition of the nervous system.

At this point of acceptance as *facts*, notice of them seems to have ceased. Their bearing upon Psychological Science has been neglected by the Physiologists and Physicians, with rare exceptions. There has been little curiosity to inquire what was the meaning of these strange and seemingly inexplicable phenomena; what light, if any, they throw upon the mysteries of Mind and Soul. Is it that our Scientists fear to ask, lest the answer should be fatal to their own pure Materialism? Or is it that their faith in Materialism is so firmly fixed that they deem it a waste of time even to hear *evidence* on the other side? Whatever the cause, while the facts and the phenomena of Somnambulism have been reluctantly accepted, their value as revelations of the composite Mechanism of Man, and the manner of its action, has been grudgingly admitted. To this

moment the phenomena have been but partially employed for the promotion of that knowledge of HIMSELF which is—or *should* be—the highest and most important object of man's researches.

The phenomena of *natural* somnambulism have been familiar to all the world, at all times; but superstition appears to have forbidden that close observation and careful experiment requisite for discovery of their nature and sources. Indeed, the Mechanism of Man as constructed of Soul and body, until very recently has been so imperfectly recognised as a *physiological* fact that attempts to explore the causes of any psychic or mental action of the organism would have been but wasted labour. Whatever was new and therefore strange, or seemingly mysterious, or inexplicable, was always then, as often now, disposed of by calling it "supernatural" and assigning it to the agency of spiritual intelligences. There can be no doubt that many of the ancient oracles were the utterances of somnambulism artificially induced. The accounts that have been transmitted to us of the Delphic priestesses show them to have been somnambules, speaking in a state of trance, such as may be witnessed by any reader who will undergo the labour of hypnotising any half-dozen persons among his family and friends. MESMER directed public attention to the phenomena of Somnambulism when induced artificially and his name was given to the process. It was first applied successfully to the cure of disease. As experiment proceeded, other remarkable phenomena were elicited. Then the popular world, unable to deny *facts* that were daily proved, set them to the account of a special power with which the operator was presumed to be endowed, some attributing it to angelic and others to diabolic agency. Few or none then cared to ask if *natural* causes might not be found for them.

Thus MESMER himself and his many followers in all countries, down to our own time, continued the practice of Artificial Somnambulism, believing that the condition was induced by the influence of "animal magnetism" proceeding from themselves, and directed by their own



Will power, by means of which sleep (or what was called sleep), was imposed. They taught that the force of the greater Will subdued the lesser Will and made the Somnambule the temporary slave of the operator.

Dr. BRAID, of Manchester, was the first to dissipate this delusion. At the time when the Scientists were most loudly proclaiming "mesmerism," as it was then called, to be a fraud, its practitioners impostors and its believers fools, Dr. BRAID bravely undertook its investigation, despite the abuse and ridicule to which he was subjected from his medical brethren. He was richly rewarded. He discovered that Artificial Somnambulism was not produced by any imaginary magnetism, nor by the Will of the operator, nor by any force proceeding from him, but that, in fact, it was a condition *self-induced*. The passes that were supposed to direct a magnetic stream—(whose very existence was unproved)—from the operator to the nerves and brain of the submissive patient were shown to be nothing more than *contrivances to concentrate the attention* of the patient. Metallic tractors had been used to convey, as was assumed, the imaginary "animal magnetism." But when tractors of wood, painted to resemble metal, were substituted the same results ensued. "Passes" were then abolished and the patient was directed to fix his eyes upon a penny-piece in his palm. The "mesmeric" condition was found to be thus brought about with equal efficiency and rather more speed than by waving the hand before the face or thrusting the tips of the fingers into the eyes.

The obvious conclusion from these decisive experiments is, that Artificial Somnambulism is not a condition imposed upon the patient by the Will of another; that it is not produced by any *force*, magnetic or otherwise, nor by any influence proceeding from another; *but that it is a condition wholly self-induced*. In what manner self-induced will be considered presently.

Here the attention of the reader is invited to the very instructive and interesting narrative of his own experiences, written by the distinguished chemist AGASSIZ, who submitted himself to be "mesmerised," as it was

then termed, purposely to ascertain what are the sensations accompanying the condition and especially the *mental* process by which it is accomplished. I borrow the translation by Dr. TUKE, in his valuable treatise on *The Influence of the Mind over the Body in Health and Disease* :—

Neufchatel, Feb. 22nd, 1839. Desirous to know what to think of Mesmerism. I for long sought for opportunity of making some experiments in regard to it upon myself, so as to avoid the doubts which might arise on the nature of the sensations which we have heard described by mesmerised persons. M. Desor and Mr. Townshend (Rev. Chauncy Hare Townshend, M.A.) arrived here with the *Evening Courier*, and at ten p.m. Mr. Townshend commenced operating on me. While we sat opposite to one another, he, in the first place, only took hold of my hands and looked at me fixedly. I was firmly resolved to arrive at a knowledge of the truth, whatever it might be; and, therefore, the moment I saw him endeavour to exert an action upon me, I silently addressed the Author of all things, beseeching him to give me power to *resist the influence*, and to be conscientious in regard to myself as well as in regard to the fact.

I then fixed my eyes upon Mr. Townshend, attentive to whatever passed. I was in very suitable circumstances; the hour being early, and one in which I was in the habit of studying, was far from disposing me to sleep. I was sufficiently master of myself to experience no emotion and to repress all flights of imagination, even if I had been less calm; accordingly, it was a long time before I felt any effect from the presence of Mr. Townshend opposite me. However, after at least a quarter of an hour, I felt the sensation of a current through all my limbs, and from that moment my eyelids grew heavier. I then saw Mr. Townshend extend his hands before my eyes, as if he were about to plunge his fingers into them, and then made different circular movements around my eyes, which caused my eyelids to become still heavier. I had the idea that he was endeavouring to make me close my eyes, and yet it was not as if some one had threatened my eyes and in the waking state I had closed them to *prevent* him; it was an irresistible heaviness of the lids which *compelled* me to shut them; and by degrees I found I had no longer the power of keeping them open, but did not the less retain my consciousness of what was going on around me, so that I heard M. Desor speak to Mr. Townshend, understood what they said, and heard what questions they asked me, just as if I had been awake, but I had not the power of answering. I endeavoured, in vain, several times to do so, and when I succeeded I perceived that I was passing out of



the state of torpor in which I had been, and which was rather agreeable than painful.

In this state I heard the watchman cry ten o'clock; then I heard it strike a quarter-past; but afterwards I fell into a deeper sleep, although I never entirely lost my consciousness. It appeared to me that Mr. Townshend was endeavouring to put me into a sound sleep; my movements seemed under his control, for I wished several times to change the position of my arms, but had not sufficient power to do it, or even really to will it; while I felt my head carried to the right or left shoulder, or backwards or forwards, without wishing it, and, indeed, in spite of the resistance which I endeavoured to oppose; and this happened several times.

I experienced at the same time a feeling of great pleasure in giving way to the attraction which dragged me sometimes to one side, sometimes to the other, then a kind of surprise on feeling my head fall into Mr. Townshend's hand, who appeared to me for the first time to be the centre of attraction. To his inquiry if I were well, and what I felt, I found I could not answer, but I smiled; I felt that my features expanded in spite of my resistance; I was inwardly confused at experiencing pleasure from an influence which was mysterious to me. From this moment I wished to awake, and was less at my ease, and yet, on Mr. Townshend asking me whether I wished to be awakened, I made a hesitating movement with my shoulders. Mr. Townshend then repeated some frictions, which increased my sleep; yet I was always conscious of what was passing around me. He then asked me if I wished to become lucid, at the same time continuing, as I felt, the frictions from the face to the arms. I then experienced an indescribable sensation of delight, and for an instant saw before me rays of dazzling light which instantly disappeared. I was then inwardly sorrowful at this state being prolonged; it appeared to me that enough had been done with me; I wished to awake, but could not. Yet when Mr. Townshend and M. Desor spoke I heard them. I also heard the clock, and the watchman cry, but I did not know what hour he cried. Mr. Townshend then presented his watch to me, and asked if I could see the time, and if I could see him, but I could distinguish nothing; I heard the clock strike the quarter, but could not get out of my sleepy state. Mr. Townshend then woke me with some rapid transverse movements from the middle of the face outwards, which instantly caused my eyes to open, and at the same time I got up, saying to him, "I thank you." It was a quarter past eleven (about an hour having elapsed since I passed into the mesmeric state). He then told me, and M. Desor repeated the same thing, that the only fact which had satisfied them that I was in a state of mesmeric sleep, was the facility with which my head followed all the movements of his hand, although he did not touch me, and the pleasure which I appeared to feel at the moment when, after several repetitions of

friction, he thus moved my head at pleasure in all directions.—AGASSIZ (lxxxviii., p. 388).

The Professor experienced only the incipient stages of the condition. He did not lose consciousness, although his Will was paralysed. Repeated trial would doubtless have thrown him into the further phases. Few persons are brought entirely into the hypnotic condition on the first experiment. Once established, however, it is readily reproduced, insomuch that, with sensitive patients, it may be evoked by an almost imperceptible suggestion from any person accustomed to experiment upon them. I knew a lady who, at a glance of the eye or a mere wave of a finger from the other side of a dinner-table, suggesting the condition to her, passed instantly into the hypnotic state, even when surrounded by company. A similar suggestion instantly restored her to consciousness. It is asserted that the mere silent Will of the operator, without any external expression of it conveyed to the patient, can induce the hypnotic condition. I have witnessed the experiment, but never was it successful. *After* hypnotism induced, the Will of the operator can undoubtedly be conveyed to the patient without visible or tangible expression. But for purpose of inducing the condition itself, the patient being in his normal state, I am satisfied that an intimation of the desire must be conveyed to him by sign, or look, or something that suggests the action, or there must be knowledge by the patient that at such a time and in such a place the condition would be expected to recur.

The process by which Artificial Somnambulism is induced is by *fixing the attention*. The first step to this is to fix the eye. If the thoughts wander—if the mind is busy receiving external impressions, or forming ideas, the condition cannot be induced. So, likewise, a resolutely *resisting Will* can oppose itself successfully to the influence. The weakness of the patient's Will is the measure of his capacity for Somnambulism. A strong Will is with difficulty affected. A weak Will is readily



hypnotised. It must be noted, however, that *the Will is not the Intelligence*. A powerful intellect may have a weak Will. The smallest mental capacity may be associated with a most powerful Will. Hence the patients subject to Artificial Somnambulism are not to be sought with any reference to mental or moral endowment. Experiment may discover a ready patient in a man of genius, as was shown in the case of AGASSIZ, narrated above, and find a hopeless one in a fool. Somnambulism is *paralysis of the Will*, and according to the power of the Will to assert itself so is the resistance of the patient to the process by which it is paralysed.

It is in this impassive condition of the Mechanism of Man that phenomena present themselves which have the highest interest for the Psychologist, as tending to throw a blaze of light upon the mutual relationships of Body, Mind, and Soul. What, then, are these phenomena?

The instant effect of the suspended Will (which is the temporary severance of the Conscious Self from the material mechanism of the mind) is to leave that mechanism uncontrolled and for the time inactive. If roused to action, it is an action without intelligent direction and command.

The first remarkable result of this state of suspended Will, and the consequent uncontrolled condition of the mental mechanism, is its subjection to the control of the Will, and sympathy with the mind, of any other person who may come into that mental association with the patient for which our language has no appropriate term, but which the French express in graceful phrase as being *en rapport*.

It was believed by the early investigators of Artificial Somnambulism that the only person whose active Will could thus take the place, as it were, of the suspended Will of the patient and control and direct the action of his mental mechanism, was the *operator* by whom the condition had been produced. But experience has proved this to be an error. As the operator is *en rapport* with the patient when passing into the hypnotic

state, he necessarily has the first control. But if he withdraws and any other person takes possession of the patient, the new Will is equally effective.

In the majority of cases, the operator needs not to convey his Will by words nor by external signs. It suffices that he has a definite idea in his own mind and *desires the patient to feel and act in accordance with it*. For instance, he Wills that the patient shall take a certain book from the library. If the patient had been in his normal condition, how would this have been communicated? The operator would have conveyed his Will by the *words*, "I command you to bring me such a book from that library;" that is to say, he would have suggested to the patient's mind, by the *words* "book" and "library," the *ideas* of the place and thing; by the words "bring to me" the idea of the bodily action and by the words "I command you" the sense of compulsion. There is no likeness in any of these *words* to the ideas they are designed to suggest. But the mind has been educated to associate those ideas with the expressed sounds, and thus, when those words are spoken the ideas linked with them come into the mind of the hearer. The difference between this process—which seems simple only because it is so familiar to us—and the process by which the operator suggests the same ideas to the same patient in the hypnotic condition is merely this—that the suggestion of the ideas existing in the operator's mind is made to the mind of the patient by some other impressing medium than the *sounds of words*. The senses of the patient being suspended in somnambulism, the normal medium of language is lost to him. What is the substituted medium for the suggestion we do *not* as yet *know*; we can but conjecture. There is, however, no reason to despair of discovering it, if patient investigation be made by largely collecting the observed *facts*. This is one of the many practical tasks that will be imposed upon the Psychologist of the future, when basing his Science on *facts* instead of logic, on physics instead of metaphysics.



The phenomena resulting from this exercise of the Will of the operator upon the patient—who has no Will and no consciousness, who is, in fact, merely an animated machine—are very curious. Whatever ideas the operator *suggests* to the mind of the patient are impressed there, precisely as if they had been brought by the senses from without or were self-produced within. The ideas so suggested influence the other mental faculties exactly as they would have done if self-conceived. As thus. The operator suggests that the patient cannot lift his foot from the floor, and he is unable to do so, strive as he may. If the hand of the patient is placed upon the hand of the operator, with the like *suggested idea* that it is fastened there, the patient cannot withdraw it and may be dragged round the room, as if his hand had been actually bound to the other by an iron chain. Suggest that the chair on which the patient sits is on fire, he rushes from it with expressions of extreme terror; that it is very cold, and he shivers and buttons his clothes tightly; that it is very hot, and he takes off his neckerchief, opens his collar and fans himself; that he has a baby in his arms, and he performs the act of nursing; that a wasp's nest is about his ears, and he exerts himself vehemently to beat off his imaginary foes. Offer him a coin, suggesting by your silent mental act that it is hot; he drops it with a cry of pain.

An experiment often tried and always successful is to present a glass of water, willing it to be to him as wine. The patient drinks it as wine, smacking his lips with unequivocal pleasure. Take it and again offer it to him, willing it to be to him as medicine; he will taste, and reject it on tasting, with unmistakeable disgust. The same glass of water may in this manner be proffered, with a change only of a silent suggestion as to its contents, until all liquids known to the patient are exhausted, and he will still accept each one as being that which the operator had silently desired that it should appear to him to be. Not only does he protest that it is the thing it was represented, but his actions

show that it was believed by his dreaming mind so to be.

The *rationale* of this phenomenon, once deemed so wonderful as to be denied by the Scientists, on the familiar plea that it was *impossible*, is now apparent. It is not that the glass of water was changed to the actual nerves of *sense*, but that, the senses being sealed and the Will paralysed, the mental mechanism was thrown into the same condition as with all of us in dream. The *ideas* of wine and medicine were suggested by the mind of the operator to the mind of the patient; therefore he dreams that he is drinking wine and medicine. Then, as in ordinary dream, the ideas thus generated in the mind itself are mistaken for realities and accepted as real. *But the Somnambule, unlike the dreamer, acts the dream which, if he had been merely asleep he would have believed that he had acted, although he did not act it.* Precisely as we see him doing he is dreaming that he does. In ordinary sleep, dreaming that a glass of wine and then a black draught had been given to him, he would have tasted them in fancy; the Conscious Self would have accepted it as a fact that he had *really* tasted them. But, his body being quiescent, the mental process would not have been seen by the spectator, as it is in the Somnambule, who not only dreams but acts his dream. This will, I hope, make clearly intelligible to the reader the difference between the mental conditions of Sleep and Somnambulism. I repeat the conclusion, for it is all-important to knowledge of Psychology.

*In Sleep, the dreamer believes the dream to be a reality and that he is acting the dream; but he does not act it. In Somnambulism, the patient believes the dream to be real, and acts it.*

In brief, *the Somnambule is a dreamer who acts his dream.*

To understand the phenomena of Hypnotism, it must be distinctly in the mind of the observer that the senses of the Somnambule are closed against all impressions from without. No intelligence is brought to him by them. The entire of the information received by his



mind appears to come through the mind of the operator. When that communication ceases, the patient is again silent and motionless. In this state he continues from two to eighteen hours. He then wakes as from sound sleep, wholly unconscious of the existence he has passed in the hypnotic state, with no memory of any dream, with no sense of the flight of time (as in ordinary sleep), but refreshed and invigorated in mind and body. Whatever be the condition, it is manifestly conducive to the well-being of the patient and powerfully promotes the return of the sick to health.

However long the trance, there is, when wakened from it, perfect unconsciousness of the state itself and of all that occurred in it. The memory of the waking life revives at the very point where it was suspended. To the mental contemplation of the patient there has been no break in it.

A curious characteristic of this condition is that, whenever it recurs, the memory returns, not only of the incidents of the last hypnotic trance, but of all that had passed in the like state previously. The present state appears to the Somnambule to be in continuous action with past like states, as if no waking intervals had interposed. Thus he lives, as it were, *two* lives and has *two* distinct memories. In his normal state, he remembers the incidents of his past waking life, but none of his hypnotic life. In his hypnotic state, he remembers the incidents of his past hypnotic state, but nothing of his waking life. In neither condition has he memory of anything that occurred in the other. In this, also, Somnambulism differs altogether from the state of sleep.

Roused by the operator, the patient *appears* to waken to consciousness and active life. But that life is little more than automatic. It continues so long only as the operator continues to exercise his Will and so to keep, as it were, the mind of the patient in motion. The patient is conscious and acts in sympathy with him and for him only. The profound interest attending this condition arises from the question, that at once presents itself to

the Psychologist, what is the action of the one mind upon the other mind by which this remarkable relationship is brought about? What is the influencing power? How does it operate? By what physiological or psychological process does my mind convey its *Will* and even its ideas to the mind of the Somnambule without the medium of speech, or sign, or any appeal through either of the five senses?

That is a problem which no theory of Materialism can solve. No mere molecular mechanism can accomplish it. When one human *body* acts upon another human *body*, we know precisely the medium by which it is accomplished and we can measure the force and its effects. "Action at a distance," motion without contact, direct or indirect, with something else in motion, is pronounced by the physicists to be impossible. But in Somnambulism and some other abnormal conditions of the mechanism of Man we see what *appears* to be "action at a distance"—motion without contact—one mind moved by another mind. If the physicists are right in their assertion, something must be operating between the two brains, by which motion is conveyed from the one to the other? What is that medium? True, it is imperceptible by any sense, but not the less must it exist, for its existence is proved by its effects. If not this, then there is something other than the material mechanism by which this intercourse is conducted.

This action of mind upon mind—by some other than a material process of the molecular mechanism—may be witnessed and experimented upon to any extent by the student when the state of artificial Somnambulism is established. It will be considered in a future chapter.

## II.—CATALEPTIC PHENOMENA.

It is as yet an unsolved problem by what process it is that the relationship, called by the French *en rapport*, is established. The patient is in a state of profound stupor, of absolute inaction and unconsciousness. The mind, but



not the body, is wakened to active existence by the Will of the person desiring to exercise such control. This Will is usually expressed by words of command or by signs. With very sensitive patients the mere mental exercise of the Will suffices. If by any accident two persons are thus placed *en rapport* with the Somnambule, the strongest Will prevails, after a brief conflict in which the struggle of the double influence is distinctly perceptible. The relationship once established, the results are instantly exhibited.

As already stated, the eyes of the Somnambule are firmly closed, the eyeballs being turned inwards and upwards, quivering incessantly. This is an unfailing test of the reality of the condition. It cannot be assumed by any effort of the Will.

The limbs are relaxed before the mind is wakened by the operator. At his command the patient is roused. He lifts the arm, draws his hand slowly over the muscles from the shoulder to the wrist and forthwith the whole limb is stiffened as if it had been turned to stone. The whole body may be affected in like manner. In what position soever any muscle is placed, there it remains until released by another exercise of the Will of the operator. Whatsoever the cause, the patient endures the consequence without any sense of pain or inconvenience. A posture of the limb which would, in ten minutes of the waking state, cause intense pain, and which the strongest man could not endure for a quarter of an hour, is maintained by the weakest patient for an indefinite time and without fatigue or pain.

This rigidity of the limbs (in fact an artificial *cataplexy*) is shown in many curious experiments. Try to hold by one end a heavy steel poker at your arm's length and you will drop it in unconquerable weariness in a few minutes. Place the same in the hand of the Somnambule, stiffening his extended arm by "passes," as above described, and it will be sustained by him for any time the condition continues. Not only do the muscles endure this tension without failing, but no sense of pain

or fatigue follows. The fact seems to confirm the theory, broached long ago, that weariness is not of the body but of the mind.

This cataleptic condition may be limited to any limb or extended to the whole frame, at the Will of the operator. So rigid are the muscles, that the body may be extended between two chairs, the head resting on the edge of one, the heels on the edge of the other, and not only will the body sustain itself thus indefinitely, but it will bear, without bending and without distress, the weight of one person or more sitting or standing upon it. In the waking state, the strongest man could not preserve such a position for a single minute. Consequently, it cannot be an imposture, as it has been called by some who had never witnessed it. The cause may be wrongly assigned, but the fact is clearly proved. Nor is it a rare phenomenon. It is exhibited by four-fifths of the patients, and probably would be found in all, if the experiment were properly tried.

This condition of *catalepsy* is induced *apparently* by the act of passing the hand slowly down the limb to be affected. This action of the hand is commonly supposed to transmit from the body of the operator to the body of the patient an unknown something, conveniently termed "Animal Magnetism." But another solution of the problem appears to me to be more rational. The true active influence is the *Will of the experimentalist*, expressed by the act of the hand. It is the *Will* and not the hand that is obeyed.

The rigidity of the muscles is usually relaxed by reversing the motion of the hand. But it is the Will that operates, this action of the hand being accompanied by and expressing the action of the *Will*.

The following case is reported by Dr. GREGORY, Professor of Chemistry in the University of Edinburgh :

Mr. J. H., a young and healthy man, could be rendered instantly and completely cataleptic by a glance, or a single pass. He could be fixed in any position, however inconvenient, and would remain ten or fifteen minutes in such a posture that no man in a natural



state could have endured it for half a minute. Thus he stood for about ten minutes, fixed and rigid, the eyes insensible to light, on one foot, the body lying horizontally, the head forward, the other foot stretched out behind. He was made to place his feet without shoes, the toes pointing in opposite directions along the wall, and the feet resting on a narrow foot-board, about two inches wide, while his back was placed flat on the wall, and the arms stretched out like a cross. In this awkward position, he was rigidified and fixed by a pass or two, and stuck there at least five minutes. Mr. Lewis then demesmerised the upper parts down to the knees, when Mr. H. felt in great danger of falling off; but the feet adhered so firmly to the foot-board, that I could not move them. When the feet were demesmerised, he instantly fell down in a heap in our arms. He was made to go down on all fours, and in this position rendered rigid, so that, with all his efforts, he could not lie down on the floor.

### III.—WILL POWER.

The Somnambule is a person whose mental mechanism is in a perfectly passive state, the action of the senses and the Will being for a time suspended. By reason of this temporary paralysis of the Will he has ceased to direct the material mechanism of his mind and body. We have before us a mental Mechanism, capable for the work of mind, but the power is suspended that, in the normal condition of the mechanism, sets the machine in motion and directs its motions.

In this state of mental paralysis, the passive machine is moved and directed by any other mind or psychic force brought to bear upon it. *Any* active mind placed *en rapport* with the *passive* mind of the Somnambule can, by the exercise of its own Will, set in motion, and to some extent control, the action of that passive brain.

The manner in which this process, so improperly called "Thought-reading," is effected will be considered hereafter. Here we deal only with the facts and phenomena.

The operator exercises an act of *Will*. He desires the patient to move, speak, do. This may be expressed by words, or signs, or tacitly by the mind. Immediately, the patient seems to wake as from sleep. He recovers the attitude of attention; he resumes the control of his limbs. But his senses continue closed to the outer world.

His eyes are closed and preserve the position and the quivering characteristic of Somnambulism.

All patients are not equally sensitive. Some are instantly and wholly obedient to the Will of the operator. Some obey slowly ; some partially. But all become more sensitive and submissive by practice.

As the operator *wills* him to do, so the patient *does*. He goes hither and thither, follows or recedes, stops or advances, in accordance with the unexpressed desire. There is perfect community of *idea* as well as of feeling. His perceptions are obtained only through the person *en rapport* with him. Whatever ideas come into the mind of the operator are instantly present also to the mind of the patient. The Mind whose Will is paralysed is moved and directed by the Mind whose Will is active.

This fundamental condition and special feature of Somnambulism will be found to explain the greater portion of the phenomena presented. Its physiology and psychology will be considered hereafter.

Of this phenomenon Dr. GREGORY thus reports :

Mr. B. was discovered by Dr. Darling to be susceptible, at the house of a well-known and popular authoress. He was so obliging as to meet Dr. D. and a large party at my house. There he exhibited many of the effects above described, chiefly, however, the control of Dr. D. over his movements, sensations, perceptions, and memory. His movements were controlled in many ways, which it is unnecessary to repeat. But what rendered the case peculiarly interesting was, that he described his feelings, and reasoned on every experiment as it was made ; and told us that, in spite of perfect consciousness, he found it impossible, by any efforts, to resist the suggestions of the operator. He was unable to forget his own name, or that of any other person ; to be unable to recognise persons whom he knew quite well ; to forget and be unable to name a single letter of the alphabet. It seemed to him as if he saw the letters in motion, but could not lay hold of one of them. These experiments were very painful to him, and he informed me, that when thus compelled to forget his own name, not only was the sensation most unpleasant, but he felt ill for a day or two in consequence.

#### IV.—COMMUNITY OF SENSATION.

There is complete community of *sensation*. What the



one feels the other feels. Pinch the operator, the patient winces. A whisper in the ear of the one is heard by the other. The patient sneezes if the operator takes snuff. What the operator sees, and seeing has in his mind, the patient has in his mind and thinks he sees.

This and some others of the experiments reported here are not satisfactory when witnessed by a spectator merely, because of the natural suspicion of collusion and the impossibility of disproving it. The student can only be *assured* that they are genuine by becoming himself the operator. Fortunately, there is little difficulty in doing this, for patients may, by perseverance, be found in almost every household.

#### V.—ELECTRO-BIOLOGY.

But the mind of the Somnambule is not wholly dependent for action on the mind of the Operator, although it seems as if only thus it can be set in motion. There is apparently a stage of the condition when the paralysis is not perfect. Then we have the state that has been so absurdly called "electro-biological," but which has no connection with either "electricity" or "biology." More than any other of the phenomena it resembles those seen in *Natural Somnambulism*.

The process by which this condition is induced is the same as described above, namely, fixing the attention of the patient by fixing his eyes. The operation may be performed with many patients at the same time more perfectly than with few, proving how little a supposed "magnetic" power in the operator is concerned in it. Call a crowd of strangers upon a platform. Place a metal disc in the hand of each—set him or her to fix the eyes steadily upon it. In a quarter of an hour, one in about four or five will be seemingly asleep. A strong expression of command recalls them to the attitude of waking; but not to actual waking life, for the senses remain closely sealed, the eyes are firmly closed, and there is no consciousness. The mind being thus made passive, the operator suggests some imaginary circum-

stance, as that the chair is on fire, that there is a wasp's nest near, that it is very cold, or very hot, or that an angel is looking down upon them, or that they are in a church. At once each one accepts the suggestion so made. All act with wonderful perfection the part they would have acted had the suggested occurrence been real. In fear of the imaginary wasps they rush to and fro, covering the ears with coat or handkerchief. To the ideal angel they bend or kneel with the most profound expression of veneration in face and form. At the suggestion of cold every coat is closely buttoned, the hands are thrust into the pockets, and they stand shivering as in a polar wind. Or if heat be intimated, the coat button is loosened, the necktie is thrown off, and they vigorously fan themselves with hat or hand. These experiments may be varied infinitely at the pleasure of the operator, and always with the same results. A remarkable feature of the phenomenon is the rapidity with which the influence works, the unanimity of action among a numerous party of patients, and the admirable perfection of the acting, which surpasses anything to be seen upon the stage in the completeness of natural expression. And these are not rare nor exceptional phenomena. They characterise all patients, with few exceptions, and equally upon the first, as after repeated, experiment, proving that it is not a lesson learned but the natural expression of an actual mental idea. Bidden to go to a certain house and take a certain book from the bookcase there and bring it to the operator, the patient with closed eyes instantly runs, jumping over seats, thrusting aside all obstacles, threading his way through the crowded streets; he selects the right book from the array upon the shelf, still without the help of sight, and returns with it as he went. I witnessed one of these strange exhibitions at one of our naval arsenals. The persons who offered themselves for experiment were chiefly soldiers and sailors—the hardiest of men, and therefore not subjects of that hysterical condition to which the phenomena have been attributed



by some medical authorities. They were even more sensitive than others. The condition was more readily induced and they were more perfectly under the influence of the operator's Will. None of them had witnessed anything of the kind before. They were wholly ignorant of what was to be done. I was not content with the experiments suggested by the operator. I proposed many, which were at once adopted; but the result was the same. I found, however, that in this, as in all the forms of Somnambulism, it was a necessary condition that the suggestion should pass from the operator to the patient. No Will nor desire of mine, however loudly expressed, had the slightest effect upon the patients. It was manifest that they had no cognisance of my voice or even of my presence. Their ears were as closed as were their eyes. But when I whispered my wish to the operator, so far off from them and in a tone so slight that the keenest ear among them could not possibly have heard it, as also when I wrote the request and it was silently read by him, at once, before a word was spoken, all were playing the same new part, showing that the suggestion came to them simultaneously, although widely separated and so far from me that, by whatever sense conveyed to them, it was certainly not through the ear.

These are a few only of the facts of that form of Somnambulism known as *electro-biology*. Its Psychology will be examined in another chapter.

Some authenticated cases are appended. The first was reported by Col. GORE BROWNE, the patient being an officer and Dr. DARLING the operator.

He was found, in about two minutes, quite susceptible or impressible. His muscular motions were controlled in every possible way. He was rendered unable to raise his hands, or to let them fall; he was made unable to move one, while he could move the other; unable to sit down or to rise up; or to take hold of let go an object. One arm was deprived of sensation, or both arms, or the whole frame. He was made to feel a knife burning hot, and the chair on which he sat equally so. When he started up, he was made to feel the floor so hot that he was compelled to

hop about, and wished to pull off his boots, which burnt him. He was made to feel the room intolerably warm, and actually perspired with the heat; after which he was made to feel it so cold, that in a minute or two he buttoned his coat, and walked about rubbing his hands. In about five minutes his hand was really chilled, as I found, like that of a person exposed to frost. He was made to forget his own name, as well as that of Col. Gore Browne, who was present, and to imagine Col. B. a total stranger. He was compelled, for a time, to give a false answer to every question asked; and then was forced to give true answers to every question, in spite of any effort he might make to do otherwise. He was told he was on duty, at drill; and began to give the word of command, as if in the barrack-yard. He was compelled to sing and whistle, in spite of himself; to laugh immoderately, and then to feel sad, and even to weep, all in spite of his own will. He was told that a stick was a gun, and with it he shot and bagged a grouse, which he was made to see before him. He was told the pianoforte was a horse, and after feeling and closely examining it, he specified its points and defects, and appraised its value. He tasted water precisely as was suggested to him, as lemonade, tea, or wormwood. He was told that Dr. D.'s hand was a mirror, and in it he saw himself with a black face, as Dr. D. told him to do. He was made to look at his watch, and then convinced that it pointed to a different hour from the true one. He was then made to believe the watch to be a daguerreotype of Col. Browne, and again of a lady. Dr. D.'s empty hand became a snuff-box, from which he took a pinch, which made him sneeze violently, and this passed into a most severe cough, as if he had inhaled snuff, which sensation was not removed for about half an hour. He was made to go to sleep in one minute, and in his sleep to be deaf to the loudest sounds. He was made to see, in Dr. D.'s empty hand, a bank note for £10, to read its number, to fold it up, and put it in his pocket. And when afterwards asked, he declared he had done so, and was surprised not to find it there. He was rendered quite unable to jump over a handkerchief laid on the floor; and was compelled, according to Dr. D.'s command, and in spite of every effort, either to come down on it, or on one or other side of it, or straddling across it. In every one of these experiments, Mr. W. was quite aware that the suggested idea was false, but found it impossible to resist the impression. About fifty persons were present, including Sir David Brewster, and other men of science.

Dr. GREGORY reports of two lads who were subjected to experiment for the first time by Mr. LEWIS:

Their sensations and perceptions were entirely under control. When they drank water, and were told that it was milk, coffee,



rum, whisky, or wormwood, they tasted it as such. Nay, after drinking it as whisky, they were told that they were drunk, and in a minute or two became, in every particular, very drunk indeed. The expression of the face was perfectly that of intoxication, and they could not walk a step without staggering or falling. They were easily made, by suggestion, to fancy themselves any other persons, and acted in character. They shot, fished, swam, lectured, and exhibited every feeling suggested to them. They were as easily made to suppose a stick to be a gun, a rod, a sword, nay, a serpent; or a chair to be a tiger or a bear. From these animals they fled with extreme terror. They were made to see, hear, and feel a dreadful storm, and to creep for shelter under a table or a chair, supposed by them to be a house. From this they were soon expelled by the serpent, or by the flood rising, when they swam lustily for their lives. This was the first time that either of them had been tried; and the control exercised by Mr. Lewis over their sensations, perceptions, and emotions was perfect, although their consciousness was entire. They knew the suggested impressions to be false, but could not resist them. It was most interesting to watch closely their countenances, when an object, for example, a handkerchief, was placed in the hand, and after they felt quite sure of what it was, they were told it was a rat, &c. The gradual change to doubt, from doubt to certainty, and from that to disgust or anger, was inimitable, and conveyed at once, to those near enough to see it, complete conviction of their sincerity.

Some little light is thrown on the mental operation by the following :

Mr. F., acted on by Mr. Lewis in the presence of ten or twelve persons, of whom I was one, exhibited several of the phenomena. He was sceptical at first, but soon found that his perceptions were under control. For example, an apple was given to him, and he was then told it was an orange. At first he denied this, but by degrees he began to feel doubtful. At last he said, "It is certainly very yellow" (it was dark brown). He then took a sly glance round the company, each of whom had an apple, but found them all yellow too. He next cut out a piece with his finger, looked at the inside, smelt and tasted it, and concluded with, "Well, it is an orange, but yet I know I took an apple into my hand."

## VI.—INFLUENCE OF METALS.

A Somnambule is singularly sensible to contact with metals, distinguishing them instantly by touch. Repeated

experiment has shown that the sensations experienced are those of degrees of *heat*. It is not a fanciful impression, for the like sensations are described by all. Lead causes a sensation of positive coldness, iron of pleasant warmth, silver of endurable heat; but gold is dropped instantly, with the exclamation, "It burns me." It is not a fanciful impression, for the result is the same if the hand is placed behind the back or thrust through a hole. Of course it is only a sensation resembling that of heat or cold. There is no thermometric difference. But the fact raises some interesting questions, which physiologists might usefully follow to their conclusions, as to the nature of the sensations of heat and cold. The rigor that attends upon blood-poisoning is a familiar instance how the sense of cold may exist without its actual presence. Doubtless the abnormal sensations of the Somnambule, when in contact with metals, are of like character.

#### VII.—SUPER-SENSUOUS PERCEPTION.

The Somnambule possesses to a great extent the remarkable faculty, treated of in another chapter, to which I have ventured to give the descriptive name of "Super-sensuous perception;" meaning by this term a capacity in the mind, under certain abnormal conditions, to obtain perceptions of the external world by some other medium than those nerves of the senses which, in the normal state of the mechanism, are the media employed in receipt and conveyance of impressions made by the world without. As will be then seen, there can be no doubt of the *fact* of such abnormal perception. No fact in nature or science is established by more abundant *proof*. It is disputed by the Materialists, of course, for it goes far to disprove their doctrine. But mere dogmatic denial is no answer to *evidence*, and in no case do they base denial on actual experiment. They have never seen nor tried the phenomena they dispute. They contend only that, being



opposed to their theory, it *cannot* be; therefore they will not condescend to investigate what they deem to be impossible. The position is not new. It has been the practice in all ages and countries.

A Somnambule, with closed eyes, can perceive objects beyond the range and out of the line of vision had the eyes been open, and even although opaque bodies are interposed. The French name given to this abnormal faculty (*clairvoyance*) is open to the objection that attaches to the majority of the names that have been used in Psychology. The term, which means *clear-seeing* or *clear vision*, assumes that the faculty is a power of extended *vision*; that the eye or its mechanism actually *sees*, in some mysterious manner, and that the mind is informed through the nerves of *sight*. This assumption has given a vantage ground to opponents by enabling them to evade more troublesome questions. A neutral name should always be found for a scientific fact. If this had been done at the beginning with the phenomenon now under consideration, science would have been spared a vast amount of irrelevant and useless controversy. The term *Super-sensuous Perception* avoids all this trouble, for it assigns no *cause* for the fact it names. It means merely what it implies—that in certain abnormal conditions of the human mechanism the mind obtains perceptions of external objects by some other medium (as yet untraced) than that mechanism of the senses by which alone, in the normal condition of the structure, mental perception is obtained.

That this perception is not obtained by an increased sensitiveness of the nerves of sight, as some have contended, is conclusively proved by a multitude of experiments. If the eyes be covered with wool and bandaged, or the lids fastened with sticking plaster, so that no ray of light can by any possibility penetrate to them, this perceptive power of the mind is not at all impaired. Howsoever achieved, it is manifestly not through the eye nor by impressions upon the nerves of vision.

In this state the contents of closed packets are read.

The pages of a book or a newspaper are perused with bandaged eyes as readily as if the eyes were open. Events occurring at a distance limited, indeed, but beyond the range of vision, are perceived and accurately described. Distant places, which the Somnambule has never visited, are pictured with sufficient accuracy to be at once recognised. I have *repeatedly* seen a child read an advertisement column in the *Times*, her eyes being bandaged by a sceptical and experienced doctor who warranted her *not* to see. I have played cards many times with a Somnambule, my servant, whose eyes were covered by cotton wool and four handkerchiefs, yet never did he make a mistake as to the cards he held or as to those in my hand. If I played the wrong card he would say, "You have the king" (or, as it may be), "you must play it." He named the cards dealt before they were taken up. He repeatedly read words inclosed in four thick envelopes. Once he said that five figures, naming them, were under some wafers with which I had fixed a series of almanacs to the wall. Removing them, I found under five layers the figures he had named.

These and similar phenomena noted by others have been opposed by a legend current that some banker somewhere had placed a bank note in an envelope, offering to give it to any Somnambule who would read it; but none had claimed it. In the first place, is the story true? Who was the banker? How was the note inclosed? Where was it deposited? How were the conditions made known to the Somnambules whilst in the hypnotic state, for they have then no memory of anything done in their normal state? But even if the story be true, it is necessary to learn precisely how the bank note was laid, for if folded over and over upon itself, it could not possibly be read even by a Somnambule. The object presented to the mind by his abnormal power of perception in no way differs from the same object presented through the medium of the eye. If a bank note, or any matter written or printed on semi-transparent paper, or other like material, be folded up on itself so that the lines



of writing cross in opposite directions, the keenest eye cannot read it. So it would be with the Somnambule. He would see, precisely what we should see, merely a confused mass of crossing lines and curves, but no definite shape of letters. This explains the failure of Somnambules to read a folded bank note in a box, if, indeed, the whole story is not a fiction. It explains also why one of the conditions of reading enclosures in envelopes and such like is that the paper containing the words to be read shall be laid flat and not folded. As our eyes could not read a folded writing, so neither can the perceptive faculty—whatever it be—of the Somnambule.

In *Natural* Somnambulism the patient performs with accuracy and rapidity the work of waking life. In darkness and with closed eyes he reads, writes, threads his way through crowded rooms without tripping, walks in dangerous places without falling. In Somnambulism *artificially* produced the same phenomenon is exhibited. I had a man-servant who, when hypnotised, with eyes bandaged would go to the pantry, collect the tea-things, fill the tea-urn, cut the bread and butter, carry the tray with all the tea equipage up a dark staircase and lay out the table, without erring, or tripping, or breakage. When wakened, he had no memory of what he had done. If he chanced to be hypnotised at the hour for the meal, on the instant he would exclaim, "It is time to get the tea; I must go." He went in his hypnotic condition and performed his task with closed eyes.

The Rev. A. GILMOUR, a highly respected clergyman of Greenock, is the reporter of the following case. The Somnambule was a servant, aged 18. Among many other phenomena exhibited by her and carefully observed and noted by her master, was that of perception far beyond the range of the senses :

I may state (he says) that during the summer, Dr. T—— of K——, Mrs. T——, and her two daughters, visited me. On the day that they left, I requested him to take notice of all that was doing in his house at 11 o'clock of that same night, and I

would visit him, through my clairvoyant. I did so, and dispatched to the Doctor, by the next morning's post, my questions and her answers, stating that the Dr. and Mrs. T. were in a small parlour; that it was lighted by a gas jet from the mantelpiece; that Mrs. T. was sitting at the table with a book before her; that she had a turban on her head; that she had a dress of an uncommon kind, which she described; that the Doctor was standing in the room; she described his dress; that one little Miss was in a small bedroom off the parlour, and that another little Miss was in bed with the servant in a room at the head of the stair. I may state that she had never been in K. in her life. By return of post, the Doctor acknowledged the receipt of my letter; stated that Mrs. T. was dressed in the peculiar manner described, and that everything which I had stated was true; but he informed me that he was playing upon the flute, and expressed his unwillingness to believe in the possibility of any person telling what was doing at such a distance.

Another case is reported by Dr. GREGORY :

Mr. J. D., a plate-layer from Annan, was put to sleep by Mr. Lewis in my presence and in that of several gentlemen. I asked him to find and describe my house, which he did most accurately, although he had only that day come to Edinburgh and did not know me. In particular, after describing the street-door and steps, the lobby, the staircase, and the drawing-rooms, he said he saw a lady sitting in a particular chair, reading a new book. On returning home I found that Mrs. G. had at that time been sitting in the chair alluded to, which she hardly ever does, reading a new book, which had been sent to her just before, but of which I knew nothing. Besides, I found that J. D. did not, in describing the house, read my thoughts at all, but dwelt on many things, strange to him, which I never thought of, and omitted others which I did think of and wished him to notice.

The next is interesting :

Sir T. Willshire took home with him a nest of boxes belonging to Major Buckley, and placed in the inner box a slip of paper, on which he had written a word. Some days later he brought back the boxes, sealed up in paper, and asked one of Major Buckley's clairvoyantes to read the word. Major B. made passes over the boxes, when she said she saw the word "Concert." Sir T. Willshire declared that she was right as to the first and last letters, but that the word was different. She persisted, when he told her that the word was "Correct." But on opening the boxes, the word proved to be "Concert." This case is very remarkable; for, had the clairvoyante read the word by thought-



reading, she would have read it according to the belief of Sir T. Willshire, who had either intended to write "correct," or in the interval, forgot that he had written "concert," but certainly believed the former to be the word.

But this is not so remarkable as is the following :

Sir Walter C. Trevelyan, Bart., having received a letter from a lady in London, in which the loss of a gold watch, supposed to have been stolen, was mentioned, sent the letter to Dr. H., to see whether E. could trace the watch. She very soon saw the lady, and described her accurately. She also described minutely the house and furniture, and said she saw the *marks* of the watch (the phrase she employs for the traces left by persons or things, probably luminous to her) on a certain table. It had, she said, a gold dial-plate, gold figures, and a gold chain with square links; in the letter it was simply called a gold watch, without any description. She said it had been taken by a young woman, whom she described, not an habitual thief, who felt alarmed at what she had done, but still thought her mistress would not suspect her. She added, that she would be able to point out the writing of the thief. On this occasion, as is almost always the case with E., she spoke *to* the person seen, as if conversing with her, and was very angry with her. Sir W. Trevelyan sent this information, and requested the writing of all the servants in the house to be sent. In answer, the lady stated that E.'s description exactly applied to one of her two maids, but that her suspicions rested on the other. She also sent several pieces of writing, including that of both maids. E. instantly selected that of the girl she had described, became very angry, and said, "You are thinking of pretending to find the watch, and restoring it, but you took it, you know you did." Before Sir W. Trevelyan's letter, containing this information, had reached the lady, he received another letter, in which he was informed that the girl indicated as the thief by E. had brought back the watch, saying she had found it. In this case, Sir W. Trevelyan was at a great distance from Bolton, and even had he been present, he knew nothing of the house, the watch, or the persons concerned, except the lady, so that, even had he been in Bolton and beside the clairvoyante, thought-reading was out of the question.

Here is another from the same eminent reporter :

At the house of Dr. Schmitz, Rector of the High School here, I saw a little boy, about nine years of age, put into the mesmeric sleep by a young man of seventeen. As the boy was said to be clairvoyant, I requested him, through his mesmerist, whom alone he heard, to visit, mentally, my house, which was nearly a mile off, and perfectly unknown to him. He said he would, and soon,

when asked, began to describe the back drawing-room, in which he saw a sideboard with wine glasses, and on the sideboard a singular apparatus, which he described. In fact, this room, although I had not told him so, is used as a dining-room and has a sideboard, on which stood at that moment glasses and an apparatus for preparing soda-water, which I had brought from Germany and which was then quite new in Edinburgh. I then requested him, after he had mentioned some other details, to look at the front room, in which he described two small portraits, most of the furniture, mirrors, ornamental glasses, and the position of the pianoforte, which is very unusual. Being asked whom he saw in the room, he replied, only a lady, whose dress he described, and a boy. This I ascertained to be correct at that time. As it was just possible that this might have been done by thought-reading, although I could detect no trace of any sympathy with me, I then requested Dr. Schmitz to go into another room, and there to do whatever he pleased, while we should try whether the boy could see what he did. Dr. S. took with him his son, and when the sleeper was asked to look into other room, he began to laugh and said that Theodore (Dr. S.'s son) was a funny boy and was gesticulating in a particular way with his arms, while Dr. S. stood looking on. He then said that Theodore had left the room and after a while that he had returned; then that Theodore was jumping about; and being asked about Dr. S., declined more than once to say, not liking to tell, as he said, but at last told us that he also was jumping about. Lastly, he said Dr. S. was beating his son, not with a stick, although he saw a stick in the room, but with a roll of paper. All this did not occupy more than seven or eight minutes, and when Dr. S. returned, I at once gave him the above account of his proceedings, which he, much astonished, declared to be correct in every particular.

#### VIII.—PHRENOLOGICAL PHENOMENA.

By far the most interesting of the phenomena of Somnambulism are those which certainly *seem* to be conclusive evidence that the brain is the organ of the mind, and cogent evidence that the various mental faculties have their separate seats in various parts of the brain.

The facts are very remarkable, whatever their interpretation. For trial of the experiment some *knowledge* of the scheme of GALL and COMBE is required on the part of the Psychologist, although *belief* in it is not necessary. Indeed, the test will be more certainly applied if you are



sceptical, for there will be then an assurance for yourself that the action of the Somnambule is not a reflex of your faith.

When *en rapport* with a Somnambule, you can play upon his mind as upon an organ, as certainly and rapidly, and with almost as many answering tones. As surely as, when you strike the key you hear the responsive note, so surely and promptly does the mental faculty respond to your touch. Place your finger on the asserted locality of mirth, the patient smiles; of veneration, he lifts his hands or kneels, prays aloud or *looks* a prayer; of combativeness, he strikes you; of benevolence, he throws his arms about your neck, or seizes your hands and kisses them; of music, he sings; of language, you evoke a flood of eloquence; of imagination, pictures pass before his mind's eye; of self-esteem, he stands erect and struts. And so with the rest.

Still more interesting and instructive it is to observe the combined action of two or more faculties. In this experiment you see the mind working, at your command, precisely as in waking life it works under the control of its own Will. These combinations may, of course, be varied infinitely at your pleasure. Here I can notice but a few of them. Touch the alleged seats of *Music* and *Mirth*, the Somnambule sings a comic song. In the middle of a verse, remove your finger from *Mirth* and place it upon *Veneration*. Instantly the whole aspect changes; he drops the comic song and sings a hymn. Restore the finger to *Mirth*, the hymn ceases and the comic song is resumed. The most remarkable feature of this phenomenon is that hymn and song are renewed at the identical notes at which they were broken off. Return to *Veneration*, the hymn is renewed, and thus he may be made to oscillate between comic song and hymn, so long as you continue to strike, as it were, the alternate chords of the patient's mind.

Nor this only. Allow a long interval to elapse, during which you try experiments with other faculties. Returning then to the song or the hymn, the same

result appears; either is resumed where last it was broken off, even if in the middle of a bar. The same continuity of mental action on the recurrence of the same conditions is presented in other cases. If many days have elapsed, during which the patient has performed all the work of daily life with entire unconsciousness of the events of his hypnotic life, when again restored to the hypnotic state he resumes the action in which he was engaged when awakened. When the dream (for such it is) is revived, it is continued at the precise point at which it had ceased before.

This curious mental phenomenon surely demands the earnest investigation of Physiology and Psychology. What is its explanation? What does it suggest? What is the mental condition that thus presents to us the phenomenon of a *double life*? Is the entity that in hypnotism works without the aid of the senses the same entity that works in waking life through the senses—and through them alone?

The *natural language* of the mental faculties, as expressed by Somnambules, is singularly beautiful. No actor has surpassed and few have equalled them in this. It matters not who is the patient, young or old, male or female, gentleman or clown, educated or ignorant, the acting is excellent with all and has striking features of resemblance, proving that nature has made us more alike than we are willing to believe, and that when the Mind works according to its own untrammelled impulses, the *expression* of its several faculties differs little in *kind*, though much in *degree*. I have seen boys taken from the street, under the influence of excited veneration, express in attitude and feature emotions which GARRICK might have envied or RAPHAEL been proud to portray. Excite together veneration and imagination suggesting a religious *picture* to the Somnambule. No words could describe and no art depict the rapt expression of awe and devotion with which the entranced patient beholds, as he believes in his dream, the heaven opened.



Then touch "language" also. He breaks into an invocation of marvellous beauty, or sinks upon his knees, folds his arms, bows his head and utters an eloquent prayer. Many times I have seen boys and girls *called out of the street* and hypnotised, and then the silent touch sufficed to evoke emotions the expressions of which amounted to positive sublimity.

The passions and sentiments may be as readily and as perfectly excited by the same means. Love and hate, destructiveness and benevolence, mirth and melancholy, hope and despair, firmness and fear, may be summoned to action by the lightest touch of the finger and allayed as speedily by its removal or by the counteraction of another faculty.

The practitioners of this art, reluctant to abandon their pretension to a power enabling them thus to control the action of another mind, insist upon the passage from themselves to the patient of some mystical "fluid," assumed, without the slightest evidence, to be "magnetic," and by which, they say, their control is established. They believe that every movement of the mind of the Somnambule is directed by their Wills; whereas, in fact, they merely suggest *the subject* of the dream which the mind of the patient invents and acts.

Among the more thoughtful investigators of these phenomena the question has been raised, if in this experiment the mental faculties are stimulated to action by excitement of the brain produced by the touch of the finger, or if the result is not rather due to the influence of the active Will of the operator controlling and directing the passive mind of the patient, as in others of the phenomena of Somnambulism. This conclusion would have been accepted by myself but for some seemingly contradictory facts. The same results were produced by the touch of persons wholly ignorant of the asserted localities of the various faculties. If the supposed site of some other faculty was touched in error, the expression was that of the faculty whose site was touched and not that of the faculty intended to be excited.

A case within my own experience bears upon this important point.

A youth was brought to me for examination. He was singularly sensitive to this influence. I was trying various experiments with a view to learn what are the mental faculties that combine for the production of various mental characteristics. Desiring and intending to touch the alleged locality of "Hope," I turned to speak to a friend, and accidentally my finger lighted upon the alleged seat of "combativeness." Instantly the patient fell upon me with extreme fury, beating me with his fists. With much difficulty I was enabled to touch the asserted seat of "Benevolence." As instantly as my finger rested upon him there, his combative mood ceased and was exchanged for signs of the most fervent affection.

Here my Will had desired to evoke one emotion, but accidentally and unconsciously my hand had touched the supposed locality of another emotion. The touch and not the Will prevailed. This would appear, at the first view of it, to negative the theory that the patient does but echo the Will of the operator. Nor is it a solitary instance. I have witnessed many like it. Nevertheless it admits of another solution suggested in the next chapter, to which the reader is referred.

The following case is recorded by Dr. GREGORY :

A. F., a young man, was put to sleep by me in a few minutes. In this state, every part of the head that was tried yielded striking manifestations of the corresponding phrenological faculty. I had no reason to think that this young man knew the position of the organs, nor anything about phrenology; but even if he had some general notions on the subject, the effects produced appeared so rapidly that it was impossible for him to have simulated them, even had he been disposed to do so, which I am sure was not the case. Benevolence, Destructiveness, Combativeness, Secretiveness, Acquisitiveness, Self-Esteem, Love of Approbation, Veneration, Cautiousness, Adhesiveness, Philoprogenitiveness, Tune, &c., were all tried, first in rapid succession, and all yielded strong manifestations, although very often they were quite different from what I had expected, or were distinct when I had no clear idea of how they were to be manifested. Benevolence being touched, he instantly began to give away all his money to me, taking me for an object of charity, and when I continued the contact, took off his coat to give me. This is the almost universal manifestation of Benevolencé,



obviously because, when the feeling is excited, its most natural result is to give to those in want. Cautiousness produced the most vivid picture of terror I ever saw; he said there was a fearful abyss before him, and felt as if he was to fall into it. Tune instantly caused him to sing; Imitation, to imitate not only every sound he heard, but also, with closed eyes, the gestures made by those near him. It is impossible here to give all the details; suffice it to say, that although it all looked like first-rate acting, a close study of his countenance showed the most entire truthfulness. Besides, as I moved my hand from one organ to another, so rapidly as to confuse any one not very much in the habit of guessing what organ is touched, the effects never failed to follow. To test him further, I tried touching two organs at once, and invariably obtained combined manifestations. Thus when Benevolence and Acquisitiveness were touched, he put his hands into his pockets as before, but instead of giving me the contents, he treated me to a lecture on the heinousness of begging, and declared that he thought giving money the worst kind of charity. Veneration alone caused him to pray humbly and devoutly; Veneration and Self-Esteem combined gave rise to a prayer, in a standing position, in which he returned thanks for having been made so superior to other men in religious knowledge. This combination was accidental, Self-Esteem having been first much excited, with very amusing results, and Veneration having been touched before the excitement of Self-Esteem had subsided, with the desire of reproducing the former humble devotion. Many similar trials yielded analogous results. I found also that when, intending to touch one part, my hand accidentally glided to another, the manifestation was always that of the part really touched, not of that which I intended to touch. In the region of the supposed organ of Alimentiveness, I found, within a small space, three different points; the touching of one of which produced excessive desire to eat; of another, the desire to drink; of the third, sensations of smell. To obtain these results, which could not be known to the subjects, since they were not then published, nor generally known to phrenologists, although I had heard of them, it was necessary only to move the point of the finger one-fourth or one-eighth of an inch, the three points certainly lying in less than the surface of a shilling. In all these trials, it did not signify what I wished, nor what I said; only such organs were excited as I touched. I had complete evidence that the subject did not sympathise with me or with my thoughts, but that my touch excited the faculty corresponding to the part touched.

This case occurred to me in 1843, and at that time I had three other similar cases, in persons absolutely ignorant of phrenology; nay one of them, a girl of ten or eleven, of the lowest class, ignorant of everything, and very nearly imbecile. In some of these cases, certain organs could not be excited, while others were

easily brought into action. In all of these, I assured myself that neither sympathy nor suggestion played a part.

But another case from the same authority appears to support the suggestion I have adventured, that it is the Will of the operator, and not the touch of the finger upon the skull, that evokes the mental expression :

This case presented some more peculiarities. I could excite laughter by touching the organ of Gaiety or Mirthfulness. But I could also cause laughter by touching the angles of the mouth, when it often became very violent. In either case, I had only to touch the middle of the chin, in order instantly to change the laugh into the profoundest gravity. This fact was pointed out to me by Mr. Bruce, who had studied the case four years before. He also told me, that touching a certain part of the leg caused the young man to dance. I tried this, but probably did not touch the right spot, or touched it too strongly, for the result was a sudden and most violent kick, fortunately received by a table, and accompanied by a very angry pantomime. This I saw several times. When I placed my finger, for less than half a second, on his left breast, he instantly sank down, as if fainting; but observing this, I placed my hand on Self-Esteem and Firmness, when he instantly rose into a posture of defiance. I am convinced that I could have caused him to faint entirely in a few seconds; nay I think, in that state, death might be produced by keeping the hand over the heart.

#### IX.—DOUBLE CONSCIOUSNESS.

Another strange but well-proved phenomenon. Somnambules have *two lives*, each having its own distinct memory. Awake, they have no recollection of anything that occurred in the hypnotic condition. It is a total blank to them. But when that condition is again induced, the memory revives of all that occurred, not in the last only, but in all previous similar conditions, precisely as we have of the events of our own lives. Nor this only. There are two distinct streams of memories. In the hypnotic condition there is no memory of any incident of their waking lives. In their waking lives there is no memory of any incident of their hypnotic lives. Each life is a blank to the other.

Although there is no conscious memory by the patient



awake of his *actions* in the hypnotic condition, some of the mental *impressions* remain, but the origin of them is lost. One case of many will suffice to illustrate this.

I was acquainted with two ladies in Cornwall who were highly susceptible to the hypnotic condition. If in the trance state either was directed and promised to do something at some named time when awake, it was invariably done. "Go," I said, "tomorrow at one o'clock precisely, take a book (naming it) from the library, open it at the page (named), bring it to my room and place it on the table with the leaf turned down." As surely as the hour came, she, then being awake, appeared with the right volume rightly marked as I had directed. Asked why she did so, she could say only that she felt an impulse to do it, but whence coming she had no knowledge.

It is one only of many cases in which I made trial of this interesting phenomenon, in hope to learn something of its physiology. I have witnessed the like with other patients. The impression of the promise is upon the mind, but there is no memory how it came there. Who shall say how many of the unaccountable mental impulses of our waking lives may not have been in like manner received unconsciously into the storehouse of the memory and afterwards reproduced by some unsuspected suggestion which, because we are ignorant of its source, we are not unwilling to accept as an inspiration.

#### X.—MENTAL TRAVELLING.

Another phase of Somnambulism is that which has been termed "mental travelling." The patient describes distant places he has never seen. If this faculty had been limited to descriptions of towns or other localities which might have been the subjects of painting or photography, the accuracy of these pictures might be reasonably attributed to some previous acquaintance with them. But it extends to dwelling-houses *and their contents* in distant countries, which the Somnambule could not possibly have visited. This also has been the subject of repeated experiment, so as to leave no doubt of the fact in the judgments of all who have

investigated them. One instance, within my personal experience, will suffice to give the reader a clear conception of the character of this very curious psychological phenomenon :

The Somnambule was a little girl, aged only ten years. She was invited to go (mentally) with me to Somersetshire. She described accurately my father's house there—the verandah and the glass doors opening to the garden. Asked if she could see anything in the room? "Oh yes!" she said, "such a funny chair, it rolls about." (It was an American rocking-chair). "Anything more?"—"Yes, pictures." "Tell me what they are about."—"One is a house pulled to pieces." (There was a drawing on the wall of the ruins of an abbey). "Any more?"—"Yes; the sky is on fire; horses are jumping about." (It was a large painting of a storm, and horses struck by lightning). "Anything more?"—"A river runs by the side of the house." (Right). I should state that the child had never been out of London. A friend who was present accidentally then asked to be allowed to question her. He was placed *en rapport* with her simply by my removing my hand and giving her hand to him. Re-establishment of this relationship was essential to the production of the phenomena. As I had never seen my friend's house, I cannot vouch for her accuracy with him as with myself; but I had his assurance that it was equally correct. I should state that neither of us gave the child the slightest intimation by word or look; indeed we did nothing but put questions. My friend's house was at Dover. She described some of the way down—such as the tunnel and the cliffs. "Now," she said, "I see a row of houses and such a lot of steps to get to them." "Go with me up the steps of the third house."—"Yes." "Now we go in; what do you see there?"—"Something like a monkey and some horns." (Right). "Now go into the room on the left."—"Yes, such a lot of books about; there is a horrid thing on the chimney-piece." (It was a skull). "There's a picture of a gentleman's head over it." (It was a portrait). "Now we will go upstairs."—"What a beautiful room, and oh! what a beautiful lady." "What is she doing?"—"Oh, no; it's a picture I mean, with such a beautiful dress, and she has a hat on; how funny!" (It was the full-length portrait of a lady in a riding habit). She described much besides which my friend stated to be correct. Then she added, "There's a young lady with long yellow curls looking out of window." He whispered to me, "She is wrong there. I have a niece with such hair, but she is from home. She reads the picture in my mind." My friend returned to Dover the next day and the following post brought me a letter stating that he was surprised to find that his niece had returned unexpectedly, and was in the draw-



ing-room as described, but she believes she was not at the window.

The same child had also the power of indicating diseased parts of the bodies of persons *en rapport* with her. In this manner I repeatedly heard her describe in childish phrase, but accurately in substance, phthisis, diseased liver, internal tumors, &c., in persons whom she saw for the first time.

Some of these descriptions are undoubtedly difficult of explanation by mental communion ; nevertheless, I am inclined to the conclusion that this is the true solution. It was essential that she should be *en rapport* with the person inquiring. The inquirer's mind was directed to the subject by the act of inquiry. This called up in himself a series of mental pictures which were (in the manner stated elsewhere) reflected from his mind and depicted upon hers. Hence the sometimes very correct and sometimes only partially correct descriptions. The same explanation applies to the diseases indicated by her. The persons *en rapport* with her knew their own diseases, had formed more or less accurate mental pictures of the diseased organs. These pictures were reflected on her mind. She did not actually see the distant places, nor peep into the bodies of the questioners. She described merely pictures that were upon her mind, the source of which she did not know, but which by the laws of our mental mechanism are accepted, as in dream, as being the products of external objective impressions brought by the senses. Doubtless when the drawing-room was depicted in my friend's mind, as it must have been by simple suggestion, instantly upon his asking her to go into it with him, it was in his own mind associated with the form of the niece whom he had habitually seen there. Hence her sympathetic pictures of the room and of which the niece was a part. Such an explanation of the entire series of these phenomena is far more probable than the other solutions offered—that the eyes of the child could see from London to Dover, or her soul quit her body, travel thither, and return between the question and the answer.

This is but one of many like cases. The first impression of the experimentalist is, of course, that the Somnambule actually perceives the objects he so describes, although so far beyond the range of vision. But the descriptions given suffice for question of this assumption. They are at once too accurate to be guesses and too imperfect to be pictures in words of things actually beheld. Some are very vivid, others indistinct in form and colour. The solution advanced by certain Scientists, who cannot dispute the fact, is that they are happy guesses. But this is too idle to be seriously answered. Let any reader try the experiment by setting down his own *guesses* as to the arrangement and furniture of a house which he has never seen. He will find himself utterly at fault. Even if furniture could be "guessed," would he rightly guess the subjects of pictures? Yet were these among the most minute of the descriptions given by the Somnambules in the cases cited, as in those reported.

The solution that suggested itself to me, and which reflection and experience have strengthened, is that this is another of the phases of that faculty, familiarly but erroneously called "thought-reading," which explains so much of the phenomena of Psychology and Mental Physiology. My suggestion (for it is not proved) is that the mind of the Somnambule is impressed by the mind of the operator and does not perceive the object itself, but only the idea of the object as it exists in the mind of the person *en rapport* with him. This would account alike for the accuracies and imperfections of the description. The recollections of all of us are more or less imperfect. Some memories are far more vivid than others. Endeavour to describe in speech, or, better still, in writing, a room, with its contents, even if familiar to you for years. You will be surprised to find how imperfect that recollection is. You have mistaken a distinct memory of certain striking objects for a clear memory of the whole. The Somnambule has in his mind the same picture as is in your mind, its shadows



and its lights—its perfect and its imperfect memories. Hence the perfection of some descriptions, the shadowy and uncertain character of others. This accounts also for the accuracy with which pictures are usually described, for these, being frequent and unchanging objects of inspection, the mental impressions of them are of necessity more distinct than of things that vary in appearance, and change often their location.

To the objection that things are sometimes described which the operator does not remember, the answer is, as shown in the chapter on Memory (Vol. I. p. 366), that we have *memories* of many things we are unable to *recollect* at the moment, as a thousand experiences of life will prove. Inasmuch as in all probability every impression made upon the mind remains there, even although unconsciously impressed,—before it can be affirmed of any perception by the Somnambule that it is *not* a reflection of the operator's mind, we must be assured, by some conclusive evidence, that the thing perceived by him could at no time have been impressed upon the mind that is *en rapport* with his. There is no more common error than to confuse the faculty of memory with the power of recollection. When we suppose a person to have a defective *memory*, it is usually, if not always, that he has defective powers of *recollection*.

#### XI.—ACTION AT A DISTANCE.

They who have much practised the artificial production of Somnambulism, attributing all to some mysterious personal power, assert that they can, by the exercise of their own *wills*, influence the actions of a patient far away. Their assertion is that at any moment, by fixing their thoughts upon the patient and *willing*, they can prompt him to some desired action, contending that thus they move his mind.

I can only refer to my own experience. I have tried and witnessed the trial of many experiments with a view to ascertain the existence of this very extraordinary power. In no one instance has clear and satisfactory proof of it

been given to me. Even under the far more favourable condition than separation by a wall, I have not found the expected result. Where the patient had an inkling of what was going to be done, the desired effect followed. But when all possible suspicion of what was designed was precluded—as where the patient was ignorant of the accustomed operator being in the house—the *Will* was exerted in vain. Nothing came of it. In every experiment that appeared to be successful, careful examination could trace something that might have given to the patient a *suggestion* sufficient to set up that abnormal action of the nerve system which issues in Somnambulism.

## XII.—MENTAL EXALTATION.

The general exaltation of the mental faculties in the hypnotic condition is one of the most interesting of the phenomena of Somnambulism. The paralysis of the senses,—the entire isolation of the mind from its normal action upon the body,—the temporary release, as it were, of the Conscious Self from the burden of the material mechanism,—appears to relieve the mental powers from some restraint, enabling them to work with vastly greater capacity, lucidity and rapidity. Somnambules are always much more *intelligent* in their hypnotic than in their waking state. Indeed, the whole mind appears to have undergone a complete revolution. The most stupid when awake are lively and even clever when hypnotised. The intelligent become positively brilliant. Whatsoever be the bent of their genius, it takes the most exalted forms. It is the like with the passions and the sentiments. They are largely multiplied. Knowledge is exhibited which they were not supposed to possess, but which had been at some past time received unconsciously by some sense and so impressed upon the brain and conveyed to and retained by the memory. Whatever the true character of the patient, it is unreservedly displayed. Fine thoughts expressed in beautiful language flow from lips that in waking life never uttered anything



but the commonest platitudes in the plainest dress. The merest lout is lively and even clever. The shy are forward to speak and the timid fearless to do. No theatre in the world could present such exquisite acting as is shown by a Somnambule playing any part suggested to him. If only the dullest patient could do when awake what he does in this trance, *that is not sleep*, he would be the greatest actor the world has ever seen. But it is an evanescent genius, exhibited only when the mind is working without the impediments put upon it by the material mechanism of the senses. The connection restored, the bonds of the body resumed, the mind returns to its normal stupidity, without the slightest memory of its doings during the short season of its exaltation.

For so it is. As already stated, the Somnambule lives two lives. He has two wholly distinct streams of consciousness. In his normal and waking state he has no memory whatever of anything that has occurred in his hypnotic state, and *vice versa*. But when he returns to the hypnotic state, the memory returns of all that has passed in his previous hypnotic conditions, and he has no memory of the events of his normal condition. He becomes, in fact, a changed being, with very few traces indeed of his waking self.

The process of *awakening* is noteworthy, for it throws some light on the condition itself. In compliance with the old practice, based upon the notion of a magnetic influence exercised by the operator, the usual course is to make what are called "reverse" passes—that is, instead of moving the hand from the head downwards, it is moved rapidly in the contrary direction. Sometimes the operator blows in the patient's face. In very obstinate cases of profound hypnotic sleep all these, with the addition of a rude shaking, often fail to produce the desired effect. But whatever the movements of the hand or the vigour of the breath, the action is always accompanied by a strong expression of the operator's *Will* that the patient should awake. This

appears to be the true awakener. As in the hypnotic state the mind of the patient is controlled and directed by the *Will* of the operator, so it is *his* Will that commands the mind of the patient to resume possession, as it were, of its own Will and thus to revive the action of the senses. Then the body is practically restored to the Conscious Self by renewal of the connection between that Self and its material mechanism, to the partial dis-severance and dislocation of which all the phenomena are due. The reversed passes, the stream of breath and the other customary devices, are *only indications by the operator to the patient that he Wills him to awake*. He commands the action of the mind in the trance, when the Will of the patient is paralysed, and that command is equally potent to make the mind throw off the spell and resume its self-control.

Dr. GREGORY, in his admirable treatise, thus tersely states the phenomena of Somnambulism which he deems to be established. My own lesser experience confirms, to my own judgment at least the greater portion of them. From some it will have been seen that I dissent.

I think we may regard it as established: first, that one individual may exercise a certain influence on another, even at a distance; secondly, that one individual may acquire a control over the motions, sensations, memory, emotions, and volition of another, both by suggestion, in the conscious, impressible state, and in the mesmeric sleep, with or without suggestion; thirdly, that the mesmeric sleep is a very peculiar state, with a distinct and separate consciousness; fourthly, that in this state the subject often possesses a new power of perception, the nature of which is unknown, but by means of which he can see objects or persons, near or distant, without the use of the external organs of vision; fifthly, that he very often possesses a very high degree of sympathy with others, so as to be able to read their thoughts; sixthly, that by these powers of clairvoyance and sympathy, he can sometimes perceive and describe, not only present, but past, and even future events; seventhly, that he can often perceive and describe the bodily state of himself or others; eighthly, that he may fall into trance and extasis, the period of which he often predicts accurately; ninthly, that every one of these phenomena has occurred, and frequently occurs, spontaneously, which I hold to be the fundamental fact of the whole inquiry; Somnambulism,



Clairvoyance, Sympathy, Trance, Extasis, Insensibility to pain, and Prevision, having often been recorded as natural occurrences. Tentbly, that not only the human body, but inanimate objects, such as magnets, crystals, metals, &c., &c., exert on sensitive persons an influence, identical, so far as it is known, with that which produces mesmerism; that such an influence really exists, because it may act without a shadow of suggestion, and may be transferred to water and other bodies; and lastly, that it is only by studying the characters of this influence, as we should those of any other, such as Electricity or Light, that we can hope to throw light on these obscure subjects. Let us in the meantime observe and accumulate facts; and whether we succeed or not in tracing these to their true causes, the facts, if well observed and faithfully recorded, will remain, and, in a more advanced state of science, will lead to a true and comprehensive theory.

### XIII.—MEDICAL USES.

GREAT *healing power* is claimed for Hypnotism, and there is no doubt of its efficacy in nervous disorders and the maladies that grow out of defective vital force or irregular nerve action. Before the discovery and use of anæsthetics, capital operations were successfully performed under the insensibility produced by hypnotism. The introduction of chloroform superseded the earlier practice, by reason of the ease of its administration and the great certainty of its action. All succumb readily to chloroform; only one in three to the influence of hypnotism. But for curative purposes it remains without a rival and would be more employed but for the prejudices surrounding it through professional jealousies and the systematic hostility of scientists to the *name* by which it was first known. Whole volumes have recorded the cures wrought by this instrument. Dr. ESDAILE published a book devoted to a record of the good work done by it in the Hospitals of India. Miss MARTINEAU, in her autobiography, repeats her emphatic assertion that, after the doctors had pronounced her case hopeless, hypnotism cured her of a disease declared to be incurable by medicine. That it will often remove neuralgia in its various painful shapes is familiar to all who have made trial of it. It may

be readily put to the proof by any who doubt. If it does not cure, it is at least harmless; when it fails to cure it rarely fails to relieve pain.

Nor is the *rationale* of its operation so obscure and difficult as some have supposed. It admits of a very reasonable and probable explanation.

Hitherto, the popular theory has been based upon the assumption of a supposed force called "Animal Magnetism." According to this theory, a fluid, imperceptible by any sense, but by which the processes of Life are performed, is possessed by all human beings. Some persons have more, some less, of this fluid. They who possess it *plus* are capable to become the operators in the production of magnetic phenomena. They who have it *minus* are fitted to be patients. The operator communicates to his subject, by means of the "passes," a portion of his superfluous magnetism, which flows from the points of his fingers, thus restoring the patient to the magnetic equilibrium necessary to health.

What says Science to this theory?

The very existence of such a fluid is unproved. There is absolutely *no* evidence of its being. The most delicate instruments have failed to show its presence. If any such force exist, certainly it is not magnetic, nor in any way connected with magnetism, for the most careful tests do not reveal the slightest traces of it. No one fact confirms the *mere conjecture* that anything is transmitted from the operator to the patient. True, the hypnotic condition was first induced when magnets chanced to be used and this led to the hasty conclusion that magnetism was the agent. But the experiment was afterwards tried with tractors of wood, painted to resemble magnets, and precisely the same results followed. Then the hand was tried, without the magnet, and the operation was as perfect as before. Obviously, therefore, the agent was *not* magnetism. But the belief that it was magnetism, of some kind or in some form, could not be shaken off



and so the name of "Animal Magnetism" was given to it.

Further experiments have since ascertained that the hand of the operator is not necessary to the production of the hypnotic condition. This may be induced as perfectly by the patient staring at a coin held in his own hand as by looking at the tips of the operator's fingers. The conclusion, therefore, is that nothing magnetic or otherwise is *communicated* from one to the other, and that, in fact, hypnotism is a *self-induced* condition.

But although no healing power is possessed by the operator, and no positive fluid or force is transmitted from him to the patient, there is no doubt that the cure often, and almost always the relief, of a large class of maladies is accomplished by means of the manipulation. How?

As yet, in lack of positive proof, the conclusion is necessarily little more than conjecture; but it is a rational conjecture and a probable conclusion, and in strict accordance with the physiology of the nerve system and the entire Mechanism of Man.

It may be thus expressed :

Disease, in the vast majority of cases (*not* caused by the introduction of a poison, such as are those called infectious and contagious), is the consequence of a deficiency in quantity, or irregularity in the distribution, of the vital (or nerve) force that is transmitted from the nerve centres. The immediate result of insufficient vital power is that the functions of the organism are imperfectly performed in such parts of the structure as are so defectively supplied. The nutrient particles are not eliminated from the food; or they are not taken up by the absorbents; or they are not properly amalgamated with the blood; or they are not abstracted from the blood by the parts of the organism requiring repair; or they are not perfectly converted into flesh and bone; or the used-up particles are not removed in due course, but remain to impede more or less the healthy working of the machine. The vital (or nerve) force is that by which

all the organic changes are wrought, and the nerve system is the mechanism by which that force is conveyed to every part of the structure. This sustaining and healing influence may fail at its source, and then the whole organism first flags and then dies. Or its flow may be impeded in parts only of the mechanism, and then those parts alone are affected. The obvious remedy for diseases so caused (and they form the vast majority of the ailments we endure) is obviously to increase the amount of nerve (or vital) force at the producing centres, or to promote its more equal distribution by removing the obstacles that impede its flow to the diseased parts; as the case may be.

This, briefly stated, being the immediate source of many maladies, how does hypnotism accomplish its undoubted cures?

To answer this question we must ask another. Can the nerve force be directed by any voluntary effort? There is cogent evidence that it may. It is an established fact that, by fixing the *attention* upon parts of the structure, positive pains may be produced in those parts. Neuralgia is supposed to be mainly due to a process of this nature. The stigmata of ecstasies, whose existence is too well attested to be denied, are doubtless due to the same cause. We never send a command to a limb to move but we direct the nerve force thither to do the work. The weariness of walking is not weariness of the muscle, but of the mind that moves the muscles, as is shown by this, that if a sudden excitement stirs the lagging nerve centre to send forth a fresh stream of the nerve force, the weariness passes away on the instant. This could not be if the weariness were in the muscles themselves.

Such being the action of the nerve force, may it not well be that the hypnotic process—which is performed by making what are called “passes;” that is, by passing the hand slowly and equably from the head down the back, from the neck to the arms, and so forth, especially over the affected part—operates by directing the *attention* of



the patient to the parts of the body over which the hand is drawn, this *attention* being accompanied, as a necessary consequence, by a flow of the nerve force to that part, thus restoring the equilibrium of vitality and sending to the diseased part the vital force of which it is deficient. I am conscious that such a simple explanation is not satisfactory to those who assume the existence of a fluid, call it animal magnetism or what they please, which they believe to be transferred to the patient by the benevolence of the operator out of his own abundance. But I may be excused for holding that we should not invoke an unproved power, natural or supernatural, to account for proved facts, until we have exhausted all ways of accounting for them consistently with what are known of the laws of nature. It is equally unreasonable and unscientific to refuse to accept a fact because we cannot at once discover a natural cause for it. Wisdom will shun both errors. Cure by hypnotism is *a fact*. The fact admits of an explanation consistent with recognised science. I venture to submit that explanation to the reader, not as being positively proved, but as being very probable.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

## THE PHYSIOLOGY OF SOMNAMBULISM.

SUCH being the phenomena presented by Somnambulism, whether naturally produced or induced artificially, the next question is, with what *physiological* changes are they *probably* attended? The reader should clearly understand that but little progress has been made towards a solution of this problem, because as yet scientific methods of experiment have been insufficiently directed to it.

That Somnambulism is not a purely mental or psychic condition appears from some facts noted by Physicians.

The eyes, as stated, are turned upwards and inwards, in a position impossible by any voluntary effort. Where this is found, therefore, it is certain that the patient is not shamming. The eyeballs and eyelids exhibit constant and rapid quivering, difficult to imitate at all, but which could not possibly be continued for five minutes. The Somnambule exhibits both of these physiological phenomena so long as the affection lasts, even when continued for many hours.

A similar position of the eyeball, but without the quivering, is said to be found in coma. Hence it may be reasonably inferred that the physical condition of Somnambulism is allied to the comatose condition.

We know certainly that *all the senses are paralysed*; they have ceased to convey to the mind the impressions made upon the body. The communication between the Conscious Self and the body is severed, but we are as yet ignorant if it be that the nerves have ceased to



carry, or the brain to receive or to impart, the messages to be transmitted. Whatever the cause, it is certain that, in some manner not yet ascertained, the recipient power of the central ganglion of the brain (the organ upon which the sense-nerves converge and through which their impressions are conveyed to the Conscious Self), is paralysed or its power to communicate with the Conscious Self is for a time suspended. *Some* physiological change doubtless takes place *there*, but we know not its nature. The *Will* is wholly suspended—that is to say, brain and body have ceased to obey the commands of the Will. But this is not a special feature of Somnambulism. As we have seen, a like state of the mechanism attends ordinary sleep.

The Physiological condition of Somnambulism is marked by a temporary cessation of the control of the brain over the body and the consequent severance of the Intelligence from the mechanism of the body.

But this is not all. In the first stage of Somnambulism, when artificially induced and we are enabled to observe minutely the process of passing into the hypnotic condition, the brain itself appears to be more or less paralysed, the intelligent Will, that moves and directs the brain in the normal state, having ceased to move it. The entire of the mechanism stands still, as a machine does when the motive force is withdrawn. One result of this is the remarkable phenomenon of *catalepsy*. Place the limbs in any position and they remain there, because the paralysed Will has no power to move them. The immovable muscles continue thus fixed for an indefinite time without weariness. Why? Because they are not sustained in that position by an effort of the Will. The weariness or pain of what we term a constrained posture is in the nerve and not in the muscle. This is the simple scientific explanation of the seemingly marvellous experiments in which the limbs of Somnambules are stiffened and kept for hours in positions impossible to be sustained for a minute by any voluntary effort. The extension of the arm,

a heavy weight held in the hand, is no more painful nor wearisome to the Somnambule than is a like posture to a lay figure. The *sense* of pain and weariness is in the brain, not in the body. The brain of the Somnambule is severed from his senses. He cannot direct the motions of his limbs. His body is to his mind—his consciousness—as if it were dead. To the experimentalist it is only as the lay figure. Place it in any position and it remains there, because the motive force within is suspended. The normal link between mind and body is practically severed.

---



## CHAPTER VII.

## THE PSYCHOLOGY OF SOMNAMBULISM.

I MUST repeat, that the *physical* condition of Somnambulism is a temporary paralysis of a portion of the brain or of the communicating nerves of the Senses, by reason of which the connection between the brain and the body is severed. The action of the Will has ceased. The communication of the Self with the mechanism of the body, normally conducted by means of the brain and the nerve system, is suspended. The senses carry to the Conscious Self no messages from the external world.

Thus we have what is substantially a *mind without a body*, and we are enabled to study deliberately, and even to try experiments upon, this bodyless mind. What a pathway to the investigation of mental physiology and psychology is here opened to the student! The marvel is that it should have been so long neglected by Psychologists. For some inexplicable reason they have preferred, and seem still to prefer, the *metaphysical* pursuit of their Science to the study of it, as all other Science is now pursued, by observation of and experiment upon the mechanism in action?

The brain being in this passive state, the Will has ceased to control it and no longer holds command over the body. It is not until the operator exerts *his* Will that the Somnambule shows any signs of revived mental or bodily action.

Then, however, the effect is immediate and remarkable. The active Will of the operator takes the place of the passive Will of the patient. What the operator *wills* him to do the patient does.

But this is not the entire of the process. The senses of the Somnambule being closely sealed and their communication with the mind cut off, he does not feel the sensations brought by his own senses. But he feels the *sensations* communicated by the operator. If he is pricked, the patient winces; what he tastes and smells, the patient tastes and smells.

It is not necessary to this *mental sympathy* that there should be any audible communication. It suffices that the sensation exists in the mind of the person *en rapport* with the Somnambule.

An English word to express what the French call being *en rapport* is much wanted in Psychology. Unable to find one, I am compelled to employ the foreign term. But I am desirous that there should be no misunderstanding of the sense in which it is here used. It is employed to designate a certain relationship between the mind of a Somnambule and the mind of the experimentalist—a species of mental sympathy—by which the waking mind moves the hypnotised mind. The precise nature of that relationship, how it works and by what *physiological* action it is produced, is as yet very imperfectly understood. But the existence of such a relationship is a fact patent to all acquainted even but slightly with the phenomena of Somnambulism. It is supposed by some that it can be established only with the person by whom the hypnotic state is induced. That is a mistake. *Any* person can be placed *en rapport* with the patient by coming within an undefined (but not indefinite) range of his mental mechanism and excluding the counteracting presence of the influences of other minds. Where these prevail, the disturbance of the conflicting forces is painfully manifest. The strongest Will, in such case, ultimately obtains the mastery, but only after evident pain to the patient. The distance from the person of the Somnambule at which another mind can become *en rapport* with his appears to depend, partly upon the power of the Will of the operator, but much more upon the sensitiveness of the patient. It is



vastly extended by practice alike in range and in intensity.

It has been already remarked that the hypnotic condition is, in the judgment of the present writer, *self-induced*. He is aware that in this he differs from others who have had greater experience than himself. But it may be that, the suggestion never having occurred to them, they have not directed their experiments to this inquiry. The production of the condition by some form of personal manifestation is so general that it seems almost to have been taken for granted that the result is due to *personal* influence exercised by the operator. The theory of an imperceptible fluid passing from the one to the other has been accepted as the solution, because of some supposed resemblance to the action of the invisible force of magnetism. But I am satisfied that magnetism is in no way concerned in it. There is no proof of its presence in any shape. All known tests fail to show the slightest traces of it. Doubting much if personal influence was really the *modus operandi*, I tried various experiments and found, as did Dr. BRAID, that the condition may be produced, without an operator at all, by the mere mental action, or rather *inaction*, of the patient; that it is, in fact, a *process of fixing the attention until a state of mental inaction or paralysis is produced*. All the operator really does is to cause the *attention* of the patient to be riveted until the whole mind is concentrated on the effort. Insensibility then follows. The process was usually effected by thrusting the fingers against the eyes of the patient, or by requiring him to fix his eyes upon those of the operator, or by "passes." It will be observed that, whatever the means adopted, the end sought is the same—the *fixing of attention*. This view of the process having occurred to me, I found abundant proof of its verity. For experiments in so-called "Electro-biology," the patient is made to rivet his eyes upon a disc in his hand. Four patients out of ten can be hypnotised on first trial by looking steadfastly at a spot upon a wall or a small

pattern on a carpet. Mr. BRAID, whose book on Hypnotism is accepted by the profession and cited by Dr. CARPENTER, invariably hypnotised his patients by a similar process.

The brain and nerve system are thus reduced to a perfectly passive condition, and then it is that the operator is enabled to control both mental and bodily action.

Let us now examine the remarkable results of the relationship so established. The patient being placed *en rapport* with the operator, the one mind becomes entirely subject to the other mind. The passive mind of the Somnambule can be incited to action only by a mind *en rapport* with him. In the first stage of the hypnotic condition, the mind of the patient is wholly passive and moves only as it is moved. In the second stage, when there has been a partial waking from perfect passiveness, the first impulse must be given to the mind of the patient by the mind of the operator. He must suggest *a subject* and the mind of the patient then proceeds to *construct a dream* based upon that suggestion. In brief, it is here as in ordinary sleep and dream. In sleep, the subjects of dream are commonly suggested by the uncertain action of the torpid but not wholly paralysed senses. In Somnambulism, the senses being completely paralysed, the mental action of the operator suffices to suggest *the subject* of the dream, which the mental faculties of the patient weave into a drama—as in the dream of sleep.

But the principal difference between the dream of the Somnambule and the dreams of all of us in our normal condition lies in the action of the *Will*. In ordinary sleep we dream, we *Will* to act and we *believe* that we act the dream. But we act it in thought only and not in reality because, although we are exercising the *Will*, and believe that it is doing its waking work and making the body obey its commands, it is, in fact, not doing that work; the body does not obey. In Somnambulism, the patient being partially awakened, the *Will* revives



and directs and the dream is *acted* accordingly. In few words, the difference may be thus described. In *dream*, we *believe* that we act the dream, but do not act it. In *Somnambulism*, the patient dreams and *acts his dream*. Both are dreaming; but the dream is determined in each by different influences and exhibited in different results.

The interest of these phenomena of Somnambulism, so profoundly important to Psychological and Mental Science, culminates in the question, "how is the mental state of the operator imparted to the patient by a merely mental operation, without communication by means of the senses, through which alone, in the normal condition of the mechanism, mind is enabled to communicate with mind?"

*Physiology* might answer thus. The brain is constructed of an incalculable number of nerve fibres (some say nerve cells), of inconceivable minuteness. Every square inch contains *many millions* of these fibres or cells. Certain motions of these fibres impart to us (the Conscious Self) certain sensations which we term *ideas* and *emotions*. The processes we call "Memory" and "Recollection" are the tendency of these brain fibres to reproduce any motion once impressed upon them. When any motion is thus set up, from any cause, it is followed by a series of allied motions, in the same order in which they had been grouped on former occasions. This is what we term the *association of ideas*. *Physically*, "association of ideas" is the recurrence of motions of the brain fibres that were associated before, the one setting up the other.

We must turn now to the science of acoustics for the theory of *vibration*. Practically we know that when two chords are strung to the same pitch and one of them is struck its motions are communicated to the atmosphere, and by the atmosphere to the other chord, which forthwith vibrates in unison. The late Sir CHARLES WHEATSTONE had in his drawing-room a harp suspended from the ceiling by one small wire which communicated

with a pianoforte in an upper room. When the pianoforte was played above, the harp below repeated the tune, that single wire sufficing to carry the vibrations of the strings of the piano and impart them to the strings of the harp.

Now for the application of this acoustic phenomenon to *mental sympathy and communion*. (See *ante*, p. 182).

The brain fibres are infinitely more minute and sensitive than are the strings of WHEATSTONE'S harp and doubtless respond to infinitely slighter impressions. Motions of the atmosphere, altogether imperceptible to any sense, are imparted to them and probably also motions of that *ether* which TYNDALL and others now accept as occupying the Universe and in which our molecular atmosphere is merely diffused.

Such being the physical condition attending the process of mental communication, its psychology may be explained thus.

An idea is present to my mind. Physiologically, an idea is a certain *motion* (change of position) in the molecules of one or more of the fibres of my brain. But no motion of any particle of matter can occur without being communicated to other surrounding particles. As the motion of the strings of the piano was communicated to WHEATSTONE'S harp strings, so, by precisely the same process, the motions of the fibres of my brain are communicated by the atmosphere, or by the ether, to the brain fibres of another brain within a certain distance and being in a certain condition of susceptibility. Somnambulism produces this susceptible condition, or some condition favourable to it, doubtless by excluding all the conflicting influences of the throng of impressions upon the senses which in the normal state are continually being brought to the brain by the nerves.

It is probable that, even in the ordinary intercourse of life, this community of brain action is not infrequent. But the mind is then too much occupied by the multitudinous impressions flowing into it on all



sides to take note of the infinitely more delicate impressions communicated by the motions of other brains.

In the case of the Somnambule, all the conditions favour the operation of this process of "mental communion." The passive brain of the patient is in a condition of absolute immobility. The motions of the brain fibres of the communicant have no opposing forces to meet them in the brain of the Somnambule. The consequence is that the passive but highly sensitive brain of the patient is readily subject to the influence of the minutest waves proceeding from the active brain of the operator. One moves as the other moves. Identity of action is identity of conception. The ideas of the operator are echoed by the Somnambule, who, ignorant of their source, assumes, as all of us do in dream, his own mental conceptions to be the impressions of realities from without.

Hence the phenomena of that which is termed "transference of sensation," of obedience to unexpressed commands of the operator, of "communion of thought and mental sympathy," and the phenomena of "electrobiology," as exhibited in the many forms described in a previous chapter.

But the active mind of the experimentalist needs not to exercise continuous control over the passive mind of the patient. In the second stage of Hypnotism (which is identical with the sleep-walking state of natural Somnambulism), the operator needs only to set the mind of the patient in motion, giving to it the first impulse and direction. Then the mind of the patient proceeds, *precisely as in ordinary dream*, to employ its various faculties in constructing a vision upon the suggestion so made. In fact, the Somnambule *is* dreaming as we dream. But his dream differs from our dream in this: The dream of sleep is suggested by some slight impression upon the senses, or some image self-generated; the dreamer *thinks* that he is acting the dream, but does not act it. The dream of the Somnambule is suggested by the motion of another mind setting his mind in motion in a certain direction. Moreover he *acts* the dream.

Nor is this the only difference between the two conditions of Sleep and Somnambulism. *The sleeper usually remembers the dream he does not act; the Somnambule has no memory whatever of the dream he acts.*

But, although the partially revived Will of the Somnambule can work without the control of the operator, he continues his command in so far that he can divert and direct the mental action at his pleasure.

Another feature of the trance of Somnambulism is to be noted by the Psychologist. The mental faculties are in a highly *excited* and *exalted* condition. Brain power is really increased. The mind is in the state which has been termed *ecstatic*. This condition has been in all ages the subject of superstition—sometimes for reverence, sometimes for persecution. It has been treated by turns as prophecy, as inspiration, as the utterance of a God or of a demon. How may Science explain it?

The *fact* of such a mental condition is undisputed. It occurs naturally. It may be produced artificially. It is witnessed occasionally in Natural Somnambulism. It is the frequent attendant upon induced Somnambulism. It has been already described and needs not to be repeated here. It is exhibited partially in the state of dream. The process of its production may be suggested thus.

The ecstasy is due to the concentration of nerve (or psychic) force upon the few mental faculties called into action, the greater portion of the mental mechanism being perfectly passive. The excess of stimulus thus provided for few faculties causes in them an excitement and consequent exaltation, greatly in excess of their normal condition, when the entire mental mechanism is moving and the motive force is distributed over the whole brain or among many faculties. Similar results are often seen to attend excitement of the brain by disease—as in brain fever and some forms of insanity. In Hypnotism, the excited faculty is usually in a state of health and therefore capable of the most powerful expression. The active mind of the operator has set in motion parts only of the passive mind of the



patient and upon those parts are concentrated the entire of the force that produces the intelligent action of the brain (the "Psychic Force" as I have ventured to call it). The effect of such concentration of the motive force is seen in very exalted expression of the faculties so excited. There is a temporary transformation of the character of the patient, so far as those excited faculties are concerned, the other mental faculties being passive and paralysed. When the extraordinary stimulus is removed by the process of wakening and restoration of the general action of the brain, thus redistributing the motive force among the whole mental mechanism, those excited faculties return to their normal condition, the ecstasy ceases and the patient is as dull and insensitive as before.

The remarkable phenomena which Phrenology has claimed as positive proof of her own title may be thus accounted for. The brain of the Somnambule is passive. Parts of it are called into activity by the touch of the operator. But the touch is merely the indication of his Will. He desires that a certain mental faculty of the patient, then dormant, shall become active. In fact, he wakens that part only of the passive brain. As fully described above, the other parts of the brain remaining dormant, the awakened part concentrates in itself the entire of the motive force which, in the normal condition, would have been distributed among many parts. Hence the abnormal activity and exaltation of mind, in a very limited direction, which form so remarkable a feature of this phenomenon.

Another explanation has been offered. May it not be that the mind of the experimentalist suggests the particular idea to the mind of the patient by the process of *mental communion*, already described? (p. 182). May not the astonishing results we witness be caused by mental suggestion and not by touch at a supposed site of an unproved brain organ? Such a solution deserves inquiry. It is true that some reported cases

appear to negative this theory. But those cases require to be reviewed, with careful reference to the new light thrown upon them by the more recent recognition of "mental communion." The conclusive test would be for a Somnambule, ignorant of phrenology and on whom experiments had never been tried, to be manipulated by a person equally ignorant, so that neither the Will of the one nor the touching of the other could possibly influence the result. If *then* the asserted faculties should be excited and exhibited, the proof would be almost conclusive that the brain is really structured as it has been mapped by GALL, SPURZHEIM, and COMBE, and that the action of the Somnambule was not an echo of a thought of the experimentalist. Until such a test be tried, the question of cause must be an open one.

The phenomena of that which is wrongly termed Clairvoyance (but which might be called more properly *Super-sensuous Perception*, for which the reader is referred to the next chapter) are more difficult of explanation. The majority of them are explicable by reference to mental communion; but others, equally authentic and familiar, do not admit of that solution, as, for instance, perception by the mind of objects not perceptible by the sense of sight—at least, as that sense is normally exercised, through the medium of the eye.

But it is not necessary to invoke supernatural influences for the solution of the problem. It may be explained by known natural laws. Further observation and experiment must determine if the explanation be the true one. I offer it as a suggestion merely. Science asserts now that all we call "matter" is made of molecules floating in the ether that occupies the whole visible universe. These molecules combine in various proportions to produce the various things we call "substances." But these molecules are not at rest, and do not touch each other. They are in continual motion, even in the bodies that to our coarse and very limited senses are what we call "solid." Through these moving masses of molecules the physical forces (or as



Professor TYNDALL contends, *the one motive force* which presents itself to us in various forms, according to the mode of its motion) are incessantly passing, changing the combinations of atoms and molecules. Light, as one form of that force or one mode of that motion, passes readily through some substances, with difficulty through many substances, and not at all through others. The eye is constructed to receive the rays of light and pictures of forms and colours impressed by those rays upon the retina. The nerves of sight convey those impressions to the brain. The brain imparts them to the Conscious Self. Substances through which those rays of light pass are called *transparent*, being no impediment to vision. Substances through which they do not pass, and by which vision is impeded, are called *opaque*.

But some of the other modes of the motion of this force (as, for instance, that called *magnetic*), unlike its mode of motion which we call light, find few obstructions to their passage anywhere. Consequently, if the Conscious Self, or the brain, can, in certain conditions, receive and perceive the magnetic, or any other force, as the eye receives and the optic nerve perceives the force of light, *opacity* would not exist; all substances would be transparent and objects would be perceived by the mind which, in the normal condition of the mechanism, are imperceptible because invisible.

A third solution is suggested in the modern recognition by Science of the existence of an ether occupying all space—at least within the small circle of the visible Universe. All perception, it is contended, must be by means of *motion*. Something changing its position impinges upon the recipient, be it brain or Soul. May it not well be that the motions of the infinitely refined *ether* penetrate and are perceived by the Conscious Self when the ruder motions of the denser *atmosphere* are imperceptible by reason of the temporary paralysis of the senses.

A Somnambule, with whom I experimented largely, thus described to me the process by which he perceived

words and pictures wrapped in a dozen envelopes of brown paper. The packet was placed by him, sometimes against his forehead, sometimes against the back of his head. He spoke of the act as "looking" and "seeing;" it appeared to him to be an exercise of the *sense of sight*, although he did not and could not use his eyes in the work.

"When I look very hard at it," he said, "after a little while a bluish flame seems to come over the paper; then that goes and I see the next paper; then the blue flame plays over that and I see the next, and so on until at last I see the printed words just for a second or two and then they vanish."

I tried the experiment of folding the writing on itself. He could not then read it. Asked why, he said, "For the same reason that you could not read it. The letters cross each other and the strokes run all ways. It is impossible to make them out."

The explanation of the healing power of hypnotism is sufficiently obvious, without invoking the supernatural. The diseases to which alone it is applicable are nervous maladies, or such as are in some way the result of irregular or imperfect nerve action. The motions of the hand (called "passes") slowly and steadily direct the *attention* of the patient to the disordered parts of the body over which they are made. When attention is continuously directed to any part of the structure, there is by that act of attention an increased flow of nerve force from the nerve centre to that part. An increase of nerve force follows the hand of the operator; but it does not, as he supposes, proceed from himself. It is self-generated, although it is directed by his action to the place where it is wanted.

This process, often repeated, restores by degrees the nervous energy at the seat of the malady, supplying the vital or nerve force by whose aid alone the disordered structure can be made to resume its healthy functions.

Such is the simple explanation by Psychology of healings by "faith" or "mesmerism," and doubt-



less of not a few of those of which legitimate medicine boasts.

Rigidity of the muscles induced and relaxed at the Will of the operator, and its attendant phenomena, may be thus explained:—

This rigidity is not peculiar to Somnambulism. It is seen also in an affection well known to medicine as *Catalepsy*. In this disease, some or all the muscles of the body become suddenly stiffened. The whole frame is, as it were, changed into a statue. It reverses the fable of Pygmalion. Instead of the marble melting into flesh, in catalepsy the living form becomes a statue, saving only that it breathes. No force can produce flexure of any limb. There is no motion of the features save the quivering of the eyes. There is no consciousness on the part of the patient of external existence. We know not if he dreams, for the cataleptic cannot *act* his dream. Whatever the posture at the moment of attack, it is preserved until the ceasing of the paroxysm. It may not continue more than a few minutes; it may last for many hours.

It has been stated in a previous chapter that a very similar condition is readily produced in Hypnotism, not as an exceptional, but as an almost universal, characteristic. But there is a notable difference in the exhibition of it. In natural Catalepsy the whole body is made rigid at the same instant. In the Somnambule, any limb may be made rigid at the Will of the operator—a finger, one arm, or one leg; or each limb may be affected in succession, until the whole body is in the cataleptic state. So the body may be made to assume any attitude at pleasure and remain fixed in that position. The living patient resembles the lay figure of the artist in that it may be posed as easily, and so kept as long as the operator desires.

What in this cataleptic condition is the state of the muscular fibre? It is not in *contraction*. The muscles have not the cord-like aspect that attends constriction.

Suppose the Somnambule lying in an unconscious

state upon a sofa, every limb relaxed. At the Will of the operator, expressed by gently stroking the limb, the muscles suddenly become rigid. There is no other visible change. There is no spasm and the muscles do not contract unless desired to do so. It is not until an endeavour is made to move the limb that we discover such stiffness that it cannot be lifted without lifting also the whole body, which itself may be made as rigid as if it had been hewn out of wood. In this state it will bear immense weights, precisely as if it were constructed of wood and not of flesh and bone.

How is this curious condition brought about? What is the process, bodily or mental, by which that rigidity of the muscles is produced?

First, observe the condition of the muscular fibre. It is not in a state of contraction, unless the limb is placed in a position that compels contraction. It simply *stiffens* in whatever posture it may be, precisely as if it were the limb of a corpse. It will not contract after the condition has taken place. Whatever the state of the muscle at the moment when the condition occurs, in that precise state it continues so long as the condition lasts.

In the normal state, the nerve force, conveyed to the muscle by the nerves which permeate it in all parts, causes the muscle to contract, in obedience to the Will or by involuntary excitation. If the connection between the nerve centre and the muscle be severed, the muscle cannot be moved by any voluntary effort. Save that it is still fed by the blood, it is for all purposes of use as marble.

This is the precise condition of the muscles of one or more limbs, and sometimes of the entire structure under the command of the Will, during the cataleptic state so commonly seen in Hypnotism. The immediate cause of the rigidity of the muscles in catalepsy is the absence of the force, directed by the Will, which, in the normal state of the organism, gives to the limb the motions desired by the Intelligence. The immediate



cause of the cataleptic condition is the severance of the connection between the controlling Will and the muscles it moves. So it is in Paralysis. But there is this difference, that in paralysis the severance is the result either of organic lesion or of obstruction by pressure, and is more or less lasting. The catalepsy of Hypnotism is due to some influence suspending, but only for a short time, the connection between the Will and the muscles.

Such being the actual condition, however brought about, let us trace its consequences. For an instance; suppose the arm to be the limb whose muscles have been deprived of their usual supply of nerve force by interruption of the flow of the force at some point between the brain and the extremities of the nerve cords. The limb lies senseless and motionless. In whatever position it is placed by external force, so it remains. The muscles have no consciousness of fatigue or pain; the nerves, that in their normal state impart to the mind the sensations we call weariness and pain, are unable to impress the mind. This is the *rationale* of the rigid limb remaining so long without apparent fatigue in positions the endurance of which, if the Will had been active or the nerves of sensation operating, would have been impossible to be preserved for five minutes.

What characterises this temporary severance of the connection between the Will and the answering limb—between the nerve centre and its extremities? It will be remembered that the primary features of Somnambulism are paralysis of the *Will* and suspension of the *consciousness*. The necessary consequence of this is that, if the machinery of the body devoted to voluntary action moves at all, it must be automatically; that is to say, the mechanism works without the control of the Will and without knowledge of its action by that entity (whatever it be) here called “the Soul” or “the Conscious Self.” The immediate condition is perfect passiveness. Roused by some impulse communicated *from without*, the brain,

and through the brain the nerve system, which in the normal state is under the control of the Will, in this paralysis of the Will is set in motion by the influence of whatever Will is in that undefined relationship to it called *en rapport*. This foreign Will operates with more or less of power, but always with a force inferior to that of the native Will by which the brain is usually governed. So long as that stronger influence is continued, the action of the subject brain continues. When it is withdrawn, the precedent passive condition is restored.

The Physiology and Psychology of Catalepsy may be thus explained. When in the normal state your arm is at rest every muscle is relaxed. But if you *Will* to use your arm, the nerve carries the command from the ganglion at the base of the brain, which is the presumed seat of the Will, to the arm, and instantly each one of the nerve fibres that are attached to the muscles either itself contracts and pulls the muscle, or more probably imparts to the muscular fibre a stimulus by which its molecules are brought closer together.

But, when the Will is paralysed in Somnambulism we have this remarkable phenomenon. The passive brain, not being subject to the control of its own Will, is moved by the Will of any mind that chances to bear to it the relationship termed being "*en rapport*." What is the precise nature of this connection is as yet but very imperfectly understood. It is not precisely the sympathy by which one mind is often unconsciously attracted to another mind. It is rather a physical than a psychical influence. It may be that to become *en rapport* with the patient the operator must be within the sphere of his nerve atmosphere, that is to say, the nerve force which, according to Dr. RICHARDSON, extends beyond the extremities of the nerves in certain constitutions and, in the condition of somnambulism especially, passes abnormally beyond its usual limits.

If the Will of the operator desires that the limb shall become rigid, and intimates that desire by drawing the hand over the part sought to be affected, the brain obeys



the Will, the nerves follow the direction of the brain, the muscles obey the nerves, and the limb stiffens, precisely as it would have done if it had been acting in obedience to its own Will. Now observe the peculiarity. If a limb is stiffened by direction of its own Will, the rigidity is brief, because the Will wearies with its own effort, and that sense of weariness, which is in the brain alone, is by a well-known law transferred to the limb.

But when the Will of the patient is suspended and his brain, having ceased to be self-controlled, is set in motion by another Will, the nerves acting in obedience to that Will cause the same action of the muscular fibre, but with a different result. Under the influence of that foreign Will the muscles become rigid in any position in which they are placed and so remain until that or some other Will intervenes to incite the brain to change the condition of the nerves. Weariness is not felt, because the position has not been maintained by a continuous effort of the Will of the patient. Another Will, directing the nerve force, has placed the muscles in certain positions. So they must of necessity continue until the restoration of the Will of the patient or until the interposition of some other Will changes their condition by again setting the brain in motion, through the brain the nerves, and through the nerves the muscles of the rigid limb.

So far as the muscle itself is concerned, one arrangement of its particles is as painless as another. It is the brain and the nerves that are made uncomfortable by certain postures. Thus it comes that a limb stiffened in Somnambulism by the Will of the operator can remain in any position, however painful in the normal state, and for any length of time, without the slightest inconvenience.

The Self is not conscious of the condition of the limb. Probably its state is not communicated even to the brain, because of the paralysis of some part of the nerve mechanism between the limb and that Self.

And what *is* this remarkable Physiological and Psychi-

cal condition of insensibility and unconsciousness to pain and bodily injury ?

As with the phenomenon last noticed so with this ; there is a severance of the nerves of sensation and motion from the Conscious Self. There can be little doubt that in this state the message of an injury done, which is the use and purpose of *pain*, is received by the nerves of sensation at the injured spot and conveyed by them to the sentient brain. There it is that the chain is broken. Either the brain does not receive the message so brought to it, or if received it is not transmitted thence, for no consciousness of either the hurt or the pain is imparted to *the individual* being whose body has been injured.

But, although the sense of *pain* is suspended in the patient in his passive state, it can be revived at the Will of the operator. The patient holds a heated coin without exhibiting the slightest sense of pain, even if his flesh be burned. But if the same coin be handed to him when cold, the operator silently willing that it shall appear to be hot, the patient drops it instantly, exclaiming that it burns him. So it is with other pains and alike with or without cause. They are felt—that is, the idea of pain presents itself—at the bidding of the operator. They are felt when the mechanism of the passive Mind is set in motion by a foreign Will. They are not felt when the machinery is at rest or acting automatically without the control of *any* Will.

The most remarkable of the phenomena exhibited in Somnambulism is the *double life* it undoubtedly reveals. In Somnambulism there is no consciousness and consequently no memory. When the patient is restored to his normal state, he has no recollection whatever of anything that occurred in his hypnotic state. From the moment of unconsciousness to the moment of waking there is no sense of *time*. Upon recovery, the Mind takes up the thread of its existence at the point at which it was broken when the condition commenced. The thoughts flow on as before, in the same channel as before,



and it is as if so many hours had been blotted from the life of the patient.

It is not really so. One life has been interrupted, but another life has been acted. The Somnambule has an existence altogether apart from his normal existence and that existence has its own memory, more perfect and tenacious even than the memory of his waking life. He has *two lives*, his waking life and his trance life. When next he passes into the hypnotic state, he renews the suspended life at the precise point at which it had been interrupted and then all the memories of that dream life revive. Not only does he live his hypnotic life and cease to live his waking life, but he remembers then all that has occurred during his past somnambulisms and has no memories of his normal existence. So complete is his return to his hypnotic life that, although days or even weeks may have elapsed, during which his mind had been occupied with the countless impressions of waking life, none of them come to him in that dream life, but he takes up the thread of his hypnotic existence at the very point where it had been severed and continues the last dream as if it had never been disturbed. If he be awakened while singing a song, so that it is broken in the middle of a bar, and a fortnight afterwards he again passes into the somnambulist condition and the same mental faculty is excited, he will resume that song at the very note at which he had dropped it fourteen days before and continue whatever other actions had been then in progress as if they had never been disturbed. Moreover, he then remembers accurately, not merely every incident of the last trance, but the events of all former trances. But he has no knowledge of *any* incident of his waking life.

This phenomenon is of the highest interest to Psychology and I ask the Student to give to it the most earnest thought. Traced to its sources, it must throw a blaze of light on many problems at present extremely obscure. Here we find a twofold *mental existence*, each having its own memory, its own trains of thought,

its own series of connected actions, yet one series wholly distinct from the other, and each without consciousness in the one state of an existence in the other state. Nor is this all. The mental power differs greatly in the two lives. In the hypnotic state the mental faculties are vastly more exalted than in the waking state and often are seen to be developed to an extraordinary extent.

But, although there is no *recollection* in one state of occurrences in the other state, it is not that there is no *memory* of them. They are written upon the brain as perfectly as are any other impressions made upon it, as proved by the fact that they are recalled when the condition recurs under which they were received. The *Will* has no power to recall them, because there was no consciousness of their reception. Nevertheless we have seen how they are impressed upon the unconscious mind.

Again I ask, may not this throw some light also upon that obscure chapter in mental physiology, the manner in which thoughts and motives come into the mind without our Will and often in despite of it? Why did *that* thought come? What prompted *this* idea at that moment?

May not this phenomenon help otherwise to solve the problem of memory. We have a *memory* that stores up the impressions made upon the mind involuntarily. We have a power of *recollection* that is under the control of the Will. But there is also a recollection that is involuntary, when memories come uncalled for. Is it not probable that every impression made upon the mind by the senses, and even the self-produced pictures of the mind itself, are in fact stored up there, although we are unconscious at the moment of such an impression being made or idea formed?

The discovery of the microphone has revealed to us motions of the atmosphere—waves of sound—ever streaming about us, which our coarse senses cannot perceive. In this now proved fact we shall find the



solution of many problems, physical and psychical. It explains clearly some of the most mysterious phenomena of Somnambulism and Psychism.

The reader cannot fail to note how *all* the phenomena of *Somnambulism*, whether *natural* or *induced*, converge to the conclusion that the Mechanism of Man is not material merely but constructed of something other than the body—that there is, in fact, an entity, distinct from the body, a real substantive *thing*, competent to perceive and act when the body is paralysed and insensible.

And this *Something* is the CONSCIOUS SELF,—call it *Soul*, or *Spirit*, or by any other name,—whose existence it is the purpose of this treatise to prove by *facts* in Nature, such as Science now rightly demands. Thus, by Science itself may we hope to refute the materialism of Science.

---

## BOOK V.

### SUPERSENSUOUS PERCEPTION.

---

#### INTRODUCTION.

PERHAPS many readers will deem this, certainly one of the most remarkable, profoundly interesting and suggestive of the Psychological phenomena, to be one phase of various abnormal states of the mechanism, rather than a distinct, definite and independent faculty developed under certain conditions.

So it seemed to me at first. But further investigation of the facts satisfied me that Supersensuous Perception is often developed alone. Undoubtedly it is so intimately associated with some other classes of phenomena that it is difficult to avoid frequent repetitions of reference to it. But the scheme of this inquiry into the Mechanism of Man would be incomplete without a section devoted to the separate examination of so significant a phenomenon as that which I have presumed to entitle *Supersensuous Perception*.

For this faculty is not exhibited by Somnambules alone. It is developed occasionally in persons having the full possession of their senses and in apparent enjoyment of health. It is manifested in some maladies. There are few Doctors with professional experience who have not witnessed many instances of it.

Supersensuous Perception is supposed by many to be



developed in the course of ordinary sleep and dream. The fanciful theory is, that in sleep the Soul sometimes quits the body and so *sees* the objects which the Conscious Self in dream *believes* that it sees though it does not see. But there is *no* evidence to support the conjecture. Cases that appear in their first aspect to favour this fancy fail, upon closer examination, to support the claim. Dreaming of some distant place or person, pictures that are merely mental are readily mistaken for the impressions of external objects brought by the sense of sight. Thence the hasty conclusion, that the Conscious Self (or Soul) in some mysterious manner must have quitted its slumbering tenement and visited *in person* the scenes so vividly depicted to the mental conception. I do not venture to assert that such a power *may* not belong to the Soul; but I have sought in vain for *evidence* of it and have found *none*.

Supersensuous Perception is, however, an attendant upon other abnormal conditions of the mechanism. It is shown occasionally in delirium and insanity. It is frequent in Somnambulism, whether natural or induced, as the reported cases amply prove. Hereafter it will be found as an almost constant attendant upon the condition of Psychism. In all, the existence of such a faculty explains many phenomena for which no other rational theory can be suggested.

That it has a distinct existence, as a distinct mental or psychological faculty, is proved abundantly by the numerous cases reported in the medical journals and recorded by eminent physicians of all countries, attesting an extraordinary power of perception in patients suffering from cerebral or nervous excitement. A few of the multitude so recorded will suffice to satisfy the reader that like cases, occurring in other abnormal conditions, are not necessarily untrue because they are strange and because Physiology cannot at once explain them.

A great service will be done to Science if the abundant proofs of natural exhibition of the phenomena should incline the Student not summarily to dismiss, as being delusions or frauds, the like phenomena when produced artificially.

---



## CHAPTER I.

THE PHENOMENA OF SUPERSENSUOUS  
PERCEPTION.

WE find here another instance of misconception and consequent prejudice, resulting from a misnomer, itself the result of what seems to be among the most frequent of human failings,—the desire to find instantly a cause for whatever is new and strange. One of these misnomers was the French word *clairvoyance*.

*Clairvoyance* means literally *clear-seeing*. This title has misled multitudes into belief that the phenomenon is really what it is called. According to the popular notion of *clairvoyance*, in the abnormal conditions under which the phenomenon occurs the eye—the actual organ of vision—*sees* far beyond the natural range of sight and even when opaque bodies are interposed between the object and the eye.

Let it be distinctly understood, at the commencement of this inquiry, that no such meaning will here be given to that term. Purposely to prevent the Student from being so misled, I have ventured to affix to this and some nearly allied psychological phenomena a new name, chosen because it simply expresses *the fact*, without offering or insinuating any conclusion as to the causes of the phenomena or the process of their development.

The term *Supersensuous Perception* is here intended to indicate an asserted power of the Conscious Self, in certain conditions not as yet understood, to obtain per-

ception of external existences in some other manner than through the accustomed media of the senses, because beyond their capacities.

As already stated, the Mechanism of Man is constructed for the support of his being in this molecular world. It works in compliance with certain conditions imposed upon it by the *physical* laws governing that world. The Individual whose mechanism is in its normal state can receive intelligence from the external world only through the media of the senses. He can perceive nothing of whose presence and qualities the senses do not inform him. The eye conveys forms and colours, the ear sounds. But in certain conditions of the organism, when the machine is more or less disordered and its parts thrown "out of gear," perception by the Self appears to occur directly, without the intervention of the senses. The evidence of this phenomenon is overwhelming. No fact in Science is supported by a larger array of proofs. Ingenuity has exhausted itself in endeavours to find other explanations of these phenomena. But the proofs are too many and too well attested by competent observers to be accounted for upon any theory of imposture or delusion.

If the cases reported in the Medical Journals and by qualified observers were collected, they would fill many volumes. Restricted space compels the selection of a few, gathered from the multitude that offer themselves to the Student of Psychology.

Supersensuous Perception plays an important part in some of the abnormal conditions of the mechanism described in this volume and will be found to explain much that hitherto has been inexplicable. Frequent reference must be made to it in future pages. Indeed it was to avoid the necessity for repetition that this preliminary notice has been introduced.

Considered in its Physiological as in its Psychological aspect, two differing explanations have been suggested for scientific inquiry.

The physiological explanation is the same as that



offered in explanation of somewhat similar phenomena occurring in Somnambulism.

The psychological process may be suggested as thus. If the Conscious Self be an entity distinct from the body, which is merely the material mechanism for communication between the Self and the material world, it is a reasonable assumption that, when released from the conditions of its world life, it will exist under the altered conditions of a changed stage of being. Whatever the form in that new existence, its structure will certainly be something other than *molecular* and therefore subject to such new conditions as may be demanded by a new form of atomic structure. It is not in itself improbable that, in this stage of being, in certain abnormal states of the mechanism, the relationship between the component parts of the triune structure—*body, mind, soul*—may sometimes be so dislocated that the Conscious Self can have a partial release from the conditions imposed by the material mechanism and obtain perceptions by impressions directly made. Certainly it will be so under the conditions of a new state of being which is not a process of transformation, as is the vulgar notion, but of *evolution*, as is the scientific view of the scheme of creation. If this be a reasonable suggestion, it is not unreasonable to ascribe the proved facts of mental communion of ideas and of Supersensuous Perception to a like direct perception by the Conscious Self without the interposition of any Sense.

Dr. ABERCROMBIE, in his famous treatise on "The Intellectual Powers," has collected from authentic sources a large number of instances of Supersensuous Perception, for which the Reader is referred to his most able and interesting work. Some of the cases reported below came within my personal knowledge and the voucher for their truth is my own experienced care in the examination and weighing of evidence.

I was present at a test experiment with Alexis at Exeter, as previously arranged by some scientific men. One of the party, a physician, had requested a friend at Tiverton to send him a written

word enclosed in six sealed envelopes, naming to no person the word he had so inclosed. The eyes of Alexis were bandaged; the packet was put into his hand; its contents were unknown to any person present. He placed it against his forehead for two or three minutes; then with a pencil he wrote the letter "u;" again he placed it on his forehead and added the letter "n," and the same process was repeated until the word "understanding" was written. This he declared to be the word within the envelopes. The packet was opened—the six seals found unbroken, and the six envelopes perfect (indeed, it had never been out of our sight). The word "understanding" was found in the central envelope. He had not only written the right word, but he had *exactly copied the forms of the letters*. Afterwards he was blindfolded by a skilful Physician of the company, sticking-plaister being placed over his eyes, two wads of wool over the plaister, and four handkerchiefs tied over the whole, leaving nothing of his face visible but the nostrils and chin. In this condition he joined a whist table and played a rubber of whist, rapidly and without once mistaking a card, instantly detecting tricks that were attempted by way of test.

#### Another experiment with the same Somnambule :

I am informed by one of the most eminent of our Judges that he was once visited by Alexis at his (the Judge's) lodgings. Not only did he read the contents of sealed envelopes, but the printing on named pages of unopened books. "I had received," said my informant, "on that morning a book which the publisher had just issued. I was cutting the leaves when Alexis called. I laid it upon the table with the paper knife I had been using within the leaves I had last cut. I had not myself read a line of it and did not even know at what page the knife was lying. I asked him jestingly if he could read from the page where my paper knife then was. He said he would try. He laid his hand on the closed book and in a few seconds uttered a sentence. On turning to the page, I found that sentence there."

From a near relative I received the following. The noble Lord, the Somnambule referred to, died not long ago.

At our school at Tonbridge was a boy, then the son of a commoner afterwards ennobled for his military services. At that time neither myself, nor the lad, nor any of the boys, knew anything about "Mesmerism," nor had any of us the slightest conception of what it was we amused ourselves with viewing. Young H. seemed only to go to sleep when we told him to do so.



But his eyes alone were shut, for he walked about, and talked, and said he could see things in our boxes. One of our games with him was to place a book upon the floor, throw the blanket over it and then tell him to read any page we named. He always did so quite rightly. But none of us knew what was on that page. We tried this so many times, with so many different books, that it was impossible he could have known beforehand what the page contained. We tested him with pocket-books and letters, and he did the same. After a time it reached the ears of the Head Master, and he put a stop to it at the request of the boy's parents.

There can be no doubt that similar cases would be found abundantly, if sought for. The households are few that have not children or servants one or more of whom would be amenable to Hypnotism and by whom all of these phenomena would be exhibited, if due patience and skill were employed in their development.

The following case was reported to me by a Surgeon of the Royal Artillery. It occurred some years ago.

A party of children, sons and daughters of the Officers of Artillery stationed at Woolwich, were playing in the garden. Suddenly a little girl screamed and stood staring with an aspect of extreme terror at a willow tree there. Her companions gathered round asking what ailed her. "Oh," she said, "there—there—don't you see—there's papa lying on the ground and the blood running from a big wound." All assured her that they could see nothing of the kind. But she persisted, describing the wound and the position of the body, still expressing her surprise that they did not see what she saw so plainly. Two of her companions were daughters of my informant (one of the surgeons of the regiment), whose house adjoined the garden. They called their father, who at once came to the spot. He found the child in a state of extreme terror and agony, took her into his house, assuring her that it was only "a fancy," and having given her restoratives, sent her home. The incident was treated by all as being what the doctor had called it and no more was thought of it. News from India, where the child's father was stationed, was in those days slow in coming. But the arrival of the mail in due course brought the information that the father of the child had been killed by a shot and died under a tree. Making allowance for difference in the counting of time, it was found to have been about the moment when the daughter had the vision at Woolwich.

This case is of exceptional value, inasmuch as it

occurred in the presence of a large party, from two of whom I received it, and was vouched to me by the medical man who heard the assertion of the child and treated it as a waking dream.

As nothing was seen by her companions, it was clearly not a ghost story. It admits of explanation as a case either of supersensuous perception or of mental communion. The child was (as in so many other instances of which the evidence is overwhelming) in an abnormal condition. The Conscious Self had power of perception by some other means than the ordinary machinery of the senses. She perceived her father himself, as he was, and not his ghost. To what extent Mental Communion and Sympathy may operate in the directing of such a perceptive power, or if it may not be the sole agent, is a question that well deserves consideration.

A very remarkable case of Supersensuous Perception was reported to the "Psychological Society of Great Britain" by a Medical Man of Beaminster, in Dorset, as having occurred in his own practice.

Miss A.—, the subject of the report, was, at the time of the occurrences narrated, about nineteen years of age and had been for three years frequently attacked by spasmodic hysterical croup of a violent character. She had for this been bled some 250 times. One day I went to see her, and thinking the treatment to which she had been subjected to be absolutely destructive, I formally refused to carry it out, for which the whole family almost abused me. To remove the bone of contention from the sick-room, I asked them to follow me to the furthest room of a long house. Between the two rooms there was a long passage and staircase, with a door at the bottom of the staircase. In the sitting-room I began to tell her friends that she was much under the influence of her own will and was rendered worse by the treatment to which she had been subjected. Then her mother put her hands before my mouth and said that her daughter upstairs could hear every word I uttered. Surprised at this assertion, I collected all the family, servants included, in the sitting-room. Then I went to the patient's apartment and returned, closing all the doors. In an ordinary tone of voice I denounced the treatment and said that she could cure herself by endeavouring to overcome the tendency to the attacks. Then I returned to the bedroom, still finding all



the doors closed as I had left them. When I entered it, Miss A. repeated word for word all that I had said to her friends in the room below. On another occasion, my partner went to her during a heavy snowstorm, and on returning dispatched a boy with physic. The boy did not reach his destination and the snowstorm extinguished all traces of him. Two weeks after the boy was lost, the patient said to her sister that she knew where Tom was; that he would be found standing by the right-hand gatepost of a field with some medicine in his hand, which was pressed against his left breast. He was actually found in this position.

Supersensuous Perception seems sometimes to present itself to the mind in a shape that is mistaken for dream. The following is an instance within my own experience :

It occurred in the course of a trial at which I was present. A murder had been committed in Somersetshire. A farmer had disappeared and could not be found. Two men, living in different villages, some distance from where the farmer had disappeared, stated the particulars to the local magistrates of a dream both had on the same night. They said that they had dreamed that the body was lying in a well in the farmyard. No well was known to be there at all, so the two men were laughed at. The police, however, went to the yard, and although there was no appearance of a well, on removing an old manure heap, they found a dry well that had been long unused, and in it the body. Then, of course, the public suspected the two men. But it turned out that the farmer had been murdered by his two nephews, who had thrown his body down this disused well. The two men swore that they did not know of there being a well in the yard. All this was proved in court at the trial, and the two nephews were hanged for the crime.

It is upon record that the "Red Barn Murder," as it was called, was discovered and proved in a similar manner. These were obviously cases of Supersensuous Perception. The two witnesses were probably unconscious somnambules, and the peculiar condition under which the faculty is developed was caused by the intense mental excitement consequent upon the disappearance of the farmer.

Mr. PERCY GORDON, a Solicitor of London, reported to the Psychological Society the following remarkable instance.

He had been travelling in Germany with Mr. Hutchinson, a gentleman well known in Paris, and, while they were in the train together, Mr. Hutchinson recommended him to read a book entitled "Three Years before the Mast." His friend had been born in America, of good family, but in that country it was considered almost the proper thing for boys to run away to sea. Mr. Hutchinson had done so and obtained work on board a trader which made passages between London and New York. He instructed his friends that letters would find him in London and Paris. On reaching Europe he received a letter telling him that his sister was dangerously ill and asking him to return home at once if he wished to see her again alive, and he started for New York when she was suffering from fever and delirium. When he was within about a day's sail of New York, on Christmas eve, she told her friends that her brother Alexander was coming back and would arrive on the morrow. Mr. Hutchinson had never written a letter home of any kind whatever. She described the places he had visited, and told them what presents he had collected in Paris, London, and Rome, for various members of the family. She further stated what particular presents were intended for each particular individual. When Mr. Hutchinson arrived he was informed of this, and they gave him a list of the things which she said he had brought, and which were at that time packed up on board the ship. The list was quite accurate. He had not the slightest doubt about Mr. Hutchinson's veracity as a gentleman.

This was a case of mingled supersensuous perception and mental sympathy and communion. It may be the latter wholly.

Another interesting case was reported by the Rev. W. S. MOSES :

A friend of his who lived in Lincolnshire died, and he was invited to the funeral. He could not go, and was sitting quietly at home in London at the time, without being conscious in any way of anything abnormal. He became unconscious, and afterwards found by his watch that he had been in that condition for two hours. Afterwards, bit by bit, the details of the funeral of his friend came into his mind; or, rather, bit by bit he brought to recollection a scene he had witnessed. He remembered seeing the officiating minister and the mourners, just as if he had been present at the funeral, so he put all the details on paper. Moreover, the same day he posted a full account of the funeral to a friend of his who had been there, who answered in complete astonishment as to how he could have obtained the details. The minister was not the one whom he had previously expected would officiate, the clergyman having been changed at the last moment.



The funeral started from Lincolnshire, but took place in Northamptonshire. He saw and described the churchyard, a particular corner of the churchyard, and a particular tree there.

A gentleman of my acquaintance has, from childhood, possessed this faculty of Supersensuous Perception in a very singular form. Deaths of relatives are known to him, however distant they may be. These are not, as are so many of such cases of supposed clairvoyance, impressions remembered after the event or suggested by previous knowledge of illness. He names at the moment the impression upon his mind. His father died *suddenly* while he was at Winchester School. He felt the warning intimation and told his schoolfellows that he was sure his father was dead. A telegram afterwards arrived calling him home, but announcing only severe illness of the father. In fact he was dead, as the boy had declared. This is not an accidental incident with him. It has occurred many times.

The Rev. CHAUNCY HARE TOWNSEND has reported the following, which might possibly be the result of excessive exaltation of the senses—but was more probably an instance of Supersensuous Perception.

The Chevalier Filippi, of Milan, doctor of medicine, and a most determined opponent to mesmerism, has acknowledged to me that some of his patients, more particularly women after their confinement, when suffering from nervous excitement, have distinguished the smallest objects in darkness which appeared to him complete. The same physician related to me the following occurrence:—Visiting a gentleman who had an abscess, he found that the patient had not many hours to live; this, however, he did not tell him, but answered his inquiries about himself as encouragingly as he could. Taking his leave, he shut the door of the sick chamber, and, passing through two other rooms, the doors of which he also carefully shut, entered an apartment where some friends of the patient were assembled. To these he said, speaking all the time in that low and cautious tone which every one, in a house where illness is, unconsciously adopts,—“The Signor Valdrighi (that was the name of the invalid) is much worse. He cannot possibly survive till morning.” Scarcely had he uttered these words when the patient’s bell was heard to ring violently and soon after a servant summoned the doctor back again into his presence. “Why did you deceive me?” exclaimed

the dying man; "I heard every word you said just now in the further apartment." Of this extraordinary assertion he immediately gave proof by repeating to the astonished physician the exact expressions he had made use of. Subsequently, upon Dr. Filippi testifying his surprise at this occurrence to the servants of Signor Valdrighi, they declared that their master's hearing had become so acute since his illness, that he had frequently told them all they had been talking of in the kitchen, which was even more remote from the sick room than the apartment before alluded to.

An instance very similar to that above narrated is reported by the late Lord BROUGHAM in his Autobiography, and I received *from himself* a personal assurance of its literal truth.

A most remarkable thing happened to me—so remarkable that I must tell the story from the beginning. After I left the High School, I went with G—, my most intimate friend, to attend the classes in the university. There was no divinity class, but we frequently in our walks discussed and speculated upon many grave subjects—among others, on the immortality of the soul and on a future state. This question, and the possibility, I will not say of ghosts walking, but of the dead appearing to the living, were subjects of much speculation and we actually committed the folly of drawing up an agreement, written with our blood, to the effect that whichever of us died the first should appear to the other and thus solve any doubts we had entertained of the "life after death." After we had finished our classes at the college, G— went to India, having got an appointment there in the civil service. He seldom wrote to me, and after the lapse of a few years I had almost forgotten him; moreover, his family having little connection with Edinburgh, I seldom saw or heard anything of them, or of him through them, so that all the old schoolboy intimacy had died out and I had nearly forgotten his existence. I had taken, as I have said, a warm bath, and while lying in it and enjoying the comfort of the heat, after the late freezing I had undergone, I turned my head round, looking towards the chair on which I had deposited my clothes, as I was about to get out of the bath. On the chair sat G—, looking calmly at me. How I got out of the bath I know not, but on recovering my senses I found myself sprawling on the floor. The apparition, or whatever it was, that had taken the likeness of G—, had disappeared. This vision produced such a shock that I had no inclination to ask about it, or to speak about it even to Stuart; but the impression it made upon me was too vivid to be easily forgotten; and so strongly was I affected by it, that I have here written down the whole history, with the date, 19th December, and all the par-



ticulars, as they are now fresh before me. No doubt I had fallen asleep; and that the appearance presented so distinctly to my eyes was a dream, I cannot for a moment doubt; yet for years I had had no communication with G—, nor had there been anything to recall him to my recollection; nothing had taken place during our Swedish travels either connected with G— or with India, or with anything relating to him or any member of his family. I recollected quickly enough our old discussion and the bargain we had made. I could not discharge from my mind the impression that G— must have died, and that his appearance to me was to be received by me as a proof of a future state.

This was on December 19, 1799. In October, 1862 Lord Brougham added as a postscript :—

I have just been copying out from my journal the account of this strange dream : *Certissima mortis imago!* And now to finish the story, begun about sixty years since. Soon after my return to Edinburgh, there arrived a letter from India, announcing G—'s death, and stating that he had died on the 19th of December!

Perception by the Mind through some other medium than the senses could not be better authenticated than in these narratives. They are not ghost stories, like so many that are presented to us. No form was actually before the child in the garden nor the Lawyer in his bath. There were at least twenty witnesses to the first who saw nothing, though their attention was strongly directed to the imaginary object. There can be little doubt it was by this faculty of *Super-sensuous Perception* that to the mind of the child the vision of her father was suggested as he was at that moment, and so came to Lord BROUGHAM the suggested mental image of his friend. But what was the mental sympathy which so far away directed the attention of the child to its father and of the friend to the friend at the instant of the passing of the Soul from the body is one of the problems of Psychology, at present wrapped in obscurity, but which patient research may enable us to solve hereafter.

Had the child been alone at the moment of the vision and credence been given to her statement of what she had seen, it would have gone forth to the world as a

wonderful ghost story verified by the event. Nobody would have doubted that the spirit of the father had appeared to the child. But the noonday light and the presence of so many companions prove that it was only a vision of *the Mind*, which *perceived* what, through the limited sense of sight, it could not possibly have *seen*. Doubtless a vast number of the best authenticated ghost stories are to be explained in the same manner.

Having devoted much time and care to the inquiry, I am satisfied that an experiment probably often witnessed by the reader, is explicable by Supersensuous Perception. It had been exhibited in private rooms, but it was first introduced as a public exhibition by HOUDIN. It was afterwards shown in London by Anderson and his daughter. Other cases of the possession of this faculty have been discovered since. The most satisfactory, (because of the conditions under which it is produced and the great number of persons who witness it together), is that of Little Louise, lately exhibited at the "Royal Aquarium."

She is blindfolded and seated on a chair raised upon a pedestal just above the audience and in the midst of them, so that many persons are surrounding her throughout the experiment. She is about twelve years old. Whatever the communication, certainly it is not by sight; for even had she the use of her eyes, nine-tenths of the objects "described" by her are beyond or out of the range of vision. Her father goes among the seated audience far from her, and asks to be shown something. He says (and ANDERSON so informed me), that it is a condition of the experiment that the object should be seen by him. I was desirous to detect the trick, if such it was. I tried various tests, producing a variety of articles in different parts of the room of my own choosing. No objection was ever made to my standing anywhere. Thus it was: I produced a key. "What is this?" "A key, papa?" "Anything on it?" "Yes, 36, Russell-square on the handle?" Right. This was answered without hesitation. Then a railway ticket. "What is this, Louise?" "A railway ticket, papa." "From where to where?" "From Marlow to Paddington, papa." "What number?" "Two thousand one hundred and fifty-eight, papa." Right also. I produce a letter. "What is this?" "A letter, papa." "What is the address?" "Mr. Serjeant Cox, Moat Mount, Mill Hill, N.W." Right. "What is the postmark?" "Hendon, N.W." Right. Next a seal. "What is this?" "A seal, papa." "What is on



it?" She described the crest correctly. "Any words?" "Yes, Onward, Upward, papa." Once more, a coin. "What is this?" "Money, papa." "What is on it?" "A lot of queer marks, papa, I cannot make them out." It was a Chinese coin. I tried many more, but these suffice to show the character of the exhibition. She never made a mistake—never hesitated or paused for an answer. That the answer came from her lips is certain, for many were close to her and saw and heard her, as I did when the experiment was being tried by others.

How is this communication effected? Is it a clever trick, or is it Supersensuous Perception, or Mental Communion, or marvellous memory?

Many suggestions have been offered on the assumption of trick. When I first witnessed it with Anderson and his daughter, I suspected ventriloquism. She was placed upon a stage, far from the audience, with her back turned to them, and I surmised that Anderson's voice was directed so as to appear to the audience as an answer returned by her. He at once satisfied me that this conjecture was wrong by permitting me to stand at her elbow during the performance. The voice, beyond question, came from her lips, for I saw them move, heard the sounds, and when I placed my hand on them the answer was stopped. Another suggestion is that the floor is supplied with communicating wires, which when pressed by the foot of the father, convey to the child by signs the answer to be given. The objection to this is, that it is much too ingenious. Objects are inspected in at least twenty different parts of the large room of the Aquarium, and so many points of communication could not be concealed. To test this I continually changed my position. But everywhere the answer was given as rapidly and unerringly. Moreover, the experiment, tried in a private house where no apparatus can possibly be introduced, is equally successful.

The most plausible suggestion has acquired some importance, because it was asserted by HOUDIN himself. He states in his memoirs that his son was educated to the work by an elaborate system of pre-arranged signs. The tones of the voice of the questioner indicated the answer. The signs were, he says, arranged thus: They stood before a shop window, for instance, and agreed upon a different intonation or expression for each familiar article there exhibited. Thus, by the special manner of pronouncing in French the words, "What is this?" he suggested the desired answer. Obviously this would not explain the doings of Miss Anderson, Mademoiselle Prudence, Little Louise, and others of Houdin's successors. It is possible, but not probable, that a vocabulary of tones and words might be agreed upon to indicate a certain number of familiar objects—such as a watch, a seal, a hat, a letter, and articles that an audience would be likely to have about them. But no pre-

arrangement could possibly anticipate the number upon a door-key, the motto on a seal, the address of a letter, or the places and numbers on a railway ticket. If a child of twelve years could be taught the infinite variety of ideas that were to be expressed by an equally infinite variety of mere tones, in simply saying, "What is this?" it would certainly be far more miraculous and really more interesting to Mental Philosophy and Psychology than the assigning of it to the abnormal condition in which Supersensuous Perception and Mental Communion certainly occur.

The Psychological explanation is simple, intelligible, and rational.

The case is one of what is commonly called "Thought-reading," but which is more correctly termed "Mental Sympathy," already fully described (*ante*, p. 182).

The mental impressions (that is, the motions of the fibres of the brain that attend every mental act) of the father are communicated to the brain fibres of the child, for as the harp-strings vibrate in unison, so do the brain-strings. Identity of brain action is identity of idea. Therefore, when the father read the seal in my hand, the impression of it was conveyed to her by the process of (1) motion of his communicating nerve of sight; (2) this motion communicated to the connected brain fibres; (3) perception of this by the Conscious Self. Identical motions being set up on the child's brain, they produced in her identical mental impressions. Thus what he *saw* she *perceived*, and doubtless these impressions presented themselves to her conceptions as being the results of actual vision.

The facts that prove a power of perception by some other process than the medium of the senses are so numerous that a collection of them would fill many volumes. I am, therefore, compelled to restrict myself to a short report of the most remarkable and instructive. Supersensuous Perception is not found in the condition of Hypnotism alone. It occurs, as already described, in *natural* somnambulism. It attends occasionally upon fever. It has been seen, though rarely, where no abnormal state of the mechanism can be detected.



There is some ground for concluding that it is a faculty possessed by all human beings in varying degrees, but called into action only under conditions of rare occurrence.

There appears to be little doubt that some such faculty is widely extended among the lower animals. No such differences of structure are found as to render it probable that the perceptive power is merely an excessive development of one or more of the ordinary senses. The phenomena point distinctly to the existence of a special faculty—a *sixth sense*, in fact—by which perceptions are obtained of external objects far beyond the utmost conceivable range of either of the five senses.

It would certainly appear to belong to birds. Only by the possession of some such perceptive power could the migratory birds find their way over land and sea from North Africa to Great Britain. But they do so, not to England merely, but to the same county, the same parish, the same field, the very same bush, they had quitted nine months before. It has been contended that they use their eyes in their journey south and note in their memories the prominent objects on the way and so follow the same route on the return journey. The conclusive answer to this popular theory is that, for the most part, they travel by night!

Dogs and cats have been carried in baskets and covered carts to strange places many miles distant and there escaping have returned directly to their homes.

Sheep parted from their flocks on their journey to Smithfield market have found their way back to their Welsh hills.

At Falmouth, the crabs caught at the Lizard, some twelve miles distant, are taken to the harbour, branded with the mark of the fisherman and placed in a box alive, to await sale. A box was broken and the crabs escaped. Three days afterwards many of them were again captured at the Lizard, to reach which they must have found their way to the mouth of the harbour, and

having arrived there, learned by some strange perceptive power in what direction their home lay, for it was far out of any possible range of vision and they had been carried to their prison in a boat.

The bee taken into a strange field will fly straight to its hive, though out of sight. Some years ago, crossing the Channel, I saw great multitudes of butterflies crossing also. They flew a few yards and rested themselves by alighting on the crest of a wave. It was almost a calm—at least, they were not driven by any wind. Their flight was from France to England. Such light breeze as there was blew from the English coast towards which the butterflies were flying. So far as I could see, the air was full of them. Millions that escaped the fish found their way to England and covered our fields. They could not have *seen* the English coast when they started on their flight to find it. But manifestly they had knowledge that land lay in that direction, or they would not have moved thither. They were never known thus to attempt to cross the Atlantic.

In his normal condition civilised Man develops no similar faculty. He has no need for it. He can find his way from place to place, obstacles apart, by the exercise of his reasoning faculties and of his imagination. He observes surrounding objects—the sky, with its sun, moon and stars—and the features of the country about him. From the former he learns the general direction in which the object of his search lies; the others shew him what is its near neighbourhood. Wanting these human capacities, the lower animals would be limited to a very small range of country. Migration would be altogether impossible if they were not endowed with some faculty by which they can obtain, without the processes by which our minds are made the guides of our bodies, a knowledge of the direction of distant places to which it is their natural impulse to resort. What that faculty is, if it be a positive perception of the locality itself, if it be accompanied with a perception of the intermediate space, we are entirely ignorant. It has been supposed



by many to be merely a blind impulse to move in a certain direction, without any consciousness of the object to be attained. But, although a blind impulse might induce a bird to fly, and even to fly in a particular direction by reason of some atmospheric influences affecting it, a blind impulse could scarcely carry it to a particular bush in a certain field in a distant country. If, however, as is most probable, the faculty is a special one—a sixth sense, in fact—it is no more possible to conjecture how it operates than it is for a man born blind to understand what is the sensation of sight.

If the Darwinian theory be true, that Man, in common with all other animals, is a slow development in the course of countless millions of ages from an inferior structure, we can easily understand how it is that the animal world has this faculty while Man has not. It is one of the animal instincts for which the intellectual faculties of reason and imagination have been gradually substituted.

But, like so many other peculiarities in our mental as in our bodily structure, that have been slowly superseded by other structures adapted to changed conditions of existence, we might by analogy anticipate survivals of this almost extinguished faculty and look for an occasional cropping out of it under special circumstances. May not this explain much, if not all, of the mystery that attaches to the phenomena about to be described as being exhibited in certain abnormal conditions of the mind, especially in the hypnotic state. As will be seen presently, this special sense is developed in other conditions also; but the hypnotic condition has offered special facilities for observation and experiment, because it can be produced at will, at any time, and with a great number of persons. The other conditions under which it presents itself are rare, occur naturally, and therefore admit only of hasty and imperfect examination.

---

## CHAPTER II.

THE PHYSIOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY OF  
SUPERSENSUOUS PERCEPTION.

PHYSIOLOGY offers but an imperfect explanation of these phenomena. It attributes them, not unreasonably, to an excited state of the brain, consequent upon some diseased condition of the structure, by which its sensitiveness is increased to an extent that appears miraculous as compared with the limited action of the healthy brain. This argument is supported by reference to facts familiar to all, as, for instance, the painful effect of very slight sounds upon fever-patients, and in many nervous disorders. Each sense is undoubtedly capable of an excitement that largely multiplies its capacity, and if the cases of Supersensuous Perception had recorded nothing more than instances of extreme sensitiveness to external impressions, the physiological theory might be accepted as a complete solution of the problem.

In truth, but a fraction of the phenomena can be thus accounted for. Allot to hysteria, to fever, to nervous excitement, all the cases in which the senses could have been acted upon directly, there will be a residue of still more numerous cases that admit of no such explanation—cases in which the nerves of the senses could not have been acted upon—at least, according to any known physical law.

“Mental sympathy and communion” will explain many more of these cases. The motions of one brain



setting up like motions in another brain will account sufficiently for many of the recorded instances of supposed Supersensuous Perception. In such cases the patient has not perceived the object itself, but only the reflection of it, as it were, from the brain of the person *en rapport* with him. But after these also have been eliminated, there will be found a large number of well authenticated instances of perception of things beyond the utmost range of the senses, however exalted, and certainly not within the knowledge of any person present.

Such cases have been unfortunately classified with others partially resembling them, under the general name of *Clairvoyance*. But this, like so many of the terms used in mental and pneumatological science, implies an unproved cause and, therefore, is open to the grave objection, that it takes for granted a certain state of things which probably is not the true one. "*Clairvoyance*," or in plain English, "clear seeing," assumes that the phenomena so designated is an act of *vision*; that it is an abnormal exercise of the sense of *sight*. The unhappy consequence of this and similar terms implying foregone conclusions is that they provoke prejudices not afterwards easily removed. When the phenomena so termed are reported, it is contended, not unreasonably, that inasmuch as we know the mechanism of vision and the functions of the organ of sight, we know that the sense cannot extend so far or be exercised at all under the conditions stated in the alleged phenomena. These are, therefore, summarily rejected as delusions or frauds, instead of being investigated, with purpose to ascertain if there be any and what truth in them, and what their value and their sources,—as Science would have been done eagerly if the name had provoked no prejudices.

In this instance it will appear that the name has been too hastily given to the phenomena; that they are *not* abnormal operations of the sense of sight; that the objects are *not* seen by the organ of vision; that the

process is by a *mental* perception, obtained by some other medium than the eye; consequently that it is not "clear seeing" at all, nor are the bodily senses in any manner engaged in the process—that, in truth, it is a *super-sensuous* perception. Its sources and how it is exercised are not yet discovered—but the *proofs* of its existence are potent and abundant.

The existence of such a process of mental perception, not alone without the aid of the senses, but under conditions in which the senses would be impotent, is established by overwhelming evidence. No person who has carefully and extensively examined the phenomena of Somnambulism, whether natural or artificial, has failed to find multiplied proofs of it. The cases medically reported supply conclusive evidence that super-sensuous perception is naturally developed in *natural* Somnambulism. Very little experience of the phenomena exhibited in Artificial Somnambulism will satisfy the most incredulous that what is thus naturally exhibited in the one condition may be reproduced by art in the other condition. The physical or psychic causes of the phenomena are, it is true, undiscovered as yet. But so are the causes of many other facts in Science, which nevertheless are accepted as facts. After centuries of experiment we are wholly ignorant now, as ever, by what process the magnet lifts the steel; by what formative force our bodies are moulded; what life is; by what power a scratch is healed. We do not deny nor dispute other facts because we cannot explain them. The facts of Somnambulism are not in themselves one whit more wonderful nor more inexplicable than any other unexplained facts—only they are not daily presented to us for explanation.

Like all other asserted facts, they are questions of *evidence* alone. Three such volumes as this would not contain all its recorded cases. If every scientific observer of psychological phenomena were to report only his own experiences, the records of Super-sensuous Perception would fill a library. I have personally



witnessed many hundreds of instances, exhibited under the most careful tests, in the presence of the most competent observers. In this treatise, a few only have been presented, not for lack of matter, but for lack of space.

The explanatory theories have been many, but, although even the best of them are conjectural merely, they are of value as showing that the phenomena are *not* supernatural, but capable of being brought within the domain of science.

First, it is urged that they are not necessarily *super-sensuous* perceptions, but may be accounted for by abnormal exaltation of the senses, such as is sometimes seen in fever and other excited states of the brain and nerves.

The answer is decisive. The special perceptive power now under consideration is not merely an extension of the senses; it is found under conditions that preclude the exercise of the senses. The sense of hearing might conceivably be so excited as to recognise a footstep distant by a mile, the ear being practically converted into a microphone. The sense of sight might conceivably discern an object so far off or so small as to be imperceptible save by an abnormally sensitive nerve. But no such explanation will suffice for things perceived through opaque substances, or placed out of the line of vision, unless we can conceive of opaque substances being penetrable by some rays of light which, though imperceptible in the normal condition of the senses, are perceptible in some abnormal states of sensibility.

The recent discovery of the *microphone* may not improbably suggest a solution of this, as of some other problems in Psychology. That curious instrument proves the presence about us of innumerable waves of sound, so slight as to be inaudible to us. It reveals to the ear a new world, as the microscope has opened a new world to the eye. This revelation is another proof of the fact, so important to Psychological Science, that our senses are constructed to perceive only an infinitesimal portion

of the sights and sounds about us; that the invisible and inaudible world by which we are surrounded, and of whose very existence we have no knowledge, is infinitely more populous of forms, of sounds, of life, than the world which our senses reveal to us. Therefore, that it is mere folly and presumption to pass an *à priori* judgment and to pronounce of *anything* that it *cannot* be. Still more presumptuous is it to assert that molecular matter, which alone is perceptible by the senses, is all that exists in this world, remembering that those senses cannot perceive a thousandth part of that which we *know* to be, and that if our eyes had been microscopes and our ears microphones we should be actually *seeing* millions of things in that which now is solitude and *hearing* millions of sounds in that which now is silence.

Another theory has been advanced, having better claim to acceptance. The Mechanism of Man, it is contended, in its normal condition, permits of perception by the Conscious Self of external existence through the evidence of the *senses* alone, which are the mechanism specially constructed to receive impressions from the outside world and convey them through the nerves to the *consciousness*—whatever that may be. If vision be the sense so impressed, the conveyance of the impression made upon the recipient nerve is subject to certain restrictive conditions. Sight is conditioned upon the passing of rays of light from the object to the retina; and these rays are themselves subject to conditions, one of which is that they cannot pass through certain substances, which are therefore called opaque, as substances through which they *can pass* are called transparent. But light is not the only force in action about us. There is another force far more penetrating—the magnetic force—which permeates *all* molecular structure. If, therefore, an Intelligence can be conceived having a mechanism contrived to receive the impressions of the magnetic force, as the mechanism of Man is contrived to perceive the rays of light, to such a Being what we call “opacity” would not be. To



him all would be *transparent*. There would be no obstacle to his perception but diminution of size by distance, and it is problematical if even such an obstacle could impede a perception which would be almost boundless.

Psychology suggests, for as yet it is unable to prove, that in this may be sought the solution of the problem of Supersensuous Perception. May it not well be that the Conscious Self has, in certain abnormal states of the mechanism, capacity to obtain perceptions of external objects directly, or through some other medium than the mechanism of the body. For an instance. Isolated from the influence of the bodily senses and the conditions of their action (which is the actual condition in Somnambulism), may not the Conscious Self be enabled to exercise its own larger *perceptive* powers somewhat as they may be expected to exist when that Self is wholly severed from the body? May it not conceivably—nay, probably—be enabled then to obtain perceptions of external objects by means of the waves of the magnetic or electric force, as in the normal condition of the mechanism it sees by perception of the waves of light? Again; is it not reasonably probable that in some conditions of the mechanism there may be perception of the waves of the ether (the senses can perceive only the waves of the atmosphere)? In either of such cases, to the Conscious Self there would be no opacity. Every substance would be transparent and no interposing molecular matter would suffice to prevent that perception. This *must* be the future condition of Soul, if there be a life hereafter. May not that power of independent perception be exercised more or less here, under certain abnormal conditions, when the mechanism is thrown out of gear and the Conscious Self is partially emancipated from the restraints and conditions imposed upon it by the needs of its present state of evolution?

Thus does another stage of our examination of the Mechanism of Man in action compel us to the same conclusion—that the MAN is not material, that is to say,

of molecular structure, merely; that the Conscious Self is a definite existing entity, distinct from the molecular structure, exhibiting its individuality and independence in a continuous series of extra-corporeal perceptions and expressions, presented in the familiar phenomena of dream, as in the other more rare abnormal conditions of delirium, insanity, somnambulism, catalepsy, mental sympathy and communion and super-sensuous perception? In all of these we find the common feature of a severance, more or less, of the Conscious Self from the influence of the senses, a loosening of the links that bind it to the material structure, with a temporary exercise of that independent action which may be reasonably looked for when the severance is completed by the dissolution of the molecular mechanism with which the Soul (or Self) is clothed for the purpose of existence in a molecular world.

---



## BOOK VI.

---

# THE ABNORMAL ACTION OF THE MECHANISM OF MAN.

---

## TRANCE.

---

### INTRODUCTION.

PURSUING our examination of the Mechanism of Man, as exhibited in its abnormal conditions, we preserve the same scheme of inquiry. We advance from the familiar and frequent to the more rare of the phenomena, but which, because they are infrequent and unfamiliar, are witnessed with surprise or received with incredulity when reported. We proceed now to the next stage of that progressive development which is presented by the condition, part physiological, part psychical, known by the name of *Trance*.

I am reluctantly compelled to employ this name in lack of a more accurate one, for it is open to much error because it carries with it different conceptions to different readers. It has been used from the earliest times to designate not one but many manifestations, which may be various phases of the same psychic condition, but

also may proceed from distinct sources. Trance is repeatedly referred to in the Holy Scriptures as a condition of whose existence no doubt is entertained, and history abounds in narratives, the descriptions of which bear a strong resemblance to much that now is exhibited by the affection so called. The reports of modern observers have this advantage, that the phenomena have been noted with greater care and accuracy. The reporters of recent cases are not enthusiasts, looking for signs from heaven, but calm, cool, experienced Scientists, deliberately inquiring after the truth. Among them are many Physicians, who have recorded in the medical journals the phenomena here noted in their patients, stating them simply as *facts*, without reference to any theory or creed, with single-minded purpose to add to the storehouse of positive knowledge.

The phenomena of Trance may, for the purposes of this treatise, be examined in two divisions.

The first is that form of it which in external appearance simulates death and is attended with total insensibility, but whether with mental unconsciousness is yet in dispute. The weight of evidence is certainly in favour of the unpleasant conclusion that the Mind, or more probably, the Soul (or Self) *is* conscious and percipient, while the nerve system is paralysed and the material structure insensible.

This condition of Trance, although in itself extremely interesting, throws but little light upon the Mechanism of Man. Attention will, therefore, be directed more particularly to the series of phenomena in which the opposite condition prevails and, in lieu of unconsciousness, we have a state of very extended consciousness, high exaltation of the mental powers, supersensuous perceptions of extraordinary range, and this psychic development accompanied by some physiological and psychic phenomena almost as strange and incredible, being contrary to our common experience, as are the telegraph, the phonograph, the microphone, and the other marvels of Science.



Trance has been often treated as being only a phase of Somnambulism. It is true that Trance is sometimes seen in the hypnotic state. But the evidence proves conclusively that they are not identical. Trance is the next stage of development *beyond* Somnambulism and a distinct and definite psychological condition.

The Trance known to readers is marked by its outward resemblance to death. The pulse fails, the heart's action ceases, or is imperceptible. Upon this state imagination has grafted the ghastly stories of burial of the living and awakening in the coffin.

That there may be apparent death and then revival is proved by drowning. The pulse and consciousness have ceased. But life has not really departed. It lingers somewhere in the mechanism—doubtless in the nerve-centres. The blood, not yet coagulated, is by artificial pressure forced again through the arteries, the heart is stimulated to renewed action and thus the entire mechanism is once more set in motion.

But the patients in these cases of seeming death are agreed that, during this suspension of the vital functions, there was no consciousness of existence. They had gone through the sensible process of death and found the act of death to be painless. Death is simply a cessation of consciousness.

Another form of this phase of Trance is that exhibited by patients, well known to medical science, and sometimes to the public, as instances of "fasting," continued for months and even for years;—not, be it observed, entire abstinence from *any* nourishment—for the air supplies to man, as to plants, a large quantity of liquid and some solids,—but food so rarely taken that the frame in healthy action would have perished long since from inanition. In this condition of Trance, either continuous or recurrent, the vital action is so reduced that the functions of waste as well as of repair are almost suspended. The condition is not found in Man alone. It is familiar to us in the instance of all the hibernating animals. The injustice of some judgments

in the criminal courts, consequent upon ignorance of the elementary laws of physiology and psychology, will ever be a blot upon the administration of justice and a shame to Science that sanctioned it.

Another familiar instance of this form of Trance is the burying of the Fakirs in the East and finding them alive after the lapse of many hours.

In the other condition of Trance, the phenomena are the opposite of those above described. Not only is there no suspension of the vital functions, but they are in an unwonted state of activity and the mental capacity is largely increased. Sacred as well as Profane History abounds in cases of this remarkable psychic condition. Sometimes it is termed inspiration, sometimes ecstasy. This, however, is not the condition itself but only one of many phenomena attendant upon the condition.

It is to this series of phenomena that the attention of the reader is particularly invited, because it throws much light upon Psychology, and solves some perplexing problems in relation to the action of the Mechanism of Man, constructed as it is of Body, Mind and Soul.

---



## CHAPTER I.

## THE PHENOMENA OF TRANCE.

TRANCE is not sleep, nor is it in any manner allied to sleep. It is a condition, physiological and psychical, that has no more resemblance to sleep and dream than has insanity, although the doctors still talk and write of it as being merely an abnormal form of sleep.

In sleep, the senses are sealed, the limbs relaxed, the Will is suspended, the body under very imperfect control of the mind. There is but partial self-consciousness. If there be dream, the activity of the mind is only exhibited by the body in fitful contractions of the muscles, in mutterings more or less distinct, and in *attempts* to act rather than in positive action.

Otherwise it is with the condition of Trance. The patient lapses into it gradually. The first symptom is a peculiar expression of the eyes, difficult to describe but easily to be recognised when once it has been seen. This is followed by equally remarkable convulsive motions of the limbs, which vary in intensity, from a shudder-like trembling to positive convulsion, that continues for an uncertain time. Such are the external appearances that attend the coming on of *Trance*.

The convulsive paroxysm is succeeded by apparent insensibility. Breathing is difficult and irregular and the features wear an expression as of pain. But the patients unanimously declare that this appearance is deceitful and that they experience no sense of pain.

By degrees these symptoms subside. The breathing becomes natural, the convulsive twitching and shuddering cease, the features are calm and composed, the aspect is as of one in a tranquil sleep.

From this condition the patient speedily bestirs himself. He then assumes precisely the aspect of a Somnambule. The eyes remain firmly closed. He walks and talks. But his step is not that of waking consciousness. It is a peculiar gliding motion, impossible to paint by words. The voice is changed, the utterance is slower, the speech is in another tone, sometimes sinking almost to a whisper. It is difficult to recognise in the patient the most familiar voice.

The sense of sight is sealed. Yet does the patient plainly *perceive* all the objects about him. He threads his way through a crowd of intervening obstacles to another part of the room and neither touches nor trips over any of them. He will take a book, open it and read it correctly. He will seize a pen and write. He recognises every person in the company and addresses himself to each in turn. All this he does as perfectly and readily in the dark as in the light, and even with wads of wool, or sticking plaister or handkerchiefs bound over the eyes, proving conclusively that he is guided by some other perceptive faculty than the sense of sight, or at least that the sense nerve, or the brain, or the Soul, (or whatsoever is the intelligent recipient of the messages of the external senses), is impressed and informed by some other process than through the mechanism of the eye and the nerves of vision. Indeed, the mind appears to be acting without the assistance of the material mechanism and in entire independence of it.

In this state, the extremities are usually cold and the head is hot. The pulse is regular, rather full, but not perceptibly accelerated.

The mental condition of the patient is remarkable. His talk rarely has reference to the place, persons, or objects about him. He is obviously engrossed in that which has been called "a vision." A picture is in his



mind and his attention is fixed upon it. A succession of connected scenes is present to his fancy, of which indications are given by actions or by words and sometimes by both words and actions combined. He has lost all consciousness of his own personal identity. He is not himself. He conceives himself to be some other person and he commonly acts the character of that other person with marvellous fidelity.

Herein is to be observed a marked difference between *Trance* and *Dream*. In dream, we never lose the sense of our own identity. We never believe *ourselves* to be some other person. However impossible and absurd the actions we *suppose* in our dreams that we do, and at the time of dream verily believe we are doing, we never dream that we who do them are not ourselves. Another difference between the two conditions is, that in *Sleep* we merely act the dream in our minds—the *body* does *not* act it. If, prompted by the mind, there is an effort to act, it is extremely partial and attended with a painful sense of incapacity. In *Trance*, on the contrary, the body acts in accordance with the mental vision and obeys the command of the mind. A third difference is, that in sleep the dream is stuffed with incongruities and absurdities; in *Trance* the vision is coherent, although often extravagant. In *Trance*, the mind is manifestly in a high state of excitement and its faculties in a condition of exaltation and ecstasy, whence visions that soar beyond the largest conceptions of the mind in its normal state. But the vision of *Trance* is not absurd nor incongruous, like the vision of sleep. Granting that such a state of things *could* be, the dream of *Trance* is ordered precisely as reason and experience tell us it *would* be if it were real.

It is to this phenomenon of *Trance* that we must assign the utterances that have been mistaken in all countries at all times for revelations from the Divinity or communications from a spirit world. The condition itself is not new. It must have existed ever since Man attained to his present mental and bodily structure. Whether it be a survival of a past condition or the introduction to a

new one, is a question for Darwinians to determine. Psychology is concerned with it only as *a fact* of immense value as revealing to us the relative conditions of mind and body to change in which the manifestations of Trance are due. Listening to thoughts more profound than it was deemed possible for the patient to have acquired, expressed in language more eloquent than he was ever known to have uttered in his waking hours, viewing the consummate skill with which he acts the part of some great personage whom he sees in his mental vision, spectators, not accustomed to trace phenomena to their causes, are as ready to exclaim now, as ever and everywhere, "Behold, a prophet!" "An angel preaches through him!" "A devil has possession of him!" according to their several prejudices. In *truth* these visions, that seem supernatural, are nothing more than productions of the mind; the utterances and the actions are but the acting of a dream. *We* also dream nightly that we talk as wisely and as eloquently as the patient talks in the ecstasy of Trance; *we* behold visions as heavenly or as hellish; only these dreams of *ours* perish in the cradle of the mind where they were born and, not being seen of others, pass away into the limbo of vanities and are forgotten. If *we* could act and utter *our* dreams of sleep as the patient in Trance enacts *his* visions, we too should appear to others, if not to ourselves, as being gifted with divine inspiration and possessed by holy or unholy Spirits!

But the condition of Trance is not the less interesting as a Psychological study because it is thus reduced from a supernatural to a purely natural condition,—from a divine afflatus to a mere mental excitation. Enough remains to provoke curiosity and stimulate inquiry. Trance is a remarkable physiological fact and full of instruction to Psychologists. Although bearing a very marked resemblance to Somnambulism, especially in the external aspect of the patient, it presents also distinct differences that show it to be a different condition.



When the patient in Hypnotism loses consciousness, his brain, no longer under the control of his Will, may be controlled by the Will of any mind that chances to be in immediate communication with it. In Trance, although consciousness is entirely suspended, the mind is *not* subject to the control of another mind. On the contrary, it is for the most part in a state of intense activity, apparently under the command of the Will and acting in all respects as rationally as in its normal conscious state. In Trance, as in Hypnotism, the mental faculties are usually stimulated to great exaltation and the emotions to ecstasy. Not merely the imagination, but the reasoning power, and especially the language in which these are expressed, is often vastly in advance of the capacity shewn by the patient in his normal state. When restored to consciousness, the flow of ideas and words suddenly ceases and he who, five minutes before, had been discoursing fluently and eloquently upon themes that have exercised the profoundest thoughts of Philosophers, is seen suddenly to lapse into his former self and to be as dull, as ignorant, and as incapable to frame an argument or construct an apt sentence, as he had been always before.

Another peculiarity of Trance is the marked tendency of the patient to dream that he is some other person than himself and to act the character he has thus mentally assumed. In this also is to be noted a distinction between Trance and Dream. In the latter, the patient never loses his own identity. As we have seen, he accepts as actually existing almost anything his busy fancy may suggest. He believes that he sees and does the most impossible things. But it is always *himself* who so perceives and acts. Never for a moment does the dreamer think that he is *somebody other than himself*. It is not so in Trance. There the most frequent condition of the patient is the suspension, not of consciousness alone, but also of *the sense of his own identity*. He believes that he is not himself but some other person, and so believing he acts

to perfection the character of the person he thinks himself to be. In this state he talks of his actual self as distinct from his assumed character; and not merely does he talk *of* himself, but he talks *to* himself. If, for instance, the patient is called William Smith, and he falls into Trance and then believes that he is Thomas Jones, he acts the character of Thomas Jones with infinite ability, even to the tenor of his thoughts and the peculiarities of his gait and gesture; the ideal Jones will address the real Smith as a stranger and hold discourse with him rationally and cleverly, as if he was in no manner connected with himself.

It is further to be noted that, having once assumed a character during the state of Trance, there is a strong tendency in the patient to repeat that character when the Trance condition recurs. Then, as in Somnambulism, the memory of the former state of Trance returns and the Trance life, however often interrupted, forms in fact a kind of continuous existence, quite distinct in conception and memory, as well as in act, from the memories of his waking life.

As the falling into Trance is accompanied by more or less of convulsive action of the whole body, so is revival from it marked by similar convulsions. The condition is evidently attended with great excitement of the nervous system and is followed by much prostration.

There appears to be a condition of semi-Trance which often passes into complete Trance. In this state, the patient describes himself as having consciousness of what is passing about him, but dimly, as a dream appears. To the spectator he has the aspect of perfect wakefulness—converses easily and answers sensibly and often preserves his memory of occurrences during the condition. But some of the phenomena that attend complete Trance are exhibited in semi-Trance. Probably the latter is only an early stage of the affection. Little, however, is as yet certainly known of it and it appears not to have attracted the attention of the Medical Writers who have treated of Trance.



There is a phase of Trance rare, let us hope, of occurrence, which I have preferred to examine apart from those more familiar to us. In the conditions we have been considering, although there is *unconsciousness*, there is not *insensibility*. The functions of brain and body are performed, only the patient has no knowledge of and exercises no control over them. But, in the condition of Trance now to be noticed, the functions of the brain appear to be wholly suspended, and in extreme cases the functions of the entire nervous system also, so that there is the seeming of death, although it is not death, but only a suspension of the functions of life.

The first stage is seen in the many cases reported in the medical records of all times and countries of persons who have fallen into a state of partially-suspended animation—the breathing slow and slight—the action of heart and pulse scarcely perceptible—the eyes closed—the limbs motionless—the desire and the capacity for taking food extinct. The duration of the paroxysm varies considerably. It may be for an hour. It has been known to extend to weeks, months, and with very brief intervals, even to years. This condition is not peculiar to Man. It is found in all the hibernating animals, who are really in the state of Trance, and from them we learn that the effect of a partial suspension of the functions of the Nerve system is so to diminish the waste of the material of which the body is constructed that life may be continued, with an almost infinitesimal supply of food, for very considerable periods of time. All the reported cases of lengthened fastings are of persons in a state of Trance, whose bodily functions had been in abeyance by reason of the almost entire suspension of the functions of the nerve system, and in whom, therefore, there was little waste of the material required for the support of active life. These persons undergo, in fact, the process of hibernation. The assertion that such fasts are impossible, so freely made during some recent trials, betray an ignorance, of Physiology and Natural History alike, which it would be difficult to attribute to Professors of

same insensibility as before. To place the experiment beyond doubt, the coal, when red hot, was held between the two hands of the patient; a paper thrust between his fingers was at once inflamed. To complete the test, the glowing coal was placed upon the head of the patient. Not a hair was singed, while the paper was consumed instantly. Nor was this an experiment of a few seconds, like the exhibitions of the jugglers, or the familiar chemical appliances by which heat is for a short time resisted. The burning coal was sustained for nearly twenty minutes, until, indeed, it was cold. This was not an isolated experiment. It has been tried by myself and others often and in various forms. The description given by all the patients is that the glowing coal, or burning candle, or hot iron, imparts no sense of heat to them. I have seen the finger held for a considerable time in the flame of a gas lamp, with the like impunity. Upon recovering from the condition of Trance, this power of resistance to heat is lost and the flesh of the patient is as sensitive to heat and as readily burned as that of other persons.

Careful observation and experiment have, however, ascertained this—that it is not, as supposed, merely an *insensibility to pain*. The Trance condition, like that of Somnambulism, is attended with such insensibility; but the experiment in question has this speciality, that *the body is not burned*. No known chemical preparation can enable the skin to resist the application of heat beyond a very limited time. Although a patient might be made insensible to the *pain* of a burn, the substance of the flesh cannot be shielded from injury, the small hairs that cover the skin are scorched, and the skin itself can withstand, but for a very brief period, a consuming heat. The Somnambule does not feel *pain* from the touch of red-hot iron; but it burns the flesh and produces a wound, from which, when sensibility is restored, he suffers anguish equally with others. Not a trace of *the action of heat* was to be found upon the patient in Trance who had carried a red-hot coal for



a quarter of an hour. There was no singeing of the hair amid which the fire was thrust and the skin had neither the appearance nor the slightest smell of being scorched, although a blister had been instantly raised upon my own finger. And so it was with all the patients in whom this phenomena was found.

The condition, therefore, is not that of *endurance* of heat, but of *resistance to the waves of heat*, which are in some as yet unknown manner repelled by the body in the state of Trance. Heat, entering with sufficient force, separates the molecules of which the body is constructed, destroying their then combination, and dissipating the particular substance to which it is applied, but it does not destroy one atom of the mass. Change of *form* alone is thus effected. Resistance to this effect of heatwaves can *only* be by the interposition of some non-conductor that will not transmit them. What *is* the non-conductor that in Trance is imposed between the burning coal and the body of the patient, repelling or refusing to transmit the waves of heat which, if they were to enter the body, would speedily rend its molecules asunder, dissipate the substances builded of them and destroy the organic structure?

I venture a suggestion. May not this non-conductor of heat be the *Psychic* (or Soul) *Force* which, imponderable, non-molecular and therefore non-material, in the normal state of the relationship between the Soul (or Self) and the body, operates only through the medium of the body, but in the dislocation of that normal relationship, which constitutes the condition of Trance, passes beyond the body and surrounds it with a resisting envelope that will not transmit to the structure the waves of heat? Or is it Dr. RICHARDSON's nerve-aura abnormally extended in this state of Trance?

There is nothing in this phenomenon analogous to the exhibition of fire-handling by experts, or endurance of the ordeal by fire in the middle ages. The chemicals used in such cases operate but for a very brief period of time. The resistance of the non-conductor

is speedily overcome by the fire, and in less than a minute the destructive force of heat will penetrate and dissipate the structure. The long-continued resistance to heat exhibited in Trance proves that the result is brought about by some very different process. It is not that the fire is unfelt or does not consume. It can only be that the waves of heat are repelled by some unknown force greater than their own and therefore *do not enter the body at all*.

There are other phenomena of Trance, exhibited also in Somnambulism, and which being already described I do not here repeat.

---



## CHAPTER II.

THE PHYSIOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY OF  
TRANCE.

WHAT is the process, physiological and psychological, by which the condition of Trance is brought about?

Trance is always *self-induced*. Although not identical with Somnambulism, there is a marked resemblance in the aspect of the patients, and so many of the phenomena are alike in both that by hasty observers they are often confused. Trance is, indeed, a frequent consequence of Somnambulism. The Somnambule sometimes passes into the state of Trance; but not at the Will of the operator. There is, moreover, a marked difference in the expression of the patient, difficult to describe in words but immediately perceptible to the experienced. In Somnambulism, the features are singularly impassive and have a strange aspect of stupidity, until the mind of the patient is set in motion by the operator. In Trance, the features glow with an unusual intelligence; the entire expression is that of one having powerful emotions combined with active intellect, insomuch that it is difficult to recognise in the face thus fraught with the language of *Mind* the inexpressive, unintelligent countenance that was presented by the patient, in his normal state, not ten minutes before.

The differences between Trance and Somnambulism are important, as throwing some light upon their relative psychological conditions.

Hypnotism is very rarely induced without the suggestion of an operator and the assent of the patient. The condition of Trance cannot be induced by any suggestion. It occurs suddenly, without the Will or desire of the patient, and without any premonitory indications save a convulsive shuddering, of uncertain duration.

In Hypnotism, the Will of the patient is paralysed and his mental mechanism is set in motion only by the Will of some other person *en rapport* with him.

In Trance, the Will of the patient is uncommonly active and no foreign Will has any control or influence whatever over the mind of the patient.

From this we learn that in Trance, however caused, the brain is thrown into a much more active state than before and, as the consequence, that its powers are very largely extended.

Accompanying this exaltation of brain power is the same condition of *unconsciousness* as is found in Somnambulism. When the patient revives, he has no memory of anything that occurred during the Trance; but the memory of the incidents of the Trance recurs when the condition is reproduced. The patient has practically two lives—the *Trance Life* and the *Waking Life*.

Hence we further learn that, in the state of Trance, there is what appears to be a temporary severance of the link (whatever it be) that connects the Conscious Self with the body. Certainly there is an interruption of the communication between the brain and the Self, to such an extent that the brain ceases to perform its proper function of imparting its impressions to, or exciting thought and emotion in, the Conscious Self, whichever of these processes be that by which the communication of the Self with the external world is conducted through the mechanism of the brain.

In this condition of severance between the action of the mechanism of the brain and the Conscious Self, some remarkable phenomena present themselves.

The senses are sealed as in Somnambulism. There is no perception by the sight, for the eyes are closed.



No sound startles. There is insensibility to pain. But the *mind* has not lost its power of perception, only it perceives otherwise than by the intervention of the senses. Although the eyes of the patient are closed, he will thread his way, without tripping or touching, through a room thickly strewn with furniture and unfamiliar to him. Plainly this is not effected by means of light passing through the eyelids, as some have supposed, for he does the like in the darkest room, where the waking occupants stumble at every step. In this, as well as in delicate mechanical actions,—writing, drawing, and such like,—he works in the dark as readily as in the light. So far, Trance precisely resembles Somnambulism.

But the Trance patient does what the Somnambule does not. He needs no person to be *en rapport* with him; his mind is not and cannot be controlled by any stronger Will. He maintains a conversation, answering questions with astonishing ability and in language such as he cannot command in his waking state. Often he will argue with scholastic skill, treating with ease and accuracy subjects of profound thought, far beyond the range of his waking intelligence. I have heard an uneducated barman, when in a state of Trance, maintain a dialogue with a party of philosophers on “reason and foreknowledge, Will and fate,” and hold his own against them. I have put to him the most difficult questions in Psychology and received answers, always thoughtful, often full of wisdom, and invariably conveyed in choice and eloquent language. Nevertheless, in a quarter of an hour afterwards, when wakened from the Trance, he was unable to answer the simplest query on a philosophical subject and was not merely inapt at the language of science he had been lately using so glibly, but at a loss for sufficient language in which to express a commonplace idea.

From this it may be gathered that in Trance the brain is in a state of great *excitement*; that is to say, it works with vastly more vigour than in its normal

condition. We are still as ignorant how this condition is produced as we are of so many others of the functions of animal life. It is not, however, altogether new and strange, for a similar extension of the mental powers, only in lesser degree, is exhibited under the influence of spirituous liquors, of fever, and of some forms of insanity. The physiological process is obviously an increased flow of the force that sets the molecules of the brain in motion. As yet, however, we have failed to trace the process by which the state of Trance operates to increase the force, whatever it be, that moves the mechanism of the mind.

The condition of Trance appears to consist in the temporary severance of the connection between the Individual Being—or, as I prefer to call it, the *Soul*—and the molecular mechanism through which that Soul (or Self)—communicates with the molecular world. It is as if the machinery of the body were set in motion and its actions controlled by its own mechanism, without the guidance of the Will. The process may be compared to a carpet-weaving machine set in motion during the absence of the weaver. The machine would work out the pattern on the weft, but, that pattern exhausted, it could produce no more. In Trance, *the body* lives and acts according to the structure of its mechanism. But *the Self*, that directed its action in the normal state, has lost the reins; it has ceased to receive the communications which it was the province of the material structure to bring to it. If this condition were to continue, death would ensue. But in the Trance with which we are familiar, the connection between the Self and the mechanism is restored and their normal relationship resumed after an interval so brief that no harm comes of their partial dislocation.

The conclusions at which we have thus arrived may be briefly stated:

1. Trance is a condition distinct from Somnambulism, although the patient often passes from Somnambulism into Trance.



2. In Somnambulism, the control of the Will over the brain is suspended, and the brain is set in motion by any other Will that comes into a certain relationship to it. The manner in which this is accomplished is not known; but the condition is expressed by the French Scientists as that of being *en rapport* with the patient—a convenient term for which we have no English equivalent.

3. In Trance, the control of the *Will* over the brain is not lost nor apparently impaired. But there is a severance between the brain and that *something*, whatever it is, which we recognise as being *ourselves*, which possesses a consciousness of identity and of individual being, and which is here called the SOUL or Self. In Trance, the patient loses the consciousness of his own identity, has no memory of his then existence, becomes in his own contemplation some other person and sustains the character of that person with a skill far surpassing the ordinary intellectual capacity exhibited in his normal condition.

4. In Trance, other remarkable phenomena are witnessed, such as extraordinary exaltation of all the mental faculties, perceptions obtained through some other medium than the senses, ecstasy, insensibility to bodily pain and a capacity to resist the force of the waves of heat.

5. These phenomena appear to be due to some irregularity either in the production or the diffusion of the Nerve Force, or Psychic Force. Diverted from its regular channels, the force flows irregularly, and while some parts of the Mechanism are almost entirely deprived of it, to other parts it appears to stream in excess, especially to the brain, producing an abnormal development of the Mental Faculties.

6. A result of this irregular flow of the Nerve Force, or Psychic Force, and its consequent partial absorption by the structure, is that the stream of the force appears to overflow, as it were, and to be projected beyond the extremities of the nerves at the surface of the body for a circumference not yet measured nor determined.

7. It is conjectured that *this* may be the Force which, surrounding the body of the patient in Trance, protects it from the destructive impact of the force of Heat, *which operates only to dissipate molecular structure*. Hence the insensibility and resistance to heat which are exhibited in this remarkable condition of the human Mechanism. Heat would be harmless to the non-molecular structure, and the Soul or Self, if it exist, must be constructed of some other combination of atoms than that which forms molecular structure.

Such are the suggestions of Science. The Spiritualists offer a different solution. They contend that the phenomena of Trance are produced by spirit-action. The Soul, they say, is partially severed from the body of the patient. Hence the insensibility to pain, the loss of consciousness, and the absence of memory. In this state some other spirit takes possession of the body that has been vacated by its own spirit and controls the material structure, supplying to it Intelligence and Will, thus manifesting itself to the material world through the organs of the borrowed body. They assert that the utterances are those of the possessing spirit, but, being made through the mechanism of the patient, they are moulded according to the instrument through which they are expressed. Hence the contradictions exhibited. Hence the knowledge by the patient at once of so much and so little. The resistance to heat they attribute to the direct interference of the foreign spirit, who diverts the waves of heat from the patient by interposing a non-material something which deflects the heat rays, or through which they cannot penetrate.

As I have had occasion to remark already, the introduction of spirit agency would account for these as, indeed, it would account for all other facts in Nature and supersede Science and scientific investigation. But I submit that we are bound to exhaust every possible explanation by known natural causes before we assent to the introduction of supernatural powers whose very existence is unproved. At all events, I offer the



suggestion of a possible Psychological solution to the Reader, who will determine for himself if he prefers my theory to that of the Spiritualists, as being the more reasonable hypothesis accounting for the undoubted phenomena.

## BOOK VII.

---

# THE ABNORMAL ACTION OF THE MECHANISM OF MAN.

---

## PSYCHISM.

---

### INTRODUCTION.

WE have traced the gradual evolution of the phenomena exhibited in the abnormal states of the Mechanism of Man from the familiar condition of Dream, through successive development in Delirium, Insanity, and Somnambulism, whether naturally occurring or induced by art. These are conditions now recognised by medical Science. Supersensuous Perception is still in debate, many of the facts being admitted but assigned by some to an abnormal exaltation of the senses and consequent extension of their perceptive power—preferring this to an explanation that involves the admission of some process of perception other than that of the senses.

The Reader, who has so far followed attentively this order of succession in the phenomena, cannot fail to have noticed that, although classified in separate groups, because produced under different conditions, part of



each group is not distinct and isolated, but a remarkable series of progressive stages of development of what is substantially one psychical condition. The more closely the phenomena are examined the more obvious is this relationship between them. The conclusions of the most experienced, the most observant, and the most thoughtful inquirers tend more and more to this—that the phenomena are intimately allied, that they proceed from the same sources, whether they be the marvellous phenomena experienced by all of us nightly in dream or the no less marvellous phenomena exhibited in Somnambulism and Hypnotism.

The *psychical* condition that appears to be the cause of, as it is certainly attendant upon, all the phenomena we have hitherto examined, may be described as a temporary dislocation of the mechanism, by reason of which the molecular structure is severed more or less from the force by which, in the normal state of that mechanism, it is moved and intelligently directed. That intelligent motive force, whose existence is undisputed, is here suggested as proceeding from the entity in the Mechanism of Man we have ventured to term “the Conscious Self,” meaning by that term the I—the you—be it Soul, as contended by us, or be it merely a state of the material mechanism, as the Materialists contend. But it must be remembered that none of these questions as to their sources or causes affect in the slightest the facts and *phenomena* observed and reported. Our conjecture of cause may be erroneous, but the facts remain. They are not shaken in any degree by showing that the explanation of them is insufficient. Some may assign them to one cause, some to another cause, and hereafter we shall submit our own views upon this question. For the present, and at this stage of the inquiry into the Mechanism of Man, the attention of the Reader must be given to the *facts* alone—because facts only can be accepted as a sound basis for scientific argument and induction.

Note also that the most ardent Materialist, the most

enthusiastic opponent of Soul—does not venture to deny the phenomena of dream, of delirium, of insanity, of natural somnambulism. Perhaps he would dispute some of those exhibited in hypnotism (which is only somnambulism artificially induced), and he would probably contend that an abnormal exaltation of the senses will account for the undeniable instances of what has been here termed Supersensuous Perception.

But he will certainly deny with angry vehemence the entire of the phenomena of Psychism; even of such of them as are identical with the phenomena which he admits to be exhibited in those other undisputed abnormal conditions.

This would indeed be an important element in the controversy, but for the amusing fact that not long since the phenomena now advanced as explanatory of the new developments, were opposed and denied with the same anger, the same vehemence, the same denunciation of the patients as impostors and of the inquirers as fools or rogues, by the very persons and classes who now accept them as real and wield them as explaining the facts they now dispute.

Nevertheless the *evidence* that proves the existence of Psychism, as a physiological and psychological condition of the Mechanism of Man, vastly exceeds in quantity that which is accepted as proof of the phenomena of Somnambulism, and is at least of equal weight and worth and attested by as many competent and trustworthy witnesses.

The first step in the present inquiry will be to produce some of that evidence and then, having before us a full description of the phenomena, and the conditions under which they are exhibited, we may venture an endeavour to trace their Physiology and Psychology, and thence what, if any, revelations they make to us of the true Mechanism of Man, of his capacities in the present and probable prospects in the future.

But no scientific investigation can be properly conducted without a distinct understanding between Writer and Reader as to the precise sense in which certain of



suggestion of a possible Psychological solution to the Reader, who will determine for himself if he prefers my theory to that of the Spiritualists, as being the more reasonable hypothesis accounting for the undoubted phenomena.

enthusiastic opponent of Soul—does not venture to deny the phenomena of dream, of delirium, of insanity, of natural somnambulism. Perhaps he would dispute some of those exhibited in hypnotism (which is only somnambulism artificially induced), and he would probably contend that an abnormal exaltation of the senses will account for the undeniable instances of what has been here termed Supersensuous Perception.

But he will certainly deny with angry vehemence the entire of the phenomena of Psychism; even of such of them as are identical with the phenomena which he admits to be exhibited in those other undisputed abnormal conditions.

This would indeed be an important element in the controversy, but for the amusing fact that not long since the phenomena now advanced as explanatory of the new developments, were opposed and denied with the same anger, the same vehemence, the same denunciation of the patients as impostors and of the inquirers as fools or rogues, by the very persons and classes who now accept them as real and wield them as explaining the facts they now dispute.

Nevertheless the *evidence* that proves the existence of Psychism, as a physiological and psychological condition of the Mechanism of Man, vastly exceeds in quantity that which is accepted as proof of the phenomena of Somnambulism, and is at least of equal weight and worth and attested by as many competent and trustworthy witnesses.

The first step in the present inquiry will be to produce some of that evidence and then, having before us a full description of the phenomena, and the conditions under which they are exhibited, we may venture an endeavour to trace their Physiology and Psychology, and thence what, if any, revelations they make to us of the true Mechanism of Man, of his capacities in the present and probable prospects in the future.

But no scientific investigation can be properly conducted without a distinct understanding between Writer and Reader as to the precise sense in which certain of



the terms employed are to be understood. Half the controversies that have wasted time and thought would have been spared, if the combatants had first stated clearly with what meaning they desire certain words to be read.

Let the Reader, then, of these pages clearly comprehend the sense in which the term "Psychism" is here employed. The definition is somewhat long, but the precise import of the term requires to be distinctly understood, even by those who may dissent from the facts on which it is based or the conclusions drawn from those facts.

The material—that is, the molecular—part of the Mechanism of Man is inert. It is not moved and kept in motion by any force from without. Its motions are sustained by some force produced within the structure, that causes the merely vital action. When that force ceases to be generated, the mechanism itself ceases and its substance perishes.

This force is what we call the *vital force*.

It is the attendant upon and expression of *Life*, and its presence distinguishes organic structure from inorganic structure. It is a blind, unintelligent, uncontrolled force. It is not subject to the Will. It labours always, sleeping or waking, and is found alike in the sage and in the idiot. It radiates from the nerve centres. But what it is, how generated, or what becomes of it when vitality ceases, Science has sought in vain to discover.

But there is exhibited in the "Mechanism of Man" another force, also produced within that mechanism, which directs and controls the action of that mechanism. This force is distinguished from the vital force, and from all other known forces, in that, if not directly proceeding from the Intelligence, it is certainly controlled and directed by Intelligence and commanded by the *Will*. This force determines the actions of the mechanism to definite ends, and is launched or withdrawn at the pleasure—of *what* ?

Surely not of the mechanism itself that is so commanded? Is it not a more reasonable conclusion that this controlling and directing force is something other than the machine that it commands?

But for our present purpose it matters not what is the fountain of this force—whether it be the brain, or the nerve system, or a non-molecular Soul. It is with the force alone that we are now concerned.

This force is *not* the vital force. It does not move the heart nor set the stomach digesting. It is a special force, definite and distinct in its character, moving various parts of the machine to various actions, for various ends desired and sought by *something within the machine that possesses intelligence*.

To that force no name has yet been given by Science. Indeed, its very existence is denied by many eminent Scientists, and but imperfectly recognised by those who hesitatingly accept it, as if they feared to be deemed fools for accepting as true anything that seems to point, however remotely, to the conclusion that there is a Soul in Man and a God in the Universe.

That, however, is the force to be treated of here. Some name is needed for it. I have ventured to suggest "PSYCHIC FORCE" as an appropriate name. It means *Soul* force. It was adopted to distinguish it from the *vital* force, which appears to be a purely bodily force. At least it is not an intelligent force, nor directed by Intelligence.

When, therefore, the term "Psychic Force" is used in this book, it must be understood to mean *the force that is directed by some intelligent power, existing in the Mechanism of Man, by which the actions of that mechanism are controlled and directed to desired and definite ends*.

But it must also be distinctly understood that the term "Psychic Force" is not being intended to affirm anything as to the origin or nature of this force. That is a question to be determined after patient and protracted examination of the phenomena, in the production of



which, after sufficient experiment and test, this Psychic Force may be found to be concerned.

Let it be understood, also, that when it is called an *intelligent* force, it is not intended to affirm that it is itself intelligent, but only that it is directed by *some intelligent entity*. Certainly it is not directed by either of the known physical forces. All tests have failed to show the slightest connection with either of the triune forces of magnetism, electricity, or galvanism.

Probably the existence of such a force will not be seriously disputed by any rational person. He could not lift his arm to his head without recognising its presence. He *wills* and his arm rises.

At this point the Materialists part from us, and most of those who have not experimented upon this force, or thought out to their reasonable conclusions the necessary results of its existence, will say, as many now say, "admitting that there is a Psychic Force that controls the body, is there any evidence that this force can, under any circumstances, operate beyond the limits of the bodily structure?"

It is answered, that an extensive series of phenomena, apparently associated with this Psychic Force, seems almost to compel the conclusion that, under certain conditions, it can and does operate beyond the surface of the body in which it is generated.

If such extra-corporeal action be, it is, in seeming, "action at a distance." Thus is raised one of the most perplexing problems of science. Is such action *possible*? We cannot even imagine motion to be imparted to matter in any form but by some *force* applied to it. Force itself is motion, and can be conceived of only as motion. Something must communicate the motion from the moving power to the subject. The magnet *appears* to attract the steel by "action at a distance." But physicists contend that this cannot be; that *something* must intervene by which the steel is seized and carried to the magnet. Whatever this may be, it is imperceptible to any sense. But we do not deny its existence because it is

not perceived by our senses. So likewise it is unphilosophical to deny *the fact* of motion under the influence of Psychic Force because we cannot immediately trace the manner of its action or the medium through which it acts.

It must not be concealed from the reader that a numerous and in many respects influential body of experimentalists, recognising the fact of motion without perceptible contact or communication, and unable to trace any physical cause for it, have attributed such motion to the presence and activity of disembodied spirits of the dead!

If this solution of the problem of motion without perceptible physical contact could be demonstrated by conclusive evidence, it would be impossible to exaggerate its importance, for it would establish beyond further question two facts of the utmost interest to Man—the existence of Soul and life after death. It would be demonstrative proof that the Mechanism of Man is compounded of Soul as well as body; that, as here contended, we are Souls clothed with bodies.

Greatly as all must desire to find such proof sufficient, I am compelled, after long and careful examination, to declare it to be insufficient. The proofs that Soul is are many and potent, as the Reader must be already satisfied. But *this* evidence, that would have been worth all the rest, cannot be judicially accepted as being positive proof of the great fact so confidently asserted by many from whose judgment I reluctantly dissent.

There is, indeed, abundant proof of the presence and action of Intelligence, as being intimately associated with the class of psychic phenomena about to be examined. But some of the most intelligent investigators have failed to find evidence, convincing to them, of the presence and agency of spirits of the dead, although they have examined with the most anxious desire to find them.

For my own part, I must frankly say that, after long and patient examination, with all desire and pre-



possession in its favour, I also have failed to find the hoped for proof.

But of many of the *facts* and *phenomena* I can entertain *no doubt*; the question is only as to source and cause and the agency by which they are produced. No Physical Science can array a tithe of the mass of evidence by which Psychism is supported. The reporters of the vast multitude of its facts and phenomena are for the most part competent observers, having various qualifications for the work—Scientists, Physicians, Lawyers. The phenomena of Psychism have been experimented upon, tested, and noted by more skilled investigators than the phenomena of magnetism. They are attested by men of scientific eminence, whose authority in other sciences is received with unquestioning respect. Fifty such volumes as this would not contain all the cases that have been so recorded. Half a million of witnesses attest, not to mere matters of *faith*, but to positive testimony of their senses—what they have *seen*, *heard*, and *felt*.

But this huge mass of evidence, which in any other science would be deemed to be conclusive, is nevertheless confronted by a peremptory denial of each and all of the reported phenomena and confident assertion that they were either delusions or impostures.

By whom are they denied? And on what ground is the denial based?

Who are the deniers? Men who have seen and heard and failed to find? No! Strange to say, they are men who have *never seen*, who have not patiently examined. Such witnesses would be inadmissible before any tribunal, for any purpose. What would be said by Scientists if a man, who had never witnessed an experiment and who knew nothing of the science of magnetism, should set himself to refute it by simply denying its asserted facts? Would he not be ridiculed by the whole world?

The term *Psychic Force* has been already defined. It is necessary to add two other definitions of cognate terms.

The persons in whom the Psychic Force is manifested abnormally or in excess are here called *Psychics*.

To the Science which Investigators base upon the phenomena exhibited and which explores the laws that regulate them, the appropriate name of *Psychism* is proposed to be given.

By these names, then, they will be known in the following chapters. In the senses above defined and in those senses alone will they be here employed.

It must be understood, also, that in this treatise on the "Mechanism of Man" we are concerned with the phenomena exhibited in *Psychism* only *so far as they are associated with that mechanism*. Whatever may be reasonably and probably referred to the action of some extra-human force, intelligent or otherwise, is a subject for profoundly interesting consideration in itself; but it would be out of place here. Our sole business in these pages is with facts and phenomena that are associated with the Mechanism of Man and serve to exhibit the nature of that Mechanism.

If phenomena are presented which are reasonably to be assigned to any non-human agency, whether angelic, or diabolic, or otherwise, they will not be recognised as subjects for discussion here.

---



## PSYCHISM.

## CHAPTER I.

## OBJECTIONS AND OBJECTORS.

THE facts and phenomena of Psychism, like all other alleged *facts* in Science, can be determined by *Evidence* alone. Argument *a priori* is inadmissible for any other purpose than to show *primâ facie* improbability and, therefore, to secure more care in observation and more strict proof.

The proper province of argument, in questions of scientific fact, is to try the value and weight of the evidence and if the conclusions are logically and reasonably to be deduced from the collected testimony.

The same principle regulates the investigation of the aspects and characteristics of alleged phenomena and the conditions under which they are produced. These also are *facts* to be proved, or disproved, as are all other asserted facts, by *evidence*—that is to say, by witnesses who attest the results of their observations and experiments.

An objector may rightly join issue upon this. He may reasonably say of any asserted fact, "I have investigated it with patience and perseverance and can find no proof of its existence."

But, unfortunately for Science, it is not thus that novel facts and phenomena are usually dealt with by objectors. The assertions are not met with the calm, dispassionate questionings of doubters, who come with open minds and without prepossession or prejudice, sincerely desirous

to learn the very truth. For some reason yet mysterious, mental phenomena, and those of Psychism especially, are encountered by a passionate hostility that savours more of the *odium theologicum* than of difference of opinion upon a question of science and of fact. The intolerant bigotry of the middle ages, and even the persecuting spirit of that dark time, have been revived in this nineteenth century. Wherefore? What in the phenomena in question kindles such a fury of hostility, even if they be as unreal and baseless as their opponents allege?

There is another lamentable feature of this controversy. It is conducted as no other question of fact is fought in our day of free thought and free speech. The phenomena are not rejected by its opponents because they have examined them patiently, tried them, and found them to be false. Resort is had to the time-honoured argument, which has always and everywhere dogged the footsteps of advancing Science: "We say that it *cannot* be; therefore it is not." Thus the labour of experimental inquiry is avoided and dogmatism wins an easy victory.

Objections to the phenomena of Psychism, however differing in form, will be found to resolve themselves into two distinct classes.

1. That they are *illusions*.
2. That they are *delusions*.

In other words—

1. The experimentalist is self-deceived.
2. The experimentalist is deceived by others.

It must be remembered that we are not dealing now with phenomena of rare occurrence, like those of somnambulism, delirium, insanity, and other abnormal conditions of the mechanism, but with a series, the reports of which fill many volumes. We are treating of phenomena that occur daily in our midst; that are presented continually among the people of every country in the world, civilized or savage; that are witnessed and attested by thousands of persons in hundreds of households and which



any person may almost at any time and anywhere make trial of and probably witness for himself, with a little trouble and some patience and perseverance. For this purpose he needs rarely go beyond his own family circle and his own fireside. The proofs of the existence of *Psychic Force* as an active agent in the Mechanism of Man, and of its phenomena as facts in nature, are indeed vastly more numerous than the facts that form the foundation of any other science. The Witnesses comprise men of the highest intelligence, of the largest experience, men of thought and men of action, the keenest observers, the profoundest thinkers, the most calm and cool in judgment, of the foremost intellectual and social rank, Scientists practised in experiment, Lawyers skilled in evidence and trained to test witnesses and weigh proof, hard-headed men of business difficult to be deluded and not readily self-deceived.

Let the Reader think for a moment what is implied by the favourite objection of *self-delusion*. It means

That *every one* (without an exception) of these tens of thousands of reported phenomena is an illusion of the spectator!

That *every one* of the reporters of the phenomena, whatever his capacity in all other pursuits of Science and in all affairs of business,—whatever his reputation for sagacity or honesty—is, in fact, a fool!

That *every one* of the witnesses who have attested the phenomena, however intelligent and honest, was the dupe of self-delusion or the victim of imposture!

For it must be remembered by the student of Psychology,

That if *but one of all this multitude* of reported facts be *true*, the science based upon that fact is established as if all were true.

It will suffice for Science to be *assured* that in *one* solitary instance, at any time or in any place, an intelligent force has been exercised, not being one of the known physical forces. Following the path thus found, it will open to itself and to the world a new field

of knowledge that cannot but be fertile of results of the highest import to the whole future of humanity.

Although a thousand cases were delusions or frauds, if but *one* be genuine, it is enough. This fact and all that it involves is proved as certainly as if all were proved.

Surely it is incredible that such a multitude of men, comprising so many intelligent minds, so many competent observers, so many profound thinkers, so many robust intellects, should all be deceived as to the *evidence of their senses*. Such a conclusion would be *really* more marvellous than the marvels they attest.

It is, indeed, not uncommon to find even greater multitudes of wiser men implicitly accepting seeming impossibilities. But these are not the subjects of conviction based upon evidence, but of *faith* formed without evidence, or against it. *Faith* relies on the assertion of some *authority*, without inquiry into the grounds upon which the truth of the assertion is based. Science properly rejects *faith* as a factor in its own domain. Science demands *proof*.

The question for trial upon a disputed scientific fact, such as one of those to be presently examined, resolves itself into this. *Do we see, feel, hear, what we think we hear, feel and see? Are our senses to be trusted? Are they "deceivers ever?" Is there nothing real, true, provable, admissible? Is nothing to be accepted, believed, or acted upon, which our senses carry to our minds?*

Or, what *amount* of evidence is to justify acceptance of a fact? Are we really to echo the desponding cry of Macbeth, "and nothing is but what is not?"

In few words, is it, *can it be*, that—as the objectors aver—all that has been seen and heard and felt by hundreds of thousands of persons, of all degrees of intelligence, in all countries, is pure illusion? Has every one of the vast host of witnesses been deceived, not once, twice, or thrice only, but a hundred times—many a thousand times?



Again, we ask, is it *possible* that all of these myriads of phenomena can be *illusions*—which means that every one of the tens of thousands of witnesses who have attested, and still daily attest, the occurrence of the phenomena—men of science, men of business, lawyers skilled in evidence, physicians trained to observation—the testimony of whose senses would be accepted without hesitation in any case where life or fortune depended upon the accuracy of those senses, were and are, *in this instance alone*, deceived by their own senses—the very senses, be it observed, that are deemed so trustworthy and so trusted by themselves and the world in all other cases—inasmuch as they do *not* see, hear, and feel that which they believe their senses to present to them !

Moreover, with the crowd of witnesses in question the illusion is not of one sense only, but of all the senses ; and not of one sense at one time, but of all the senses at the same time ; and not of all the senses of one person alone, but of all the senses of many persons together.

Is this credible, probable, *possible* ?

If compelled, by the verdict of common sense, to abandon this objection, the objectors have another which they urge with an air of even greater triumph.

“ If not illusion, it is *delusion* ; if not self-deceived, the witnesses are the dupes of *deception*. Doubtless, they see, hear, and feel what they assert, but they are the victims of imposture. The phenomena are only frauds. The incidents are but clever conjuring.”

This is a more sensible objection, raising a more reasonable issue. Unlike the former one, it is not argumentative, but a *question of fact*, pure and simple, to be determined by *evidence alone*. If the alleged phenomena be frauds, impostures, the tricks of conjurors, they can be proved so to be by a very easy process. Show *how* they are performed and perform them. The conjuror’s art is always capable of being taught and learned. He can exhibit the contrivances by which his cleverest tricks are performed. He can display his hidden mechanisms ; he can do his sleight of hand slowly,

so that its method may be seen by every eye. Books open to all who desire to know describe accurately every detail of his performances and any person who cares to learn the art may do so with much labour. Thus we learn that, how ingenious soever the tricks, they are simply illusions.

So, if the alleged phenomena of Psychism are but clever tricks of conjuring imposture, they can readily be *proved* so to be. *Show how they are done by doing them under the same conditions.* Not only do them, but exhibit the manner of the doing. Go slowly through the entire of the contrivances, in the presence of witnesses, and exhibit every movement by which the alleged delusion is effected.

The unthinking have been much influenced by the professed imitations of some of the phenomena by showmen, who skilfully produce similar results by methods avowedly invented.

Upon this the plausible objection is preferred: "If all this can be done on that stage, may it not be presumed that the same thing is done in the same or some like manner elsewhere?"

The fallacy of this objection is transparent and could impose upon those only who are willing to be imposed upon.

There is nothing that ingenuity could not imitate. Given a clear stage for mechanism and a motive, pecuniary or otherwise, for the expenditure of sufficient money and skill, and all the beautiful experiments with which Professor TYNDALL delights his audience at the Royal Institution might be imitated, by artificial contrivances, at the Egyptian Hall. If a sufficient number of persons desired to have it shown that the PROFESSOR was an impostor and his experiments mechanical or dexterous tricks, they would certainly have been introduced long since to the visitors there as "a death-blow to electricity." The Professor would have been proclaimed an impostor and taken so to be by the gaping multitude. This has not been *his* fate only because nobody outside the circle of



science has any motive or desire to "put down" electricity. It conflicts with no prejudices, it disturbs no faiths, it threatens no interests.

The answer to this objection is obvious. It is not sufficient to *imitate* phenomena; anything can be imitated; you must do so *under the same conditions*. You may produce something very like them by your mechanism on or under your stage; but can you (the alleged exposé) produce them as they are produced naturally—that is to say—coming alone in a cab to a private house you had never entered before, bringing nothing with you but the clothes you wear, going into a strange room, with no confederate, but only eager detectives about you, your hands held by vigilant sceptics, your feet tied to your chair, a cord binding you to your neighbours, so that you shall not move an inch without instant discovery? If, indeed, thus guarded, you will do what is done upon that stage of your own construction, then you will prove to demonstration that the phenomena produced under all these conditions are not natural phenomena and that they may be, and probably are, the results of trickery. Unless this be done, nature and not artifice may fairly claim to be the parent of them. At least, the objector fails utterly to prove them to be tricks.

But there is another refuge yet for the objectors. "Frauds," they say, "have been detected; imposture has been proved."

Doubtless it is so. Impostures are many. Impostors are impudent and have been too often successful in deceiving the unwary. It is the way of the world. Wheresoever there is a prospect of profit, rogues rush in with the honest men. If anything attracts notice and prospers, imitations and impostures crowd about it. The sham follows the real as the shadow the sun. It seems to be forgotten that a sham implies the existence of a reality—imitation a thing to be imitated.

If the alleged phenomena are frauds, why, in the interests of science, of truth, and of justice, are they not instantly

exposed and the fallacies founded upon them exploded at once and for ever, as thus they would be.

The process is simple and sure. *Do the same thing, in the same way, under the same conditions, and show how it is done.* There are persons who live by professing to be able to accomplish this. But they refuse to show how the trick is performed, on the plea, that to exhibit the contrivance would destroy the interest of their exhibition and with it their source of profit. If this is not a mere excuse, indemnify them. Such a revelation would be cheap at almost any price. But the proposition has actually been made and is now open for acceptance. A wealthy gentleman has publicly offered *a thousand pounds* to any person who will produce the same phenomena under the same conditions. Why has such a magnificent prize been rejected? Impostures can be reproduced at will. It is certainly remarkable that no person has accepted the offer so made. Is not the reasonable conclusion that they do not because they cannot. Would not the Egyptian Hall long since have secured the prize—if it could?

These objections disposed of, the inquiry resolves itself into a question of *evidence*. Admitting that the phenomena occur, the only question can be, if they are produced by fraud or by some other agency. This, like every other fact, can be determined by *evidence* alone. The burden of proof is upon those who allege fraud. What is the proof of it? It is freely admitted that there has been imposture in many cases. But to establish this as an objection to the whole array of witnesses, it must be proved that there is imposture *in all cases*. The answer is, that there is no such proof; that crucial test conditions have precluded fraud in the vast majority of cases.

When all other objections fail, another is often started, and, strangely enough, it is specially affected by Scientists, whom repeated experience of things, pronounced to be impossible, afterwards proving to be true, might have been expected to make more cautious. "No



amount of evidence," says such an objector, "would suffice for proof. I would not believe the phenomenon if I saw it. I would conclude that the senses of the whole world were deceived rather than that this phenomenon should have occurred. It is contrary to the order of Nature and therefore it *cannot* be."

The first answer to this somewhat ridiculous objection is a retort.

If the objector be a professing Christian, ask him if he believes the miracles reported in the Bible? "Of course I do." "Upon what evidence?" "On the assertion of those who witnessed them." "But you object that no amount of evidence will entitle these phenomena, because seemingly extra-natural, to be credited by you, although attested to you by hundreds of *living* witnesses. How then do you accept avowed miracles on the testimony of persons you have not seen and do not know?" In a moment he is put to shame.

The Materialist meets the question otherwise. He frankly avows that he rejects the miracles of the Bible. He must, therefore, be met by other arguments. The answer to *him* is—that all human knowledge is based upon the testimony of our own senses and reliance upon the senses of other men. Argument is admissible to try the weight and worth of the evidence of the fact, but not to determine *à priori* if the fact exists.

The whole history of Science offers the best and most conclusive answer to this objection of the Scientists. Almost every fact now accepted as true was denied at first.

If appeal is made to the evidence of the senses, not of one alone, but of tens of thousands, who believe they have seen, and heard, and felt, the ready answer is an admission that our senses are often deceitful. Daily we imagine we see, hear, feel that which is not. But not the less are we dependent upon our senses for all our knowledge. The most important affairs of life are conducted in confident reliance upon our *senses*. Justice is administered upon evidence of the senses,

which are presumed to be reliable for every other purpose of existence. Wherefore, then, reject them in this alone? But, although the senses of an individual may be deceived sometimes, it never occurs in actual life that the same sense of a great number of persons is deceived at the same moment; still less that all the senses of many persons are deceived, not merely at various times but at the same instant, and not one sense only but all their senses.

Something of the same nature is the objection that the observers are "biologised;" that they are under the spell of the medium, who throws them into the "biological" condition (whatever that may be), and then makes them believe that they see, hear, and feel whatever he suggests, precisely as is witnessed with "biologised" patients in a lecture room.

It is amusing to note that this objection is urged most frequently by those who deny the existence of electro-biology and call that also an imposture! With them, therefore, it is not an honest objection. But the doubt has presented itself to some who, accepting the phenomena, desire to account for them without adopting the spiritual theory. The answer to this objection is conclusive. The biologised—that is, the hypnotised—patient has not the slightest memory of anything that occurred in his hypnotic state. The witnesses of Psychic phenomena never lose consciousness and retain a perfect memory of all that occurs. Again; only about one person in four can be "biologised;" whereas all the observers of psychic phenomena have the same perceptions; all must be deluded, or none. There is another decisive answer. If the supposed phenomena are imaginary, not real, how comes it that the servant, who cleans the room *after the meeting*, finds the chairs, tables, books, vases and such like, heaped or thrown about in all parts of it. She, at least, was not "biologised." Her labour to restore order emphatically answers the objection that the motions of those solid bodies were imaginary. Howsoever caused, they are certainly real motions.



There are some other cavils of less weight—mainly frivolous and foolish—which it is unnecessary to notice.

Such being the principal objections, who are the objectors?

Are they persons who, having seen, tried, and experimented fully, fairly, and patiently, have come to the conclusion that the alleged facts do not occur at all, or that they are the work of fraud which they have discovered and can describe?

It is one of the strangest features of this controversy that *none* of the objectors have personally and patiently investigated the alleged phenomena, and few have witnessed anything of that whose existence they deny. They do not speak from their knowledge but from their ignorance. No sane person would give heed for a moment to a man who dared to dispute the phenomena of electricity without having witnessed and examined them. What claim to a better reception has the uninstructed objector to the facts of Psychism?

The testimony of the thousands of witnesses and the vast mass of accumulated evidence are disputed by those only who have never seen, nor patiently examined, the phenomena they deny—by those who can fight only with *à priori* argument, with the feminine reason “it cannot be and therefore it is not”—witnesses who would be banished with ignominy from the witness box of any Court of Justice in any civilized country in the world!

---

## CHAPTER II.

## THE WITNESSES.

It must be distinctly understood that Psychology is a *Science*, not a *creed*; a question of *fact*, not of *faith*; to be determined by *evidence*, not by *authority*; to be pursued by observation and experiment, not by metaphysical abstractions and by *a priori* argument.

Therefore, like all other questions of fact, the truth of the alleged phenomena must be tried by the testimony of witnesses alone, and witnesses must be weighed as well as counted.

The undisputed psychological phenomena already examined, as those of dream, delirium, insanity, somnambulism, catalepsy, and trance, need no inquiry into the weight of the witnesses and the worth of their evidence. It is otherwise with the classes of phenomena whose existence is disputed. Psychic phenomena being one of those disputed classes, a preliminary review of the array of witnesses will assist the examination of the facts which they attest.

In *number* the witnesses are legion. They are to be counted by thousands and tens of thousands. They come from all countries; they are of all classes, of all creeds, of all ages and both sexes.

But it is contended that numbers do not make *proof*, for there is no religion nor superstition, however fantastic or impossible, that cannot produce a multitude of believers in its verity.



The argument is wholly irrelevant. Psychic phenomena are questions of *fact*, not of *faith*. The witnesses are not called to attest their *belief*, but what they have personally *seen*, *heard*, and *felt*. Thus this inquiry differs from disputed *creeds*, with which opponents endeavour to confound it.

Weight is given to evidence of the senses by the numbers of the witnesses. The attestation of twenty persons that they saw the same thing at the same time, is of vastly more value than that of two or three persons, because of the improbability of multiplied self-deception. But if thousands of witnesses assert that they have seen the same phenomenon in a hundred different places, not once only but many times, the weight of the evidence is multiplied in yet greater proportion than the multiplication of the witnesses.

The phenomena of Psychism might well rest upon the testimony of numbers alone. But it can present *worth* as well as *weight* of evidence.

Among the witnesses, eminent above the multitude, are men whose testimony has been accepted by the world as of pre-eminent value in other questions of Science, because they are deemed to be more than commonly shrewd observers and specially practised in the cautious use of their senses. It is enough to note here, as a few instances among the many, the names of Professor DE MORGAN, F.R.S.; Mr. A. WALLACE, F.R.S. (the distinguished Naturalist, who disputes the palm with DARWIN); Mr. CROOKES, F.R.S., (the discoverer of the metal Silenium and the inventor of the radiometer, itself the product of a psychic experiment); Professor HARE; Lord LINDSAY, F.R.S.; Professor BARRETT; Dr. ASHBURNER; Dr. ELLIOTSON; Professor ZOLNER (the foremost mathematician of Germany.)

Such witnesses possess the special title to respect of being skilled observers, trained to guard their senses against deception and whose scientific knowledge secures sufficient assurance by way of strict test and exhaustive experiment.

A long list might be made of practical men, accredited by the world with possession of more than average keenness of observation, shrewdness of judgment and strong common sense, who not only assert that they have personally witnessed the alleged phenomena many times, under various conditions, but who have made full reports of their experiences, containing the minutest details of what they had so seen. Among these are many lawyers of repute, practised in the cross-examination of witnesses, in the testing of testimony, in weighing evidence and forming a fair judgment, after a calm review of all that can be advanced on either side. Others of the witnesses are men of business, who have proved their capabilities by their successful enterprises, and whose evidence in the witness box would be accepted without hesitation by any jury, in any Court, upon any matter affecting life, liberty, or property.

And all of these witnesses have come forward to assert what they believe to have been the truthful reports of *their own senses*, in despite of the unpopularity which the votaries of the Materialism of Man have been but too successful in exciting and directing against all who assert as a fact anything that tends to prove the existence of a non-molecular Soul in Man and the consequent probability of a life after the dissolution of the molecular body, with which it is encrusted as the necessary condition of a temporary life in a molecular world.

---



## CHAPTER III.

## PSYCHIC FORCE.

SOME years ago there was a popular amusement called *table turning*. A number of persons seated themselves about a table, laying their hands upon it. Often, but not always, and after a lapse of more or less of time, the table was found to tip, or to revolve, or to slide along the floor, sometimes with such rapidity that the sitters had to rise from their seats and run to keep pace with it.

The undisputed fact received a ready explanation from the scientists. The motions, they said, were caused by the pressure of the muscles of so many hands upon the table, unconsciously following the desire that it should move in a certain direction. Elaborate calculations were made of the amount of force applied to a round table of certain dimensions by twenty hands pressing upon it at the extremities of a series of levers of which the centre pedestal was the fulcrum. So satisfied was Professor FARADAY that this was the true solution of what appeared to the unthinking as a very remarkable phenomenon that he constructed a machine which exhibited to the eye and accurately measured the amount of pressure thus involuntarily exercised; not unreasonably anticipating that the seeming mystery would be thus solved to the satisfaction of all beholders and a popular delusion, as he honestly believed it to be, dissipated at once and for ever.

The machine was tried and, greatly to his own

astonishment, was found to fail. It detected the presence of *some* amount of involuntary pressure, but none that would account, even approximately, for the force necessary to produce the motions that were witnessed. Not only was the pressure of the hands proved to be very trifling indeed, but this was neutralised by the absence of unanimity in the direction of that pressure. The sitters never desired at the same moment the same movement; consequently, all the involuntary pressures of all the fingers were never made in the same direction. The machine itself was speedily consigned to the museum of useless inventions, and the problem *how* the tables were turned remained as insoluble as ever.

The next discovery was, that many hands were by no means necessary to produce the result. When the experiment was tried for the first time, success more frequently attended a large party than a small one. After a few trials, three or four persons were found to be as efficient as twenty. The cause of this is now known and will appear presently. At the time of the early trials of the experiment, this result was not unreasonably accounted for by the "unconscious pressure" theory. It was seen, after awhile, that in fact there was no connection between the number of hands and the extent of motion.

It was next found that certain persons possessed greater power than others for the production of the motions. By merely laying one hand upon the table, they could produce frequently a more vigorous movement than a party of ten or twelve could produce with both hands.

It appeared, also, that certain other persons failed to procure the slightest motion, however persevering their effort or forcible their pressure. They sat patiently at the same table for many hours night after night and nothing came. It was noticed by some of those who were thus vainly experimenting that they had been present at other parties where the phenomena were exhibited with speed and vigour. Then it was observed



that, when certain persons were present, the experiment rarely failed, and that when certain other persons were present it rarely succeeded. From this it was surmised that the production or nonproduction of the motions was in some unknown manner connected with those persons.

The answer of the doubting to this was, of course, the ready one. "The presence of those persons is necessary because they know how to produce the motions by some secret contrivance of their own; *they* have learned the art and the others have not." The tests and experiments by which this not unreasonable suggestion was entirely disproved will be detailed presently.

The next discovery was that the motions appeared often to be in accordance with the *expressed Will* of one or more of the persons engaged in the experiment.

Then it was observed that faint sounds of a remarkable character sometimes accompanied the motions. For a long time these were supposed to be creakings in the woodwork of the table, caused by the moving of it, and although they were, in fact, very unlike any of the sounds produced when the table was purposely moved, the solution seemed probable. No suspicion being then entertained of the existence of any other cause for the sounds, it was generally accepted.

Nevertheless, the thoughtful few were perplexed by the fact that, when certain persons were present, these sounds were heard more distinctly and loudly than at other times and then resembled rather thumps upon the wood than creakings in it. It was next ascertained that the sounds were not necessarily connected with the motions. But they were produced under precisely the same conditions and always near the persons whose presence was found to be necessary to the production of motion.

Soon afterwards it was discovered that these sounds were not purely mechanical. They were manifestly directed by some *Intelligence*. Then came the question, what was the source of that Intelligence?

Upon this the Investigators were of divided opinion. The majority adopted the time-honoured practice of attributing to the action of supernatural beings that for which they could not at once find a natural or scientific explanation. Another, but smaller, party contended that we had no right to resort to the supernatural until all natural explanations were exhausted; that it was sufficient, at this early stage of information, to accept the fact without attempting to explain it, and that we should be content to trace with patience and perseverance the conditions under which the phenomena are produced, thus seeking after causes and sources in obedience to the true principles of scientific research.

The next fact presented was that these motions of heavy bodies were associated with the presence of certain persons. Taking these conditions together, the scientific inquirer deduced the not unreasonable conclusion, that the force producing the motions and sounds proceeds, in some manner not yet ascertained, from the organisation of one or more of the persons present.

The careful experiments made upon it proved conclusively that this force was not either of the known physical forces, but a force intimately associated with, if not directly proceeding from, the human mechanism. It differed in most important characteristics from the *Nerve Force*, or *Vital Force* (whatever the name preferred for that force by which the functions of life and mind are sustained). Ultimately the scientific Investigators adopted the suggestion of the Author of this book, and gave to the force so exhibited the name of *PSYCHIC FORCE*, and to the persons whose presence is necessary to its perceptible action the name of *PSYCHICS*.

On the other hand, a far more numerous following has adopted with implicit faith the doctrine of those who assert that the agency in the production of these phenomena is neither human nor mundane, but the disembodied Spirits (or Souls) of persons who have passed away from their existence in this material world, and who are permitted thus to hold communication with the



living, for the purpose mainly of giving them assurance of a life beyond the grave. They have taken the appropriate title of SPIRITUALISTS, and their creed is expressed in the term *Spirit communion*.

On this assumption they have established what is really a Religion, having a definite creed, preachers and teachers without number, and upwards of ten millions of disciples, of whom eight millions are said to be found in the United States, one million in Great Britain and her colonies, and another million about equally divided among the other countries of Europe. In all languages able journals are actively devoted to the propagation of this creed, whose success is altogether without precedent in history, and doubtless is due to the rare circumstance, that its foundation is laid entirely upon *facts* and not wholly or chiefly upon *faith*. The evidence it offers is not of feelings but of the *senses*, and of the truth of which every man may assure himself, if he pleases. Its preachers do not invoke authority nor ask for confidence; but they say, "*Behold and see!*" They call this new cult SPIRITUALISM.

But to the scientific observer this is not satisfactory. To the Philosopher, and especially to the Psychologist, there is a tremendous leap from the proved facts to the conclusion that has been based upon them. It is one thing to say that furniture is moved by an unknown force and that some yet untraced Intelligence makes sensible communications, and another thing to conclude that these motions and utterances are the work of Spirits of the Dead. To reasoning and reflecting minds, and especially to such as have been trained to the pursuit of science, there is a wide region of research to be traversed between acceptance of the fact that intelligent communications are made by some unexplained process, under certain unascertained conditions that are obviously physiological and psychical, and the conclusion that Spirits of the Dead are the producers of the phenomena and the authors of the communications. Before Science can accept this, or any other conclusion, it is bound to

examine every fact, every phenomenon, every condition attending production, and to exhaust all known and even all possible natural agencies and all physical and psychical forces, powers, and properties. This, and this only, is the contention of the *Scientific Investigators* who have advanced the title of PSYCHIC FORCE purposely to avoid the foregone conclusion implied in the more popular name. They do not thereby intend to assert that the Spiritual theory is absolutely false, but only *that it is as yet unproved*. It will be seen presently that the theory of *Psychic Force* possesses at least this remarkable recommendation, *that it is accepted, even by the Spiritualists, as being true so far as it goes*. They admit the existence of Psychic Force, although sometimes calling it by the very misleading name of "animal magnetism." They confess that its presence is necessary to the production of the phenomena, and they add to this admission the somewhat startling assertion that the Spirits of the Dead can only manifest themselves to the material senses of the living by using the Psychic Force of certain persons who have it in excess (whom they call Mediums), and in some mysterious manner applying it to the production of sounds and sights and motions perceptible to the senses. Scientifically expressed, they explain it as the conversion by the Spirit power of atoms which are imperceptible to the senses into molecules which are perceptible. "Your *Psychic Force*," they say, "is only our *Magnetism*, which enables the Spirits to aggregate atoms into molecules, and so to make themselves, or anything so aggregated, perceptible to the human senses."

Psychic Force, as its name indicates, is the force employed by the Conscious Self (or Soul) for the purpose of controlling and directing the action of the material mechanism. The existence of such a force is of course denied by the Materialists. But the appeal is to every Reader. Is *he* not conscious that, when he desires his hand to write, some force sets the muscles in motion and directs them so to shape the letters. Whence comes that force? Certainly from some intelligence, for it



guides intelligent action. Is the force from within or from without? Doubtless from within. What is the guiding intelligence within but the Self or Soul? Is that force improperly termed the *Psychic* (or Soul) force? This at least is the single sense in which it is used here.

## CHAPTER IV.

## THE METHOD OF INVESTIGATION.

PSYCHIC Phenomena, apparently as various as they are numerous, will be found to admit of something like classification. So arranged, they will be more readily remembered, and their mutual relationship will be better seen, as will also their bearing upon this inquiry into the Mechanism of Man.

We propose to review them in the order in which they appear to be developed, advancing from the most simple to the most complicated; from such as offer nothing to surprise, and which would scarcely attract notice, unless attention were directed to it, to those strange, startling exhibitions of the action of a force that, whatever its origin, is certainly not one of the known *physical* forces.

Twenty such volumes as this would not suffice for the reports of these phenomena already contributed from authentic sources. Selection, condensation, and classification are therefore unavoidable. The only practicable plan will be to adduce a few representative cases of each class of phenomena, leaving the reader to pursue the investigation among the original records, or by the more satisfactory method of personal experiment, if the reports presented in these pages should kindle in him curiosity to learn further of them.

I must confess to some perplexity in choosing between two kinds of evidence—the testimony of others and my own witnessing.



My title to be accredited as a witness may be stated shortly. Many years ago I received from friends reports of strange phenomena which they had witnessed. Sceptical by nature and made more so by an ardent love for Science, while not doubting the veracity of my informants, I questioned their capacity for observation, concluding that they were self-deceived or the dupes of others, inclining rather to the theory of *illusion* than of *delusion*. Of this I was confident, that if I, utterly disbelieving the asserted facts and that such things *could* be, were to view the phenomena three times, I should speedily detect the self-deception, or the imposture, whichever it was.

Applying to Scientists for their opinion upon the asserted phenomena, I was surprised to find that, not only had they *not* seen and examined them, but that they had refused even to view them. They had but to use their eyes, their ears, and their understandings for a few hours to assure themselves if these reported phenomena were a delusion, an imposture, or a reality. In either case, their duty was plain. They would do good service to the cause of truth by dissipating the delusion, if such it was, and detecting and exposing an imposture. But if it should prove to be a reality, its importance to Science, and especially to Physiology, could not be exaggerated. Inquiring why they did not investigate a fact so interesting and so important, and yet so easily proved or disproved, I was, to my amazement, answered that no amount of evidence could prove it. "Motion without contact," — "Action at a distance," they said, "is a physical impossibility, because it is opposed to the law of gravitation. If, therefore, they were to witness it with their own eyes, and all the world were to bear testimony to it, they could not accept it as a fact, for it was more probable that the senses of all mankind should be deceived than that a law of nature should be infringed!"

Such an argument, however satisfying to the scientific mind, somewhat astonished my less subtle legal mind.

It certainly seemed to me that this argument *à priori* was at once irrational and dangerous. It proceeded on the assumption that all of Nature's laws are already known to us and rightly understood and interpreted; that we are acquainted with all her forces, and the modifications of those forces, and how they act and react one upon another. I remembered how very little is actually known of the laws of life; how ill-informed we are of the forces by which organic matter is governed; how wholly ignorant we are of the nature of those forces, and of the conditions of existence of all that larger portion of the Universe which is not sufficiently material to be perceptible to our senses, and of whose existence therefore we can have no cognisance otherwise than in its manifestations. I asked, if the psychical phenomena might not be governed by some other law than that of gravity. I referred to the instance of the magnet, where was motion without contact and in direct opposition to the law of gravity, and I inquired why this fact also was not denied upon precisely the same grounds? The identical arguments would prove the motion of the needle by the force that flows from the magnet not to be a fact, although it appears to our senses to move. Attraction by the magnet is *à priori* impossible. But the evidence of the senses is in this instance permitted to outweigh the disproof by argument. Why not in the other instance also? In the case of the magnet, the efforts of science are properly directed to discover the nature of the force by which the force of gravity is overcome and what are the laws that thus overrule the previously known laws. Hence the science of magnetism, with its manifold uses. Let us, therefore, in respect to these alleged psychical and mental phenomena, first see what *the facts* are. When we have *the facts*, and not before, we shall be in a condition to seek for the interpretation of them.

I argued in vain. Still the dogmatical answer was the same as given by the Church to Galileo. "It *cannot* be, therefore *it is not*. Unless you can explain



to me *how* it is, I will not trouble myself to inquire *if* it is."

As a Lawyer, educated in the principles and practice of evidence, I could not accept this argument; and receiving no help from the Scientists, I resolved to pursue the inquiry personally.

I was invited to join the Investigation Committee of the London Dialectical Society, in the character of a Detective, my own conviction as to the delusive nature of the alleged Phenomena being as yet unshaken. The Committee was joined by Mr. W. CROOKES, F.R.S., who was as sceptical as myself. Both of us entered upon our duties with the most confident assurance that we should, as was expected of us, and doubtless desired, explode by exposure what we conscientiously believed to be an impudent imposture or a foolish fantasy. To this the proved skill of Mr. CROOKES in devising and trying scientific tests, combined with my own experience in the sifting and weighing of evidence and the probing of witnesses, were expected to contribute materially. The Scientific World shared this expectation, and the journals exclaimed with exultation, "Now that this superstition is to be investigation by a skilful Scientist and an experienced Lawyer it will be extinguished in a week!"

The actual result of the investigation upon ourselves and the other sceptics who joined us in it will be now narrated.

## CHAPTER V.

## THE PHENOMENA OF PSYCHISM.

## I.—AUTOMATIC MOTION AND SOUNDS.

THE following report of the proceedings of the Investigation Committee was published in a pamphlet (*a*) from which it is abbreviated.

When the London Dialectical Society resolved to appoint a committee to examine and report upon the pretensions of Spiritualism, I entered upon its duties, in common with five-sixths of the members of that committee, having the most firm conviction that we should detect a fraud or dissipate a delusion. I hoped that long experience in the work of sifting and weighing evidence, and resolving what does or does not constitute proof of asserted facts, would enable me to do good service in detecting imposture and discovering its contrivances. And such were the aims and the expectations of the great majority of my colleagues, comprising men of various pursuits and capacities, ingenious lawyers, practised scientists, skillful doctors, authors, artists, and shrewd men of business—all of them persons with keen senses, proved powers of observation, suspecting and looking for imposition and therefore more than commonly vigilant with eye and ear, and rigid in the application of tests.

Before we commenced to examine, it was our confident belief that the alleged phenomena were:—

1. Self-delusion by the spectator; or,
2. Imposture by the Psychic; or,
3. Involuntary and unconscious muscular action.

With our minds thus prejudiced strongly against the reality of the phenomena, we proceeded to their investigation.

---

(*a*) *Spiritualism answered by Science, with Proofs of a Psychic Force.* By EDWARD W. COX, Sergeant-at-Law. Second Edition. London: Longman & Co.



## EXPERIMENTS BY THE SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE DIALECTICAL SOCIETY.

It was resolved that we should meet only at the private residences of members of the committee, so as to preclude all possible prearrangement of mechanism or other contrivances.

That no professional medium should be employed.

That careful notes should be taken of each experiment and signed for verification by all present.

A Psychic was found in the person of a Lady, the wife of one of the members of the general committee, of high professional and social position. In this we were pre-eminently fortunate, for the Lady in question had never witnessed any of the phenomena with others, and therefore could not have learned the sleight of hand, requiring the practice of a life for its mastery, which would be necessary for the successful performance of a trick, if trick it was. In truth, she had discovered their production in her own presence only by chance, a few weeks previously to acceding to the request of the sub-committee to assist them in their experiments.

But six only of the forty experimental meetings of the committee were held at this lady's house; all the other meetings were held at the houses of members, and some of them at my own residence; so that I can affirm positively the absence of any mechanical or other pre-arranged contrivances by which the phenomena there witnessed could have been produced.

## IS IT ILLUSION OR DELUSION?

We were speedily satisfied that it was not an *illusion* of the senses. The sounds were distinctly audible to the ear, the vibrations palpable to the touch, the motions obvious to sight. It was not a question of doubtful mental impression only, but of actual measurement. The table and other pieces of furniture had changed their position by so many inches, feet, yards. There could be no possible mistake as to this fact of motion. We were compelled to dismiss our theory that it was a *self-delusion*.

But the motion and sounds may have been produced by trickery and fraud. That was our second theory. Accordingly, we assumed the office of detectives. We sat under the table while the motions and sounds were most vigorous. We held the hands and feet of the Psychic. Every hand in the circle was held by its neighbour; the gas was bright above us; not a finger could have stirred without being perceived by some of the many eyes that were keeping watch. Our ingenuity was exercised in the invention and application of tests. *After trials often repeated we were compelled to confess that imposture was out of the question.* The motions and sounds were undoubtedly real, and were certainly not caused by any trickery.

## IS IT UNCONSCIOUS MUSCULAR ACTION?

We retreated then upon the third theory, boasting Faraday as its parent, and repeated ever since by objectors (who had not seen them), as the easy and sufficient explanation of the phenomena we were witnessing—namely, involuntary and unconscious action of the muscles of those by whom the heavy body was touched. "Here," we said, "are eighty fingers upon the table. If each one exerts but a pressure so slight as to be imperceptible even to themselves, the aggregate sum of pressure will be very considerable. Apply these multiplied pressures at the edge of the table, and every finger is converted into a lever of which the centre of the table is a fulcrum. Make trial of it and it will be found so to be. That the muscles will act unconsciously there can be no doubt; and after a lengthened resting of the hand in a constrained position there is an involuntary contraction of the muscles, sufficient by their accumulated force to cause motion of the table, even though every person present should scrupulously endeavour to avoid pressure."

Such was the reasonable argument that led us to look to involuntary muscular action as the explanation of the motions and sounds that were continually being made. To ascertain if this hypothesis was correct, we devised a series of tests that should place the matter beyond all possible doubt. First, all hands were laid upon the table; then one hand only of each person; then the table was touched by the tips only of all the fingers; then by the fingers of one hand alone; then with one finger only. Still the motions and sounds continued with but slightly diminished force. If our theory of involuntary pressure was correct, the force should have diminished in precise proportion to the lessened points of contact. Moreover, it did not explain the fact, continually before our eyes, of the table being raised several inches from the floor on one side only, the muscular action of the fingers upon that side of the table being antagonistic and not contributory to such a motion! We continued our experiments with lessened faith in our foregone conclusion. First, one person withdrew from all contact; then a second, and a third, until one finger of one person only touched the table. Nevertheless it moved, the sounds continued to come from it, and a frequent motion was the lifting up of the table at the side on which the finger was pressing down, if exercising any pressure whatever. I should state that at all of these test experiments the tables employed were large and heavy dining tables, some nine feet and some twelve feet long, with six legs or more, in daily use in the dining-rooms of members of the committee, standing upon Turkey carpets, therefore not easily slid and difficult to move by the arm. We next tried a more decisive test. All hands were joined and held over the table at the height of three inches from it, no part of any hand touching it, the room



being well lighted with gas and all eyes keeping careful watch upon the lifted hands. The sounds were heard and the motions produced as before. It was suggested that possibly the feet might be at work; so two of the members seated themselves under the table to observe. The motions and sounds continued, but not a foot stirred. Then all the persons present stood, so that *no* foot could touch the table unseen. Still it moved. Lastly we devised a test that conclusively settled the question as to the possible agency of muscular action, conscious or unconscious. It was contrived thus:—All present turned the backs of their chairs to the table, and, kneeling upon the chairs, placed their arms upon the backs of the chairs, their hands being extended above the table, but without possibility of contact with it. The chairs were first placed six inches from the table, with which, as the reader will readily understand, neither foot nor hand, nor any part of the person, of any of those present could possibly come into contact unseen. In this position the table moved eight inches over the carpet and tilted several times. The chairs were then withdrawn further from the table, on each trial to an increased distance, and with the same results. At the distance of two feet from it the motions were continued, with but slightly diminished power. I must repeat that this was tried in the dining-rooms of members, some of them in my own house, with none present but the Committee and the Psychic. These experiments of motion without contact were repeated many times at different meetings in different houses, and with the same results. Thus was our third and last explanatory conjecture, which we had eagerly accepted on the authority of Faraday, completely demolished by the facts, and we were compelled reluctantly to the conclusion that there is a Force, apparently proceeding from the human organisation, by which motion is produced in heavy substances without the employment of any muscular force, and without contact or material connection of any kind between such substances and the body of any person present. We agreed also that these sounds and motions were directed, frequently, by some *intelligence*; but as the duty of the committee was merely to ascertain the facts, and not to inquire into causes, with these conclusive proofs of the physical facts we closed the investigation and reported accordingly.

I present here the entire of that report:

Since their appointment on the 16th of February, 1869, your sub-committee have held *forty* meetings for the purpose of experiment and test.

All of these meetings were held at the private residences of members of the committee, purposely to preclude the possibility of prearranged mechanism or contrivance.

The furniture of the room in which the experiments were conducted was on every occasion its accustomed furniture.

The tables were in all cases heavy dining tables, requiring a strong effort to move them. The smallest of them was 5ft. 9in. long, by 4ft. wide, and the largest 9ft. 3in. long and 4½ft. wide, and of proportionate weight.

The rooms, tables, and furniture generally were repeatedly subjected to careful examination before, during, and after the experiments, to ascertain that no concealed machinery, instrument, or other contrivance existed by means of which the sounds or movements hereafter mentioned could be caused.

The experiments were conducted in the light of gas, except, on the few occasions specially noted in the minutes.

Your committee have avoided the employment of professional or paid mediums, the mediumship being that of members of your sub-committee, persons of good social position and of unimpeachable integrity, having no pecuniary object to serve, and nothing to gain by deception.

Your committee have held some meetings without the presence of a medium (it being understood that throughout this report the word "medium" is used simply to designate an individual without whose presence the phenomena described either do not occur at all, or with greatly diminished force and frequency), purposely to try if they could produce, by any efforts, effects similar to those witnessed when a medium was present. By no endeavours were they enabled to produce anything at all resembling the manifestations which took place in the presence of a medium.

Every test that the combined intelligence of your committee could devise has been tried with patience and perseverance. The experiments were conducted under a great variety of conditions, and ingenuity has been exerted in devising plans by which your committee might verify their observations and preclude the possibility of imposture or delusion.

Your committee have confined their reports to *facts* witnessed by them in their collective capacity, which facts were *palpable to the senses*, and *their reality capable of demonstrative proof*.

Of the members of your sub-committee about *four-fifths* entered upon the investigation wholly sceptical as to the reality of the alleged phenomena, firmly believing them to be the result either of *imposture* or of *delusion*, or of *involuntary muscular action*. It was only by irresistible evidence under conditions that precluded the possibility of either of those solutions, and after trial and test many times repeated, that the most sceptical of your sub-committee were slowly and reluctantly convinced that the phenomena exhibited in the course of their protracted inquiry were veritable facts.

The result of their long-continued and carefully-conducted experiments, after trial by every detective test they could devise, has been to establish conclusively:

First: That under certain bodily or mental conditions of one or more of the persons present, a force is exhibited sufficient to set in motion heavy substances, without the employment of any muscular force, without contact or material connection of any kind between such substances and the body of any person present.

Second: That this force can cause sounds to proceed, distinctly audible to all present, from solid substances not in contact with, nor



having any visible or material connection with, the body of any person present, and which sounds are proved to proceed from such substances by the vibration which are distinctly felt when they are touched.

Third: That this force is frequently directed by intelligence.

At *thirty-four* out of the forty meetings of your committee some of these phenomena occurred.

A description of one experiment, and the manner of conducting it, will best show the care and caution with which your committee have pursued their investigations.

So long as there was contact, or even the possibility of contact, by the hands or feet, or even by the clothes of any person in the room, with the substance moved or sounded, there could be no perfect assurance that the motions and sounds were not produced by the person so in contact. The following experiment was therefore tried:

On an occasion when eleven members of your sub-committee had been sitting round one of the dining-tables above described for forty minutes, and various motions and sounds had occurred, they, by way of test, turned the backs of their chairs to the table, at about nine inches from it. They all then knelt upon their chairs, placing their arms upon the backs thereof. In this position, their feet were of course turned away from the table, and by no possibility could be placed under it or touch the floor. The hands of each person were extended over the table at about four inches from the surface. Contact, therefore, with any part of the table could not take place without detection.

In less than a minute the table, untouched, moved *four* times; at first about *five* inches to one side, then about *twelve* inches to the opposite side, and then, in like manner, four inches and six inches respectively.

The hands of all present were next placed on the backs of their chairs, and about a foot from the table, which again moved, as before, *five* times, over spaces varying from four to six inches. Then all the chairs were removed twelve inches from the table, and each person knelt on his chair as before, this time however folding his hands behind his back, his body being thus about eighteen inches from the table, and having the back of the chair between himself and the table. The table again moved four times, in various directions. In the course of this conclusive experiment, and in less than half-an-hour, the table thus moved, without contact or possibility of contact with any person present, thirteen times, the movements being in different directions, and some of them according to the request of various members of your sub-committee.

The table was then carefully examined, turned upside down and taken to pieces, but nothing was discovered to account for the phenomena. The experiment was conducted throughout in the full light of gas above the table.

Altogether, your sub-committee have witnessed upwards of *fifty* similar motions without contact on *eight* different evenings, in the houses of members of your sub-committee, the most careful tests being applied on each occasion.

In all similar experiments the possibility of mechanical or other

contrivance was further negatived by the fact that the movements were in various directions, now to one side, then to the other; now up the room, now down the room—motions that would have required the co-operation of many hands or feet; and these, from the great size and weight of the tables, could not have been so used without the visible exercise of muscular force. Every hand and foot was plainly to be seen, and could not have been moved without instant detection.

Delusion was out of the question. The motions were in various directions, and were witnessed simultaneously by all present. They were matters of measurement, and not of opinion or of fancy.

And they occurred so often, under so many and such various conditions, with such safeguards against error or deception, and with such invariable results, as to satisfy the members of your sub-committee by whom the experiments were tried, wholly sceptical as most of them were when they entered upon the investigation *that there is a force capable of moving heavy bodies without material contact, and which force is in some unknown manner dependent upon the presence of human beings.*

Your sub-committee have not, collectively, obtained any evidence as to the nature and source of this force, but simply as to *the fact of its existence.*

There appears to your committee to be no ground for the popular belief that the presence of sceptics interferes in any manner with the production or action of the force.

In conclusion, your committee express their unanimous opinion that the one important physical fact thus proved to exist, *that motion may be produced in solid bodies without material contact, by some hitherto unrecognised force operating within an undefined distance from the human organism, and beyond the range of muscular action,* should be subjected to further scientific examination, with a view to ascertain its true source, nature, and power.

The notes of the experiments made at each meeting of your sub-committee are appended to this report.

#### ADDITIONAL EXPERIMENTS.

But although as a committee our work was ended, the phenomena we had witnessed, and of whose reality we were assured by the most conclusive evidence, could not but induce in the most thoughtful of the members various conjectures as to the nature and origin of the Force whose existence had thus been exhibited to them, and it is not surprising that wide differences of opinion should have prevailed among us as to its source. For my own part, I resolved to hold my judgment in suspense, and to continue the investigation with a view to learn, if possible, the causes of the phenomena I had so unexpectedly witnessed. Accordingly, the experiments were resumed under new conditions and with further tests.

It would be tedious and needless to describe fully each of these experiments. Those of the sub-committee are fully set forth in



the appendix to the published report(a) of the Dialectical Society, to which the reader is referred. I will merely state briefly the most interesting results of these investigations, premising that all but three of them were made with *unpaid and unprofessional* Psychics.

1. The hand of the Psychic being held over it, a musical box upon the table untouched turned half round by four movements.

2. A sheet of paper was suspended by one corner from a pin which the Psychic held at the ends between the thumb and fingers, so that the hand could not touch the paper. Many taps, as if made with the point of a needle, were distinctly heard upon the paper.

3. The sounds frequently seemed to be directed by intelligence. They were made often in pursuance of and in answer to requests—as that so many blows should be struck, that the tappings should beat time to music, that they should be loud or soft, quick or slow.

4. So also, in like manner, the motions of the table, when untouched as well as when touched, were in exact accordance with requests, such as that it should tilt on this side or on that so many times. This was so frequent an occurrence that it was impossible to attribute it to accidental coincidence. So far from obedience being rare, as some scientists have conjectured, failure was the rare exception.

5. Occasionally the phenomena continued after the departure of the Psychic from the room, but in such cases they gradually diminished in power until they ceased entirely.

All the above phenomena were witnessed by the Investigation Committee of the Dialectical Society in the course of their experiments. The following experiments were witnessed by myself elsewhere.

#### EXPERIMENT I.

The next experiment was with the same Psychic, in the house of Dr. Edmunds, with a dining table of unusual weight and size. The same test, by turning the backs of the chairs to the table and the experimentalists kneeling upon them, produced the same results, but to a much greater extent than we had before witnessed. In that position of the entire party, a heavy dining table moved six times—once over a space of eight inches at a swing. Then the party, holding hands, stood in a circle round the table, at the distance from it, first, of two feet, then of three feet, so that con-

---

(a) *Report of the Committee of the London Dialectical Society, on the asserted Phenomena of Spiritualism*, p. 407 (Longman and Co.). A cheap edition, at 5s. 6d., has since been published by Burus, Southampton-row.

tact by any person present was physically impossible. In this position, the table lurched four times, once over a space of *more than two feet*, and with great force. The extent of these movements without contact will be understood when I state that in the course of them *this ponderous table turned completely round*, that is to say, the end that was at the top of the room when the experiment began was at the bottom of the room when it concluded. The most remarkable part of this experiment was the finale. The table had been turned to within about two feet of a complete reversal of its first position, and was standing out of square with the room. The party had broken up, and were gathered in groups about the room. Suddenly the table was swung violently over the two feet of distance between its then position and its proper place, and set exactly square with the room, literally knocking down a lady who was standing in the way, in the act of putting on her shawl for departure. At that time *nobody was touching the table*, nor even within reach of it, except the young lady who was knocked down by it.

#### EXPERIMENT II.

The next experiment was with another Psychic, in another place, but at the house of a personal friend, so that I have the best assurance that there could have been no such pre-arrangement of mechanism in the room as would have been necessary to produce the effects I describe.

It was a double drawing-room, in one of which was a table of considerable weight. The Psychic (a Lady who was *unpaid*, but known to be a Psychic), was taking tea in one room, and I had gone with three friends—one of whom had never before witnessed the phenomena—into the other room to look at some pictures. While we were thus engaged, very loud sounds, as of violent blows, came from a large loo table, which stood alone in the centre of the room—*nobody being near it*. We turned to look at the table, and untouched it tilted up almost to an angle of 45°, and continued in that position for nearly a minute. Then it fell back. Then it repeated the movement on the other side. None of us were standing within five feet of it at that time. The room was well lighted with gas. There was no cloth upon the table, and all beneath it was distinctly visible. Only four persons were in the room, and no one touched it, nor was near enough to touch it had he tried. The Psychic was six feet from it. Seeing this I said in jest, "Will you come to me?" To my amazement it came, crossing the floor for a space of seven feet. Almost doubting my senses, I said, "You have done so much, oblige me by going to that gentleman," pointing to a friend who was standing on the other side of the room nearly ten feet from me. To complete my astonishment, it complied with my request and went. It glided



over the carpeted floor of the drawing-room. Four persons were in the room, and witnessed this phenomenon.

#### EXPERIMENT III.

Alterations in the weight of tables and other furniture have been frequently exhibited. Bidding the table to be light, a finger lifted it; the next moment, bidding it to be heavy, the entire force of the body was required to raise it from the floor. It was, however, suggested by myself and others who were engaged in the *scientific* investigation of the phenomena of Psychic Force, that possibly this change in the weight of the subject of the Force might be merely in our own sensations, and not an actual change in the gravity of the wood or the operation of any pressure upon it. To test this, a weighing machine was constructed with a hook to fix to the table, the index accurately marking the weight of whatever was attached to it. Applying this machine to the table and other bodies, we found that the change was really in themselves, and not sensational merely, as we had suspected. This simple experiment was tried so often, and with so many precautions, as to establish it beyond doubt. The weights varied at every trial, but all proved the reality of the Force that was operating. One instance will suffice. Weighed by the machine, the normal weight of a table, raised from the floor 18in. on one side, was 8lb.; desired to be light, the index fell to 5lb.; desired to be heavy, it advanced to *eighty-two* pounds; and these changes were instantaneous and repeated many times.

#### EXPERIMENT IV.

Not only is motion communicated to the table or other article of furniture where the Psychic is, but everything within some definite, though as yet undefined, distance from the Psychic appears to be subjected to the Force. The smaller furniture of the room is frequently attracted to the place at which the Psychic sits. Chairs far out of reach and untouched may be seen moving along the floor in a manner singularly resembling the motion that may be observed in pieces of steel attracted by a magnet, which rise a little, fall, move on, stop, until fully within the influence of the magnetic force, and then jump to the magnet with a sudden spring. The chairs that are so often seen to come across a room to the Psychic usually approach by irregular motions, gliding for a short space, stopping, moving, and so on, until fully within the influence, and then the last movement is by a rapid jump. Larger articles of furniture are attracted in like manner according to weight; chairs move easily the whole length of a large room; a sofa will advance 2ft. or 3ft. only. Plainly the Force is limited in power; it can move only a certain *weight*; bulk is no impediment to its exercise. Nor is this phenomenon

at all dubious to the spectator. It cannot be fanciful ; it is not a delusion. However it may be done, *the fact* is indisputable that it is done. The chairs start from the wall against which they are placed ; the sofa rolls forward ; the smaller tables approach. This occurs in the light of gas, in the private room of any person who makes trial of it, is seen by all, and often gives inconvenient proof of the fact by encompassing the seated circle. At one experiment six drawing-room chairs were attracted from the other side of the room over distances ranging from 6ft. to 10ft., and thrust themselves against the circle ; two large easy chairs advanced 3ft. ; a large settee advanced about 2ft. No person was near either of them. In another experiment in my own lighted drawing-room, as the Psychic was entering the door with myself, *no other person being there*, an easy chair, of great weight, that was standing 14ft. from us, was suddenly lifted from the floor, and drawn to him with great rapidity, precisely as a huge magnet would attract a mass of iron.

From the above experiments it is not unreasonable that they who witnessed them thoughtfully should have concluded—

I. That there is a force other than the Forces of Nature hitherto recognised. But whether it is the one Force which is said to change merely its form according to the substance in which it is exhibited, or a Force entirely distinct from the known Physical Forces, and subject to other laws associated with vitality, there is not as yet sufficient evidence to determine.

II. That this Force produces positive sounds and motions in solid bodies brought within the radius of its influence.

III. That this Force is found to operate at an undefined, but not indefinite, distance from the human body.

IV. That it is developed (so as to be perceptible to the senses by its effects) in certain persons only, to whom the name of Psychics has been given.

V. That Psychics are not distinguished from other persons by any perceptible peculiarity of mental or bodily organisation. They are of either sex, of all ages, of all degrees of intelligence, of varying physical powers, of all degrees of bodily health, of all countries and races.

VI. That there is some, but not sufficient, evidence, that the power of a Psychic is a special faculty (such as is a genius for music, poetry, &c.) and that it is often inherited.

VII. That it is probable (but not yet proved), that this Force proceeds from, or is intimately associated with, the nerve organisation, and is possessed by all human beings in a greater or less degree, but in their ordinary conditions producing no external effects perceptible by the senses ; that when possessed to an extraordinary extent, this Force is projected beyond the body, and causes motions and sounds in the objects permeated by it, or upon which it impinges.



VIII. That there is some, but not yet sufficient, evidence, that Psychic Force, and what physiologists have termed "vital force," and Dr. Richardson the "nerve ether," are identical.

IX. That in some manner, as yet not investigated and therefore not ascertained, a concurrence of the Psychic Forces of several persons promotes the activity of the Force exhibited by the Psychic.

X. That it is as yet undetermined whether it is the possession of Psychic Force in a rare degree that makes itself perceptible by its operation upon solid bodies, or if a Psychic is only a person who has not in himself a greater amount of the Force than others, but who possesses the power of attracting the combined Psychic Forces of the persons who are within a certain undefined radius from himself.

XI. That the Psychic Force is controlled and directed by the intelligence of the Psychic. That this intelligence frequently acts without consciousness by the Psychic. But if such action is that of the brain, or of an individuality distinct from the brain and incorporeal, there is as yet no sufficient evidence.

XII. That the condition of the Psychic during such unconscious direction of the Force is generally similar to, if not identical with, that of the somnambulist, whose intelligent acts are the result of unconscious action of the brain, which not only dreams, but causes the patient to act the dream.

Here is Evidence which, in any Court of Justice in the world, would be held to be conclusive proof of *the fact* asserted by the many witnesses whose honesty and capacity nobody can question. If so palpable a fact as the motion of an untouched table cannot be received on the testimony of so many observers, specially charged with the duty of noting and testing, truth in any matter must be unattainable and treatises on evidence are a mockery. All the facts of Science must equally be denied, for not one of them is established by better evidence than is this fact of motion without contact. To the unanimous attestation of so many well qualified examiners, it appears an impertinence to add the testimony of an individual. But it may, perhaps, be permitted to me to say that, since the publication of the report of the Society, I have pursued the inquiry with diligence and care, and I have seen and preserved a written record of the apparently automatic motion of heavy furniture no less than *fifty-four* times, in circumstances that preclude the possibility

of deception or illusion. The following is one specimen selected from many.

#### EXPERIMENT V.

On Tuesday, June 2, 1873, a personal friend, a gentleman of high social position, a graduate of Oxford, came to my residence in Russell-square to dress for a dinner party to which we were invited. He had previously exhibited considerable power as a Psychic. Having half-an-hour to spare, we went into the dining-room. It was just six o'clock and of course broad daylight. I was opening letters; he was reading the *Times*. My dining table is of mahogany, very heavy, old-fashioned, six feet wide, nine feet long! It stands on a Turkey carpet, which much increases the difficulty of moving it. A subsequent trial showed that the united efforts of *two strong men standing* were required to move it one inch. There was no cloth upon it, and the light fell full under it. No person was in the room but my friend and myself. Suddenly, as we were sitting thus, frequent and loud rappings came upon the table. My friend was then sitting holding the newspaper with both hands, one arm resting on the table, the other on the back of a chair, and turned sideways from the table, so that his legs and feet were not under the table but at the side of it. Presently the solid table quivered as if with an ague fit. Then it swayed to and fro so violently as almost to dislocate the big pillar-like legs, of which there are eight. Then it moved forward about three inches. I looked under it to be sure that it was not touched; but still it moved and still the blows were loud upon it.

This sudden access of the Force at such a time and in such a place, with none present but myself and my friend, and with no thought then of invoking it, caused the utmost astonishment in both of us. My friend said that nothing like it had ever before occurred to him. I then suggested that it would be an invaluable opportunity, with so great a power in action, to make trial of *motion without contact*, the presence of two persons only, the daylight, the place, the size and weight of the table, making the experiment a crucial one. Accordingly we stood upright, he on one side of the table, I on the other side of it. We stood two feet from it and held our hands eight inches above it. In one minute it rocked violently. Then it moved over the carpet a distance of seven inches. Then it rose three inches from the floor on the side on which my friend was standing. Then it rose equally on my side. Finally my friend held his hands four inches over the end of the table, and asked that it would rise and touch his hand three times. It did so; and then, in accordance with the like request, it rose to my hand held at the other end to the same height above it and in the same manner.



With such conclusive proofs before me it is impossible to doubt that there is *some Force*, whatever it may be, *by which heavy bodies are moved without muscular contact or effort*. What it is, whence it comes, and how it operates in the production of these results, are questions in no way affecting the fact. These problems it is the province of science to solve by experiment, when the fact itself is *proved*.

That there *is* a Force by which heavy bodies are moved without muscular contact is established by such an overwhelming mass of evidence that it would be taken as confirmed beyond dispute, had the subject not been one upon which a strange mass of prejudice has been concentrated.

But mechanical proofs have been had of the existence of a Psychic Force, and it has been subjected to positive *measurement*. I cite from the same work the remarkable experiments by which this important fact was verified.

#### EXPERIMENT VI.

It is a peculiar feature of this controversy that none of its opponents have witnessed the phenomena they deny. They endeavour to answer a *fact* by an argument. But it was desired to leave no objection unanswered, however foolish and frivolous ; and therefore some *mechanical* test was sought, by which the presence and power of the Force, if real and not ideal, would be exhibited by metal and wood, which could be the subject of no self-delusion and would register the results truly, without prejudice, favour, or affection. Accordingly, an ingenious apparatus was devised by Mr. Crookes, F.R.S., designed to exhibit the amount of any force exercised upon a board so placed that no muscular force, however great, applied to one end of it, could produce the slightest pressure on the other end. That it did not so, in fact, was proved by this, that when others than the Psychic threw into it the utmost power of their arms, they produced not the slightest motion of the index that marked the degree of pressure upon the board.

Further, to make assurance doubly sure, it was tried in *five* ways :

First, the Psychic placed his finger on the end of the board, within the fulcrum, where no amount of pressure could affect the board or move the index.

Second, he placed one finger of each hand in a vessel of water

standing upon the fulcrum, which made pressure on the board *scientifically* impracticable.

Third, he did not touch the apparatus at all, but sat at some distance from it, his hands and feet being held, which made muscular pressure upon any part of it *physically* impossible.

Fourth, the same experiments were tried with another Psychic, and with the same result.

Fifth, the same experiments were tried with other persons, not being Psychics, and no effect whatever was produced.

In these experiments the presence of the Psychic Force was distinctly proved, not by the fallible senses of the spectators, but by the infallible, because unimpassioned, evidence of wood and metal.

Dr. Huggins, F.R.S., and myself were requested to attend the trial of the experiments, as witnesses, merely to attest the honesty and accuracy of the proceedings.

Having witnessed them, we certified to Mr. Crookes our own conviction that all had been fairly done, and that the results were shown as he had stated. Dr. Huggins reserved all opinion as to the causes of the phenomena, and I stated my conviction that they were purely Psychic, and in no way produced by Spirits of the Dead.

Fully to appreciate these experiments and their results, the reader should clearly understand with what object they were devised.

Mr. Crookes, F.R.S., had witnessed many of the experiments detailed in the preceding pages, by which motion without material contact was demonstrated. He had examined them with the scepticism that is the proper attitude of Science towards new and strange facts, until they are established by repeated trials and demonstrative proofs. Having anxiously applied to them the same amount of cautious test as he would have required for a new fact in chemistry, he was satisfied that *motion without material contact* was not the unreality he had anticipated. But, although informed by all his senses that it was a truth, he knew that the senses were subject to delusion, and, therefore, he sought anxiously for some test incapable of self-deception. *Metal* and *wood*, he argued, have no emotions; *they* cannot be biologised; *they* have no imagination; *they* neither deceive themselves nor others; *they* will not only exhibit the presence of any Force that may exist, but measure the amount of it.

The instrument was the result of these reflections,

I extract Mr. Crookes's description of the apparatus :

It consisted of a mahogany board, 36in. long by 9½in. wide and 1in. thick. At each end a strip of mahogany 1½in. wide was screwed on, forming feet. One end of the board rested on a firm table, whilst the other end was supported by a spring balance hanging from a substantial



tripod stand. The balance was fitted with a self-registering index, in such a manner that it would record the maximum weight indicated by the pointer. The apparatus was adjusted so that the mahogany board was horizontal, its foot resting flat on the support. In this position its weight was 3lb., as marked by the pointer of the balance.

Two knobs were screwed to the board on which the fingers were placed, and the foot or fulcrum of the board was immediately below them, so that no amount of pressure on the knobs could produce the slightest pressure on the board.

The Psychic with whom the first series of experiments was tried was Mr. Home. The only persons present were Mr. Crookes, F.R.S., Dr. Huggins, F.R.S., the brother and assistant of Mr. Crookes, and myself; the place was a private room in Mr. Crookes's residence. The apparatus was not seen by nor explained to the Psychic before the experiment was commenced. The room was well lighted with gas. I sat on one side of the Psychic, closely watching him. Dr. Huggins sat on the other side of him, keeping equally close watch upon the apparatus. Mr. Crookes took notes of the motions of the index. The others stationed themselves near to us, as additional observers to secure the most entire accuracy. The Psychic could not possibly have moved a finger from the knob on which it was laid without being seen by one of the three pairs of keen eyes which were purposely fixed upon him, watching.

Such being the position of the party, the experiment commenced, and I extract the result from the report of Mr. Crookes.

Mr. Home placed the tips of his fingers lightly on the extreme end of the mahogany board which was resting on the support, whilst Dr. (Huggins) and myself sat, one on each side of it, watching for any effect which might be produced. Almost immediately the pointer of the balance was seen to descend. After a few seconds it rose again. This movement was repeated several times, as if by successive waves of the Psychic Force. The end of the board was observed to oscillate slowly up and down during the experiment.

Mr. Home now of his own accord took a small hand-bell and a little card match-box, which happened to be near, and placed one under each hand, to satisfy us, as he said, that he was not producing the downward pressure. The very slow oscillation of the spring balance became more marked, and Dr. (Huggins), watching the index, said that he saw it descend to 6½lb. The normal weight of the board, as so suspended, being 3lb., the additional downward pull was therefore 3½lb. On looking immediately afterwards at the automatic register, we saw that the index had at one time descended as low as 9lb., showing a maximum pull of 6lb. upon a board whose normal weight was 3lb.

In order to see whether it was possible to produce much effect on the spring balance by pressure at the place where Mr. Home's fingers had been, I stepped upon the table and stood on one foot at the end of the board. Dr. (Huggins) who was observing the index of the balance, said that the whole weight of my body (149lb.) so applied only sunk the index

1½lb., or 2lb. when I jerked up and down. Mr. Home had been sitting in a low easy-chair, and could not, therefore, had he tried his utmost, have exerted any material influence on these results. I need scarcely add that his feet as well as his hands were closely guarded by all in the room.

The board was arranged perfectly horizontally, and it was particularly noticed that Mr. Home's fingers were not at any time advanced more than 1½in. from the extreme end, as shown by a pencil-mark, which, with (Dr. Huggins's) acquiescence, I made at the time. Now, the wooden foot being also 1½in. wide, and resting flat on the table, it is evident that no amount of pressure exerted within this space of 1½in. could produce any action on the balance. Again, it is also evident that, when the end furthest from Mr. Home sank, the board would turn on the further edge of this foot as on a fulcrum. The arrangement was consequently that of a see-saw, 36in. in length, the fulcrum being 1½in. from one end; were he therefore to have exerted a downward pressure, it would have been in opposition to the force which was causing the other end of the board to move down.

The publication of these experiments in the *Quarterly Journal of Science* caused, as might have been expected, much excitement in the scientific world as well as among the general public, and many criticisms were made upon them. Some objections were offered to the sufficiency of the tests and were thus answered by MR. CROOKES.

The objection has been raised that announcements of such magnitude should not be made on the strength of one or two experiments hastily performed. I reply that the conclusions were not arrived at hastily, nor on the results of two or three experiments only. In my former paper (*Quarterly Journal of Science*, p. 340), I remarked:—"Not until I had witnessed these facts some half-dozen times, and scrutinised them with all the critical acumen I possess, did I become convinced of their objective reality." Before fitting up special apparatus for these experiments, I had seen, on five separate occasions, objects, varying in weight from 25lb. to 100lb., temporarily influenced in such a manner, that I and others present could with difficulty lift them from the floor. Wishing to ascertain whether this was a physical fact, or merely due to a variation in the power of our own strength under the influence of imagination, I tested with a weighing-machine the phenomenon on two subsequent occasions when I had an opportunity of meeting Mr. HOME at the house of a friend. On the first occasion, the increase of weight was from 8lb. normally, to 36lb., 48lb., and 46lb., in three successive experiments tried under strict scrutiny. On the second occasion, tried about a fortnight after, in the presence of other observers, I found the increase of weight to be from 8lb. to 23lb., 43lb., and 27lb., in three successive trials, varying the conditions. As I had the entire management of the above-mentioned experimental trials, I employed an instrument of great accuracy, and took every care to exclude the possibility of the results being influenced by trickery, I was not unprepared for a satisfactory result when the fact was properly tested in my own laboratory. The meeting on the occasion formerly described was, therefore, for the purpose of confirming my previous observations by



the application of crucial tests, with carefully-arranged apparatus of a still more delicate nature."

Mr. CROOKES modestly stated at the same time that, though new to this country, the existence of Psychic Force was not a new discovery. Others had preceded us.

I am informed by my friend, Professor Boutlerow, that during the last winter he tried almost the same experiments as those here detailed, and with still more striking results. The normal tension on the dynamometer being 100lb., it was increased to about 150lb., Mr. Home's hands being placed in contact with the apparatus in such a manner that any exertion of power on his part would diminish, instead of increase the tension.

In 1854, Count Agenor de Gasparin published a book, giving full details of a large series of physical experiments which he had tried with some private friends in whom this Force was found to be strongly developed. His experiments were very numerous, and were carried on under the strictest test conditions. The fact of motion of heavy bodies without mechanical contact was demonstrated over and over again. Careful experiments were made to measure the force both of gravitation and of levitation thus communicated to the substances under trial, and an ingenious plan was adopted by which Count de Gasparin was enabled to obtain a rough numerical estimate of the power of the Psychic Force in each individual. The author finally arrived at the conclusion that all these phenomena are to be accounted for by the action of natural causes, and do not require the supposition of miracles nor the intervention of spirits or diabolical influences. He considers it as a fact, fully established by his experiments, that the will, in certain states of the organism, can act at a distance on inert matter, and most of his work is devoted to ascertaining the laws and conditions under which this action manifests itself.

In 1855, M. Thury, a Professor at the Academy of Geneva, published a work, in which he passed in review Count de Gasparin's experiments, and entered into full details of researches he had been simultaneously carrying on. Here, also, the trials were made with private friends, and were conducted with all the care which a scientific man could bring to bear on the subject.

The conclusions of M. THURY were very nearly those at which the *scientific* experimentalists in England have arrived. They are worth citing here.

1st Proposition : In the ordinary conditions of the body the will only acts directly within the sphere of the organism. 2nd Proposition : Within the organism itself there are a series of mediate acts. 3rd Proposition : The substance on which the mind acts directly—the *psychode*—is only susceptible of every simple modification under the influence of the mind ; explanations which are based on the Intervention of Spirits. M. Thury refutes all these explanations, and considers the effect due to a peculiar substance, fluid, or agent, pervading, in a manner similar to the luminiferous ether of the scientist, all matter, nervous, organic, or inorganic—which he terms *psychode*. He enters into full discussion as to the properties of this state or form of matter, and proposes the term *ectenic*

force (*ixtina*, extension), for the power exerted when the mind acts at a distance through the influence of the psychode.

There is likewise another case on record in which similar test experiments were tried, with like results, by a thoroughly competent observer. The late Dr. Robert Hare, in one of his works, gives an engraving of an apparatus very similar to my own, by which the young man with whom he was experimenting was prevented from having any other communication with the apparatus except through water; yet, under these circumstances the spring balance indicated the exertion of a force equal to 18lb. The details of this experiment were communicated by Dr. Hare to the American Association for the advancement of science, at the meeting in August, 1855.

Objection having been made that Mr. Home might possibly, unnoticed by us watchers, have slid his fingers beyond the fulcrum of the board upon the board itself, and so produced the Force whose pressure was marked by the index, Mr. Crookes instituted a second series of experiments, with still more delicate instruments, and with still more decisive results. The Force was now exhibited *without contact by the Psychic*, thus effectually disposing of *that* doubt. At this trial Mr. Home sat at a distance of *two feet* from the apparatus, his hands and feet being held by the persons present. This also was in full light of gas. The index marked a pressure of several pounds, though it was standing alone in the room, untouched by any person. In another experiment the fingers were placed in a glass of water set upon the fulcrum, which also would make access to the board by those fingers impossible.

It will interest the reader to learn that the discovery by Mr. CROOKES of the Radiometer—still a scientific problem—was due to these experiments in Psychic Force. We had suggested as a test, the suspension of some light substance *in vacuo*. Small bodies were suspended in exhausted tubes. As the finger approached the glass they were seen to move, the motion varying with different persons. Our first conclusion was that this was due to the Psychic Force. But trying with inorganic substances some of these were found to cause like movements, and where heat and flame were present the motions were especially powerful. This led by a series of ingenious experiments to the puzzling of the entire scientific world by the construction of the radiometer.

---



## CHAPTER VI.

## THE PSYCHIC.

A PSYCHIC is a person whose organisation possesses an extraordinary amount of that force, whatever it be, by which the motions of solid bodies are produced, as described in the last chapter.

The Force itself is common to all human beings, in greater or less degree, for it is that by which the Conscious Self (or Soul) directs the motions of the material mechanism. Various names have been given to it, according to the conceptions of various physiologists and psychologists as to its source and seat. By some it is called *vital* force; that is, the life itself. Others have recognised it as the *nerve* force—the force that causes all the motions of the body. Dr. RICHARDSON contends that this nerve force extends beyond the extremities of the nerves, enveloping the body with a nerve aura, that radiates to various distances, in various persons, according to constitutional tendency.

The existence of such a nerve aura explains, in his opinion, the sympathies and antipathies that so often affect us, as we suppose, instinctively. To this is attributed also many of the “supersensuous perceptions” which most of us must have experienced. This is the force to which I have ventured to give the name of *Psychic Force*, to distinguish it from the *physical* forces, which it in no way resembles, and from the *organic* force or forces,—if these be not the same as the vital force and the nerve force.

Undoubtedly it resembles those organic forces in many of its features. But it differs from them in one most important particular. *Psychic Force is an intelligent force*—that is to say, it does the work of intelligence—which the other forces do not. The suggestion is not unreasonable that, if Soul exists, it must express itself upon the material world by some force. May not this force, so intimately associated with Intelligence, be the force that proceeds from the Conscious Self (or Soul)? There is at least sufficient of probability in the suggestion to justify the giving to this intelligent directing force the name of *Psychic* (or *Soul*) Force. A person possessing this in excess, and with whom, therefore, it may probably be projected beyond the surface of the body, may be appropriately termed a **PSYCHIC**. (a)

A **Psychic** may be of either sex, of any age, of any degree of intelligence, of any complexion, of any physique. There is nothing in external appearance to indicate the possession of the power. It is unknown even to its possessor. It is always discovered by an accident. It appears to be in no way a *mental* faculty, nor to be dependant in the least on mental capacity. The foolish are the subjects of it as often as the wise, the young as the old, the infant, the child, the youth, the man, the woman. One of the best **Psychics** I have known was a child in arms. It was enough to bring it within a few yards of the table to cause active motion. That the nurse was not the **Psychic** was proved by this, that by whomsoever the child was carried the effect was the same. Boys and girls of tender age are often possessed of great psychic power, which gradually declines and disappears after puberty.

The **Psychic** has no consciousness of any *mental* action

---

(a) The name given to such a person by the Spiritualists is "a Medium," and by that name he is commonly designated. But he was so termed on the assumption that he was a communicant between the living and the dead, thus begging the whole question. A neutral name was necessary to the scientific inquirer, and "*Psychic*" meets the requirement.



in the exercise of the force. He cannot summon it nor dismiss it by his Will. He cannot direct it by any desire or command. When great power is being exercised, a convulsive quivering agitates his limbs; but this is unattended with any painful or even disagreeable sensation. Apparent consciousness often continues during the phenomena and he converses freely and sensibly. But when the force is most powerful, it is always attended by unconsciousness; in fact, it is a state of trance. Long continuance of the abnormal condition is followed by a considerable amount of nervous exhaustion.

Psychics are to be found in almost every household, equally among all classes and conditions, from the highest social status downward. It is a vulgar error that assumes the existence of professional Psychics only. The private persons who possess this faculty, and exercise it only in their homes, are a hundredfold the number of those who practice Psychism for profit.

My own circle of acquaintances is not very extensive, but I have known among them no less than *thirty-two* Psychics. The position and callings of a few upon my list will show the improbability of imposture; and it must be remembered that if but one of the array be genuine, Psychism is proved.

That list of thirty-two comprises, *inter alia*: two Clergymen, four Barristers, three Scientists, two Bankers, an eminent Artist, two Merchants, a Peeress, the wife of a Baronet, of a Physician, of an high Ecclesiastical Dignitary; the children of an M.P., of a General in the Army, of a Lady of title, of a distinguished Artist. The others are scarcely less in social rank, and are equally respectable and reputable. It is scarcely credible that all of these, whose characters in every relation of life are unimpeached, should be not merely impudent impostors, but possessed of the skill and machinery of MASKELYNE and COOKE, wherewith to conduct their impostures.

All attempts to identify a Psychic by some peculiarities of aspect, temperament, or mental condition have failed utterly. When we have lighted upon some supposed

characteristic common to two or three, another is presented who contradicts the conclusion. Contrary to the general belief, as many men as women are Psychics.

This force, like all other faculties, increases with exercise, not in power merely but also in facility. It is irregular in its action. It varies with the condition of health. It is much affected by weather. It sometimes departs entirely for weeks, months, and even years, and then suddenly returns in greater power than ever; and both its going and coming are without an assignable cause. The best Psychics are the most capricious in this respect.

Psychic Force frequently comes at unexpected and often inconvenient times. With a lady of my acquaintance it will make itself awkwardly audible in church, in a railway carriage, when walking in the street. A shower of rappings comes upon the floor she is crossing; upon the gravel path, as she is strolling in the garden; upon the ceiling, walls, and doors of the room in which she sits, and this in the presence of company. Her dinner table is sometimes kept in continual motion, so that it is difficult to prevent the plates and glasses from being overthrown. This will often continue throughout the meal, more to the amazement than the comfort of unaccustomed guests.

Psychics, as I have said, are by no means rare. Large numbers are known to their friends, and to them only, as possessing this faculty. There are few families among whom a Psychic might not be found by patient trial. The process of discovery is very simple. A party, not less than four nor more than eight, old and young of both sexes, should sit round an ordinary drawing room table, place their hands upon it and spend an hour in conversation or music. Nothing may result for a week, or a fortnight, or longer. But persevere. The same party should assemble, if possible; but no stranger should be admitted while the experiment is being tried. After more or less of waiting, faint sounds of creaking will be heard in the fibres of the wood. These will grow in



number and intensity until they become positive and loud blows. The sounds are usually preceded and accompanied by motions of the table: at first a slight quivering, scarcely perceptible—then a kind of shuddering, so rapid that no muscular effort could probably produce it. Then come risings of the table from the floor, now on this side, now on that, now at one end, now at the other. When the force is fully developed, the table rises entirely from the floor, it may be an inch, it may be a yard, sometimes so high as to be carried over the heads of the sitters and is set down outside the circle. These sounds and motions may be questioned and will be found to be directed by *Intelligence*. Ask questions and they will be intelligibly, if not always intelligently, answered by any code of signals proposed at the beginning of the experiment. The usual course is to suggest that three blows shall mean "Yes," two blows "Doubtful," and one blow "No." Answers to questions will be thus given, sometimes by blows and sometimes by motions of the table. In either case, they are not slight and doubtful expressions of the force. They are audible and visible to all and their meaning is plain to all.

The ready answer which presents itself, to those who have never tried the experiment, is that which FARADAY suggested—unconscious muscular action. It was my own explanation of it, until repeated experiment assured me of its insufficiency. Sixteen hands upon a table might apply to it great muscular force, if each hand exercised only a pressure so small as to be imperceptible to the sitter, weary with keeping it in a somewhat constrained position. I thought I detected such a contraction of my own muscles. So long as but a finger touched the table or other solid body, I was not *assured*, however difficult the supposition, that the sounds and motions were not produced thus. It was not until I had witnessed the like motions and heard the same sounds *without contact by any person*, and this so often, under such tests, in such varied conditions and in so many localities, as to make delusion impossible and preclude the possibility of

mechanical contrivances, that I was *compelled, as a lover of truth*, to abandon the theory to which I had clung with the tenacity of a profound scepticism and acknowledge that the phenomena were the product of some hitherto imperfectly recognised force, which was in some manner associated with the human Intelligence.

This is precisely what may be learned in almost any family pursuing the investigation in its own home and with its own members, in the manner above stated.

It is sometimes difficult to ascertain who among the persons present is the possessor of the power to which these interesting and most instructive phenomena are due. "The Psychic" of the party may be certainly ascertained thus:

The persons present should successively leave the room. The cessation of the sounds and motions will speedily indicate to whose presence they were due. They may not cease instantly, for motion sometimes lingers, with decreasing power, after the Psychic has quitted the circle, apparently confirming the conclusion that the force accumulates in the solid body to which it is applied, as the electric force is accumulated in the electric jar. Sometimes it occurs that two or more Psychics are present and then, if one departs, the action will continue as of course. The presence of two or more will be discovered by the same process, if the experiment of successive removals be repeated two or three times in a different order.

When once the psychic faculty is found to be possessed, in however slight a degree, it will certainly be improved by practice and develope itself, not merely with greater power, but in a greater variety of forms. For this purpose, the Psychic should sit as often as he conveniently can, with the same circle and in the same room, and strongly desire (*mentally*, not by expression) that, instead of a repetition of phenomena already produced, others may be exhibited. Probably desire promotes the unconscious psychic action that appears to direct the force.

This *development* of the psychic faculty by practice



seems to me very antagonistic to the theory that attributes these phenomena to the presence of Spirits of the Dead. It is difficult to accept for *them* a necessity for education. But that necessity is entirely consistent with the theory that attributes the psychic action to a force proceeding from the non-material part of the Mechanism of Man—a faculty developed only in persons having a special organisation and under special conditions.

Dr. CARPENTER and others meet the asserted phenomena and the profoundly important conclusions which, if true, they establish, not by suggesting other sources of them, but by asserting that all Psychics, without exception, are impudent impostors—for it cannot be too often repeated that if any one of the hundreds of thousands of cases that have been reported be true, the *one* phenomenon so found to be is as important to science and as much demands investigation as if all had been true. The question is not if, among the legion of cases, there may not be some or even many impostures, but if there be *any genuine*. The value of the genuine few is in no degree diminished by the falsity of the fraudulent many.

Admitting, then, a large amount of imposture by pretended Psychics and of self-delusion by incautious spectators, it seems to me impossible to conclude that all, without a single exception, are impostors. Where a profit is to be made by imposition, impostors will always abound, and Dr. CARPENTER will find no difficulty in citing detections and confessions in abundance among the public exhibitors of pretended spiritualistic phenomena which, put together with the ingenuity of an Advocate (whose business it is to make out a case on one side only), will have the aspect of a formidable arraignment. So, on the other side, an Advocate of equal skill could, by presenting the uncontradicted reports of intelligent and competent witnesses and suppressing all the facts that told against him, make an equally plausible case in the affirmative. Dr. CARPENTER is in this matter

not a Judge but an Advocate. Had he assumed the functions of a Judge, which is the proper attitude of true Science towards new facts, or, facts affirmed by credible and competent witnesses, he would have sought to find what the truth is and not merely to prove this or that "prepossession" to be true. For this purpose he would have presented the facts and arguments on *both* sides, produced the witnesses *for* as well as *against*, compared their qualifications as observers, weighed their testimony, and pronounced a judgment formed on a *review of the whole case*. But Dr. CARPENTER has not done this. He has not acted in the true spirit of science, inquiring "what the truth is." He has been content to purchase a cheap popularity by assuming the attitude of an Advocate—a very clever Advocate, indeed, but still only an Advocate, and making a case on one side only—a feat that would have done him infinite credit as a Lawyer, but which, it must be confessed, is not creditable to a Man of Science.

For my own part, I have endeavoured, with what success others must determine, to enter upon and steadily to pursue the investigation of these and other psychic phenomena with a perfectly open mind, without any prejudice or prepossession, with no desire or design to support or to oppose any theory, but with an honest purpose to seek after *the very truth*. My purpose has not been to prove this to be true or that to be false, but to ask simply, "*What is the truth?*" I am as assured as any man can be of himself that I am possessed with no "dominant ideas." I know that I am in the full possession of my senses, and I find that in all the work of active life these senses do not often deceive me. I am assured that what I see *is*. I do not hear what is *not*. My touch tells me truly the forms of things. I believe that I am thoroughly sane,—that I have not even a "diluted insanity"—for in all business matters I am as sagacious and as sensible as the persons with whom I deal in the work of the busy world. Trained by long years of practice in the art of weighing evidence, trying



witnesses, and judging impartially, after looking upon both sides of every question, it was in the character of the Judge, and not in that of the Advocate, avowedly assumed by Dr. CARPENTER, that I ventured to examine for myself, with the assistance of the special qualifications which accident had conferred upon me. Nor have I been content with a few trials. I have accepted nothing as proved until it had been repeated many times, under various conditions, and with the most crucial tests. I have taken nothing upon trust. I have accepted nothing on hearsay. If what I have seen, heard and felt be delusion, then for me, at least, there is nothing real and nothing true. The evidence is precisely the same as that which assures me of the existence of the sun, of the speech of friends, of the being of the pen I hold. That all Psychics are not impostors, and all the phenomena not frauds, I know, because many of those Psychics are incompetent to the work, if they designed or desired fraud. Could a child in arms construct machinery? Could a little boy or girl ten years old, who had never left the nursery, rival in dexterity a conjuror whose art can be learned only by devotion to it of a life? It seems to be forgotten by Dr. CARPENTER and others, who attribute to trickery all that they cannot explain or that is hostile to their prepossessions, that *every* Psychic is not a public nor a paid exhibitor. On the contrary, these are but a small section of them. For one professional or public Psychic there are at least twenty in private life possessing this power, but exercised only in their homes and with their families, or with a few select friends bound to silence. If any ask, "why silence?" the answer is—because of the prejudices that have been diligently fostered by the Materialists, whose degrading doctrine the phenomena, if established, must scatter to the winds. This shrinking from unpopularity, abuse, and persecution is not peculiar to Psychics. When the phenomena of electricity and magnetism were denounced as black arts and dealings with the devil, they were pursued in secrecy by the timid, and martyrdom was

braved only by a few charlatans who incurred risk for the sake of gain. But ladies and gentlemen of our time will not gratuitously subject themselves to abuse and ridicule, and to be called cheats, impostors, rogues and vagabonds, and the rest of the vocabulary of frightened dogmatism. The fact is, as I have stated, that Psychics abound in private life, but unknown to the newspapers.

It is necessary also to state, once for all, that the greater portion of the phenomena recorded in these pages were witnessed by myself; that the Psychics were private persons belonging to the classes named above; that all the experiments were tried in private houses, many in my own rooms, under strict test conditions, where the use of mechanism was impossible, and often where collusion by confederates was excluded by the simple plan of having no person present but myself and the Psychic, and nothing was accepted as proved until it had been repeatedly tried under various conditions.

But Dr. CARPENTER is not content with directly or impliedly calling all Psychics impostors and the phenomena witnessed the result of trickery, which if true would be conclusive, needing no further explanation; but he goes on, needlessly if he is right in that, to contend that all the spectators are under the influence of "prepossession" and of "a dominant idea," and do not see with their eyes, nor hear with their ears. In plain terms they are the dupes, not of the impostor Psychic, but of their own senses.

This is an accusation easily made and difficult to refute. If Dr. CARPENTER tells me he sees a certain curious organic structure in his microscope, and I say to him, "You are deceived. You are prepossessed. You expected so to see and you think you so see. You don't. It's a delusion. Go to." Dr. CARPENTER would find it difficult to prove that his eyes told him true, for if he called others to witness, the same objection would apply to them. They, too, would be under "a prepossession." Critics might apply the same silly argu-



ment to all *his* physiological experiments and annihilate his credit and book together.

But without disputing the disturbing and often the deceiving effects of "prepossession and dominant idea," and admitting frankly the necessity for strictest guard against them in scientific (as indeed in all other) investigations, there are circumstances attending experiments in Psychism that demonstrate the absence of such an influence.

All the persons present see and hear the same things at the same time. No "prepossession" could so bias the imaginations of eight or ten persons that all shall be influenced to see, or think they see, the same thing at the same instant of time.

There is further assurance that the phenomena are not illusion. Even if, by a strange coincidence, so many persons could *imagine* the identical objects of sight or sound—how is it where actual changes have been made in the position of solid bodies—as of chairs, tables, books, and such like? The motion, according to the conjecture of Dr. CARPENTER, is imaginary merely. But there are the chairs actually standing on the table; sofa and pianoforte in the middle of the room; books lying half a dozen yards from the shelves on which they were standing when the experiment commenced. Does Dr. CARPENTER contend that this dislocation of the contents of the room is an imagination also? If so, what does he say as to the parlourmaid, required to restore them to their places? She was not one of the deluded party. She was not present. *She* would not be under the influence of "prepossession." Her only "dominant idea" *she* would express by "Drat them spirits, to give me all this trouble."

Yet again. These phenomena are not presented few and far between. The cases may now be counted by hundreds of thousands, have been witnessed and reported by at least fifty thousand different investigators in every civilised country, comprising among them the most competent scientific observers, the most experienced

triers of testimony, the most calm and unprejudiced of inquirers. Are *all* of these reported cases impostures? Is there no reality in any one of them? Are *all* these witnesses either lying or deluded? Is no one to be relied upon in this, although for all other purposes of life they would be accepted as authorities? Would Dr. CARPENTER be satisfied, if either of these reporters were to leave him a fat legacy, to have it disputed on the ground of "delusion?" The allied facts are by no means answered by showing that *some* are frauds. Fraud always treads upon the heels of fact. If profit is to be made by anything real, shams will assuredly be got up too. But the shams show the reality. There could be no imitation if there were not something to be imitated. It requires no great ingenuity, with a stage at command, by mechanical contrivance to produce a representation of anything whatever. If the beautiful experiments exhibited by Professor TYNDALL at the Royal Institution interested a sufficient number of persons to make imitations of them profitable, MASKELYNE and COOKE would speedily get up an entertainment in which they would show the same apparent results from contrivances of their own. But this would not prove the Professor to be an impostor, nor his experiments tricks and frauds. The true question is, if they or any other person can produce the same results *under the same conditions*. Will MASKELYNE and COOKE come to a private room, in a cab, unaccompanied by any friend, enter that room for the first time when the experiment commences, permit an examination of their persons, or even a change of clothes, suffer strangers to bind and seal them, and *then* produce the phenomena they exhibit on the stage of their own construction, under conditions of their own imposing? If they will do this, it will be admitted that they make out a case against the Psychic phenomena. But if they cannot do so, they stand convicted of being merely mechanical imitators, for that which *they* are invited and refuse to do *every Psychic does!* The experiments with the Psychic are not tried in a



room of his own choosing, with companions of his own selection, where mechanism can be brought, fixed, or used, or where confederates are to be found, or trickery is practicable without the almost certainty of detection. The experiments reported here were not only tried with Psychics who were *not* professional conjurors, having the skill that requires the practice of a whole lifetime, but ladies and gentlemen of social position and character, of the utmost honour and purity, religious, truthful, beloved by their families, respected by their friends, honoured by the world of which they are ornaments. Is it credible that *all* these persons, so excellent in every relationship of life, should, as Dr. CARPENTER contends, suddenly, and for a short time only, when every eye is on them and detection in trickery would destroy their characters for ever, become tricksters, impostors, liars, cheats, charlatans—that they should practise systematic imposition upon the families they love and the friends they regard, and this for no conceivable motive either of profit or fame—deceiving for deception's sake, and with not even a thirst for notoriety, seeing that to be known is to incur, not unpopularity merely, but abuse and ridicule and social persecution.

Not only were the experiments tried with persons of this class, but they were conducted under all conceivable conditions to insure accuracy of observation. They were tried in the houses of the Investigators—most of them in my own—so that I am absolutely certain that no *mechanism* was employed. Confederacy, to which Dr. CARPENTER attributes so much, was, in these cases at least, impossible, for none but the experimentalists were present with the Psychic. The experiments were not hastily tried, nor one only. They were repeated over and over again, under various conditions and with many tests, and none was held to be proved until every conjectured extraneous cause had been precluded by positive test. No facts in science rest upon so large a body of *proofs*. If this mass of evidence fails to show these facts to be true, we must relinquish in despair the

pursuit of all truth—we can say of nothing that “*it is*”—we must come to the nihilist conclusion “that nothing is but what is not.” We must close our Law Courts, burn our libraries, abolish our universities, and send our professors to crack stones upon the road. We ought at once to empty our prisons, for every prisoner there has been convicted upon evidence infinitely less in degree of proof than that by which many of the phenomena of Psychism are proved. The facts in Science asserted by Dr. CARPENTER himself cannot produce one-hundredth part of the proof that has verified the facts he denies. The greater portion of these, indeed, rest upon his own unsupported testimony. What would *he* say, or think, if they were called the dreams of “diluted insanity,” and *himself* the deluded victim of “prepossession” and “dominant ideas”—that *his* eyes did not see what he says they saw,—*his* ears did not hear what he says he heard—but were made “the fools of the other senses?”

The objection that these phenomena are contrary to the order of nature, and therefore to be denied, whatever the evidence of their being, is almost too absurd for serious answer. But it imposes upon some thoughtless persons and therefore may be briefly noticed here.

It assumes that we know all nature and all the laws of being. The fact is, that we are but upon the threshold of that knowledge. We have but dim glimpses into the scheme of creation; we know only according to the conditions of our own structure. Already the mathematicians are asserting that even their science, so long deemed to be the only necessary truth, is but modified truth after all—it is truth only to human conception, and the very truth is supposed to be quite other than that which appears to us to be truth. We can conceive but of three dimensions of space—length, breadth, and thickness. The mathematicians have arrived at the conclusion that space is probably of *four* dimensions, and that of this fourth dimension we are utterly unconscious, but that its existence renders possible things that to our limited capacities appear impossible, such for instance, as that a



hollow sphere can be turned inside out without fracture, and a knot tied in an endless cord. Thus the phenomena of Psychism, at first appearing to be so contrary to the natural laws, are found by the most recent Science to be possible mathematically and, if so, there is no reason why they should not also be *practically* true.

But more of this hereafter, when the Phenomena themselves have been introduced to the reader.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

## THE PHYSIOLOGY OF PSYCHIC FORCE.

THE question now presents itself, whence comes the force that is manifested in the presence of a Psychic?

The evidence is almost conclusive that it is intimately associated with, and probably proceeds from, the human organisation. It is not exhibited save in the presence, or in the near neighbourhood, of a human being. Its more or less of power is usually dependent upon conditions, mental and bodily, of that person. Whatever affects him affects the force in like measure. If Psychic Force exists, it must belong to all human beings in various degrees, Psychics being persons in whom some constitutional peculiarity has caused either an excessive development of the force, or an abnormal action of it, similar to that exhibited by sufferers from disorder of the nerve structure. Hence, perhaps, the advantage found in the union of the Psychic Force of many persons by some such connecting and conducting medium as a table or other article of furniture. Each person present may be supposed to contribute something towards the common fund of the force. Some think that the Psychic attracts and absorbs the force that flows from others and thus increases his own store of force. But of this there is no evidence. All we actually *know* is, that the force is much increased by forming a *circle* (which term must be understood for this purpose to intend, not sitting round a centre, for that is not necessary, but that the persons should stand or sit together, so that, if they were



ranged for the purpose of forming an electric chain, they would transmit the electric force from person to person through the entire chain). This may be accomplished either by actual contact, as by the holding of hands, or by mere touching of the fingers, or by some conducting medium. Hence the preference of a table for experiments with Psychic Force. Wood is apparently a conductor of the force; a table is convenient for sitters and is found in every room. Any other piece of wooden furniture would, however, be equally effective for the reception or conducting of the force, but extremely inconvenient for experiment. The preference for tables, so much ridiculed, is thus accounted for.

The Psychic Force is probably in part contributed by the persons forming the circle, the table operating as a conductor. It has been observed that when a table, or any other solid body, is used for connecting the party, there is no need to join the hands, from which it may be concluded that the conductor conveys the force from person to person and to the Psychic. It appears to perform also the function of collector and condenser of the force. Some evidence of this is found in the fact that the force is rarely manifested until some time has elapsed from the commencement of the experiment. Occasionally the table will exhibit activity in a few minutes; but generally half an hour, or more, passes before any sign of motion appears. The action usually commences faintly in sounds and in movements alike, growing by slow degrees in loudness and power. This seems to indicate that the force is accumulated in the table somewhat as is electricity in the coated jar. But, if so, it does not, like the electric fluid, lie on the surface only. It pervades the fibres of the wood, as is indicated by continual creaking. If the ear, or a stethoscope, be placed upon the table, these sounds are distinctly audible *in the centre of the wood*, as if its fibres were in motion. Thus heard, the sound does not resemble a blow on the surface, but a small explosion within the substance of the wood itself.

Other facts go far to confirm this conjecture as to the conducting and condensing uses of the table. I have observed that a large table is more efficient than a small one. It has been noticed, without a conjecture as to the cause, that a dining table is more easily and powerfully moved than a smaller table, although three or four times heavier. A party of five, who could obtain nothing more than a slight tremor at a small work table, on adjourning to a dining table twenty-fold heavier than was the small table, found it to move actively, while the small structure had scarcely stirred, although the same hands were laid on each in turn. Nor is the power exhibited at all proportioned to the number of the hands; nor is it a necessary condition that the size of the substance to be moved and the number of persons in contact with it should bear any relative proportion. Six hands will often raise from the floor, by one finger lightly laid on the surface, a heavy table upon which twelve hands could produce only a slight tremor.

Another important fact goes far to confirm this. The explanation commonly offered is, that the wood of the table becomes charged with the magnetism (as it is absurdly termed) of the persons who use it, and therefore the phenomena are elicited more speedily than when other solid bodies are employed. There is not the slightest evidence that the force is the Magnetic force; indeed, if it were, it could not be accumulated in the wood of a piece of furniture. This fact of *condensation* of the force is nevertheless obvious on a short acquaintance with the phenomena.

There is, however, some resemblance between the action of the *Psychic Force* and that of Magnetism. The Reader knows that if a bar of iron be laid north and south it will in a certain time become magnetic. Lying in the stream of magnetism that is ever flowing in this direction, the molecules of the iron, by the impact of the passing magnetic force, are gradually deflected until they assume a fixed position in the direction of the magnetic current and thus transmit it more readily. So



it is with the Psychic Force. Proceeding from the human mechanism and passing through the table, furniture, or floor, it is probable that the molecules composing the wood are by frequent impact gradually directed to the position that gives to the force the freest passage.

Thus it comes that the phenomena are more readily reproduced in rooms and with substances that have been frequently subjected to the action of the Psychic Force; in this resembling the Magnetic Force.

It has been asked, with some confidence, *how* any conceivable immaterial force proceeding from organic matter—say the Vital Force—can move solid bodies? Repeating that the question, “*Is it?*” is altogether distinct from the question, “*How is it?*” nothing in this is really more impossible or even improbable than are a thousand other facts in nature of which we have not yet discovered the causes and the conditions, but which we do not therefore dream of denying. The Magnetic Force does the like. *That immaterial force moves solid bodies.* We are wholly ignorant, at this moment, after centuries of investigation, what that Force is. We know not the precise process by which a bar of steel is drawn to a magnet without contact or connection, and even if a solid body be interposed.

Some of the conditions requisite to the exercise of Psychic Force are known. There are others as yet unknown, for its exhibition is increased, diminished or prevented by causes that cannot even be conjectured. The *known* conditions of its manifestation may be briefly stated :

Foremost is the presence of a *Psychic*.

A Psychic is already described as a person possessing some peculiarity of constitution by reason of which the Psychic Force, that is in all of us, in him is either in excess or subject to abnormal development. When so exercised, it appears to attract to itself the Psychic Force of other organisms, directly or by means of some conducting body. Experiment has not yet been sufficiently extensive to permit of a list being made of the substances

that are conductors or non-conductors of this force. Wood is certainly a better conductor than metal, thus differing from the electric force. Some woods are better conductors than others. Silk has been observed to be a bad conductor.

Every living human body appears to produce this force. But no fact is better established than that the force produced by one organism is often antagonistic to the force produced by other organisms. The difference seems to resemble that between positive and negative electricity. The presence of such an organism will always impede, and sometimes prevent, the action of the force. But it is purely a physical, not a mental, antagonism, and often found combined with the strongest *mental* sympathy. The action of the force does not in any degree depend upon belief or scepticism, as commonly supposed. Many of its most ardent believers are physically so antipathetic, from some unknown conditions, that their presence at any experiment impedes or mars it.

The process by which the force of the Psychic is influenced by the psychic forces about him is as yet but imperfectly ascertained. Does his greater force attract to itself their lesser forces and thus increase his power? Such would be the probable conclusion; but other facts appear to negative it. If the force of the Psychic is increased by force attracted from those near him, the force might be expected to increase in some proportion to the number of contributors. The fact is otherwise. Numbers usually diminish instead of increasing the force. An attempt has been made to account for this by the assumption that, as numbers increase, so do the chances of a link of the chain being composed of one of those persons of antagonistic nerve structure described above. Other facts point to the same conclusion. Instances are not uncommon of Psychics whose force is greatest when only two or three are with him. A Graduate of Oxford, my personal friend, who has extraordinary Psychic power, is never so attended by remarkable



exhibitions of the force as when he is sitting with one, or at most with two, friends in the freedom of a *tête-à-tête*.

The force is manifestly affected by whatever affects the bodily or mental health of the Psychic, and I think I have seen the like effect, although in less degree, when one of the persons present is in ill health or suffering mental depression. A cold or a headache will diminish always, and often suspend entirely, the action of the force, even with the most powerful Psychics. A glass of wine or a cup of coffee revives the flagging nerves and restores the force. Great benefit is found to result from occasionally suspending the experiment, breaking the circle, moving about, opening the doors and the windows. The theory of Spirits of the Dead does not explain this. To me it seems abundantly clear that the increase of force following such a pause is due to the new stimulus given to the exhausted organisms of the Psychic and the sitters, by the fresh air, the change of posture and the suspension of brain action.

I have spoken of harmony of mental action among the persons present as being necessary to the action of the force. Music has always an extraordinary influence in promoting this unity. The reason is that music causes a synchronous movement of all the minds present; that is to say, the molecules of the fibres of all the brains move together, and the forces projected from them flowing in like waves, the consequence is harmonious mental motion or emotion. When each brain is employed on a different subject, the molecular motion of each being different, the waves, instead of blending and moving in alliance, mingle, clash, and destroy one another—precisely as do the waves upon water when moved by various impulses, with various powers and velocities.

I do not affirm this solution to be *proved*, but it is suggested as a scientific and sensible explanation of the proved phenomenon. Careful experiment only can determine if it be correct, or what is the true explanation of the fact.

So far there is nothing strange nor improbable in Psychic Force. It appears to be an extremely probable form of exhibition of that special intelligent directing force which undoubtedly is exhibited by the Mechanism of Man. Assuming that the human organism is moved and directed by a force of some kind (and this fact will not be disputed by the most advanced Materialist) there is no *à priori* reason why that force should not operate beyond the extremities of the material structure through which it flows. That such a force *may* be passing, without consciousness of it by the individual or any other person, will not be questioned by those who have learned from Science that motions of matter are incessantly going on about us which our most delicate senses cannot perceive. Who that has not seen would believe that in a large room he cannot strike together two coins so gently that the motion thus made in the atmosphere by the waves of the sound will not be betrayed by the fluttering of a jet of flame? Who is conscious of the thirty or forty thousand waves of ether that strike his eye in a second of time for the production of the sensation he calls a *colour*, or of the difference of a few thousand in number of the waves which produces the sensations he terms different colours? Who, therefore, can doubt that the force that causes the motion of the molecules of which the brain and the nerves are constructed, and directs their action to any object, *may* pass on and be communicated to other nervous systems within some definite distance, and set them in motion, or impinge upon the molecules of which a table is constructed and impart motion to them?

And this, or something of the like nature, is suggested by the characteristics of the phenomena, when carefully examined. The force is not exhibited instantly; it grows by degrees. Apply a stethoscope to the table for a time varying, according to the conditions, from five minutes to two hours. At first, there is no sound. Presently, very slight creakings *in* the fibrous centre (not *on the surface*) of the wood are audible. These grow



gradually louder until they become distinct and definite sounds, wrongly called "rappings," but which more resemble slight explosions, not unlike those of the electric spark when drawn from the conductor of a large machine. These are usually followed by motions, more or less violent, of the table itself. But it is to be noted that the so-called "rappings" and the motions rarely take place at the same moment. One usually ceases while the other is proceeding. The motion itself is not like that produced by mechanical force or by human pressure. It is invariably preceded by *attempts to move*, precisely as is seen with a balloon when on the point of rising and, as it were, hovering between the impulse that sends it up and the force that keeps it down. If the motion be not *onwards*, upon the floor, but an *ascent* from the floor of the entire structure subjected to the force, it does not rise, as when force is applied to certain parts of it only, or as when it is lifted by hands, but it is as if the whole substance of the table had become light and was floating upwards, as does a balloon, simply by overcoming the force of gravitation. Not only does it ascend with a floating movement, but it usually hovers in the air for a while, with a tremulous motion, descending as does a feather or paper. It does not commonly fall with a thump upon the floor. It returns slowly and gently, precisely as a balloon sinks. If it alights upon your foot, it does not crush it, as certainly it would, had it fallen from the same height by reason of the withdrawal of a lifting or supporting hand.

These facts, familiar to all who have examined experimentally, seem to indicate that *Psychic Force* is more or less *antagonistic* to the force of gravity. Certainly it overpowers gravitation. I will hazard another *conjecture*, based on the same phenomenon. May it not be that if, as the most advanced Science asserts, molecules and molecular structure alone are affected by gravitation, while atoms (which compose molecules), and probably other forms of atomic combination, are not subject to the force of gravitation, the province of *Psychic Force*

may be with *atoms* and atomic combinations other than molecules? Is it not reasonably probable that this force permeates and influences that vastly larger realm of nature which is of some atomic structure other than molecular, and to which all molecular structure is but as a grain of sand compared with the bulk of the sun?

Is it not at least conceivable that what we call spirit is *non-molecular* and what we call matter is *molecular*? That gravitation is a force that moves *molecules*? That *Psychic Force* is a force that acts upon non-molecular structure? That these and all other forces are but various forms of *one Force*, as manifested in various operations: *Psychic* when associated with non-molecular or atomic structure—*Gravity* when passing through molecular structure—*Magnetic* when passing through certain combinations of molecules—*Electric* when passing through certain other combinations of molecules—*Heat, Light*, when meeting with certain obstructions in its passage through molecular matter and so manifesting its presence by the impediments? I merely throw out this suggestion for what it is worth. It may serve to give a definite direction to the thoughts of other minds, and this is all I ask for it. I am treating of a department of the Mechanism of Man very imperfectly known and to the shame of Science as yet but slightly investigated. I am, therefore, entitled to answer the objection so often made to *the facts*—(that we are unable to explain them)—by *suggesting* a solution which will at least show that a rational explanation is not impossible, although that here briefly sketched may be erroneous.

Involuntary muscular action will not account for motion without contact, nor for sounds far off. Yet these Psychic sounds are heard on the ceiling, the door, the walls, the gaselier, on distant furniture,—all being beyond reach of any hand or foot.

Another important fact in the Physiology of Psychism is that the motions are always in the direction of the circle



and usually towards the Psychic, as if he or they possessed some power of attraction. Chairs, sofa, pianoforte, tables, advance from their places but invariably towards the Psychic. The utmost space over which this attractive force has been seen to operate, in any experiment tried by myself, was *twelve* feet. A heavy arm chair was moved thus far in my own house, not, however, drawn across the floor, but as if lifted and flung with violence. The next in distance was ten feet. It occurred with a light chair in the house of a friend. For the most part, however, the space over which the attractive force extends rarely exceeds six or seven feet. But I have seen all the pieces of movable furniture, in the private room of a personal friend, advance from their places, the lightest, such as chairs and small tables, crowding in upon the circle, and the larger advancing one, two, or three feet, according to their bulk and weight.

In my own library, a volume of the "Encyclopædia Britannica" was thus attracted, at a distance of *eight* feet from the bookshelf, to the Psychic, who was sitting at the tea-table thus far from it, followed almost immediately by a volume of the *Art Journal* from another shelf. Both were lifted from the shelf almost to the ceiling, a very lofty one, and then dropped upon the table before the Psychic. This occurred in the full light of gas, when he had the tea-cup in his hand, and the books came from behind him far out of reach. Mechanical contrivance was impossible. No opportunity had been given for any such. He had not entered the room until the commencement of the experiment. He was seated immediately, and held in his seat and could not approach the book-shelves. Moreover, the volume of the Encyclopædia was upon a shelf from which it could not be taken without standing upon a chair.

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

## THE DIRECTING INTELLIGENCE.

WE come now to what is truly a mystery—a problem in Psychology for which no satisfactory solution has yet been found.

The *Psychic Force*, whose operations we have been investigating, is, as the Dialectical Society reports, “*often directed by some Intelligence.*”

Of this there is no doubt whatever. No person who has experimented upon it—no person who has ever once witnessed it—will question this verdict. Be *the force* what it may, Intelligence directs its operations.

Sounds and motions, although apparently automatic, would excite little curiosity (save in the scientific mind) were it not for the association of that force with *intelligence*. Strangely enough, this characteristic, which gives to it its greatest value in the esteem of the Psychologist, has deprived it of all interest with the Physicist.

This direction by Intelligence is the special characteristic of the *Psychic Force* and distinguishes it from all other known forces. The physical forces are blind forces; that is to say, they act in obedience to definite laws, in a definite direction, to a definite end. Electricity is not directed by any *intelligence* and it is not in itself intelligent. The only forces known to us as naturally directed by intelligence are those that proceed from organic structure. But not all of these forces are intelligent, nor can they be directed or



controlled by the *Will*, by which name we designate the expression of the Intelligence. The part of the Mechanism of Man associated with Intelligence is that forming the brain and nerve system. This is the one apparent medium for the transmission and direction of the force at the command of the Intelligence.

The Force, whatever it be, that produces the sounds heard and motions seen and felt in Psychism is undoubtedly *directed by Intelligence*. In this it differs specifically from all the known physical and organic forces. It makes intelligent communications by intelligible signals, answers questions, expresses emotions and maintains argument.

What and whence is that *Intelligence*?

This is the first problem in Psychism that presents itself for solution. Opposing views of the nature and source of this intellectual influence are maintained by those having the largest experience, after giving to the question the most anxious investigation. The *evidence* appears to support equally the most divergent opinions. If facts presented to-day incline the inquiring mind to assign the phenomena to one source, other facts are presented to-morrow that appear to negative this and suggest another conclusion. Any hypothesis, therefore, can be little more than conjecture, and as such only must it be accepted by the Reader.

"The Spiritualists" as they call themselves, have a ready explanation. They assert the Intelligence to be that of disembodied Souls of dead human beings. The principal evidence they adduce for this is the assertion of the Intelligence. Questioned as to its identity, it usually declares itself to be the Spirit of some person deceased. But few other facts are adduced to support this theory. Is that self-assertion sufficient?

Certainly it is an easy and if accepted a complete solution of a very difficult problem. But the same solution would apply to almost every problem in Science. Assert of any unexplained fact that it is the work of Spirits of the dead and there is no need to seek further. But Science

requires some preliminary proof of the existence of the asserted agent. That is precisely the question at issue. *Do the Souls of the dead survive?* If surviving, do they remain upon this earth? If lingering here, have they the capacities necessary for the performance of such feats as are exhibited in Psychism? Beyond the assertion of the Intelligence (which, it must be remembered, comes through the organism of the Psychic), are any and what proofs given that it is what it professes to be? Has it knowledge such as we might reasonably assume to be the consequence of its new condition of being? If it calls itself by the name of a person known to the world in life, does it, in its communications, identity of character, ability, thought and language, prove itself to be that person. It must be admitted, even by those who accept the claim as genuine, that it rarely or never does so.

There is as yet no *satisfactory evidence* that, if Spirits of the dead survive, they live with us; or that, if so living, they would probably amuse themselves by making freakish sounds and motions; or that they would exhibit such limited knowledge and capacities as is, for the most part, expressed in these communications.

In such circumstances, Science rightly demands that, before acceptance of what must be admitted to be an improbable solution, we should exhaust all solutions consistent with the known and the probable.

What then are *the facts*?

It is *a fact* that the Intelligence always bears about it more or less of the characteristics of the *Intelligence of the Psychic*. Its ideas and language are his. It knows what he knows. If he is imperfectly educated, so is the Intelligence. Its grammar is his. Its teachings are what he would teach. His is its creed; his its nationality; his its tongue; his its spelling; his its knowledge and its ignorance.

It produces not the slightest evidence of the possession of superhuman intelligence; it contributes nothing to our knowledge of nature; it solves no problems in Science;



it tells us nothing new and no facts past or present capable of verification. It possesses a considerable amount of imagination and, upon matters incapable of verification, it is often abundantly communicative. For instance, it will sometimes describe the conditions of the life after death, such as, if it be a disembodied Spirit, it cannot fail to know and to have the ability to picture to us truly. It does sometimes so profess to present to us the "spirit world." But the value of its teachings in this respect is destroyed when we find that the various Intelligences manifested by various Psychics *differ* in their descriptions, each one depicting "the spirit world" in strict accordance with the notions of it entertained by the particular Psychic! So it is when religion is the theme. If the Psychic be a Roman Catholic, the Intelligence declares Catholicism to be the true creed; if a Methodist, it is emphatic in favour of Methodism; if a sceptic, it is sceptical also. If the Psychic be a child, the Intelligence expresses childish thoughts. For instance; it is reported by Mrs. DE MORGAN, in her very interesting book, "*From Matter to Spirit*," a child being the Psychic, that the Intelligence was asked to give an account of a recent deathbed. It reported how two angels had stood by the deceased, whose spirit rose out of the body, and being greeted by the sister spirits, the three walked together out of the door and up into the clouds. Here we have obviously a child's imagination of "ascending into heaven," not the actual knowledge of some distinct intelligent being who had gone through the process of death—which is the assumption of the Spiritualistic theory.

Indeed, the evidence *against* the theory that the Intelligence exhibited in these communications proceeds from Spirits of the dead is overwhelming. It is difficult to find even a few properly proved facts that appear to sustain it. For my own part I have anxiously sought for such proofs, but have failed to find them, although I have many times witnessed almost if not all the *real* as well as the *simulated* phenomena upon which the theory has been based.

The supporters of the theory, conscious of the strength of this objection, have shown considerable ingenuity of endeavour to remove it.

*That* theory is, that Spirits of the Dead are always about us, but enabled to make their presence known and to hold communion with the living only through the intervention of a human being possessing some wholly undefined, and, as it would seem, merely conjectural qualities—physical, not mental—by coming within the sphere, or by appropriation, of which the disembodied Spirit is enabled to re-embody itself so far as to become audible, tangible, and occasionally visible. Sometimes, they contend, this non-material Spirit takes possession of the body of the Psychic controlling his entire nerve system, but sometimes his organs of speech only. Then occurs that remarkable similarity to the mind and language of the Psychic which obviously characterises the communications. As the *ideas*, they say, are conveyed through the mental and bodily mechanism of the Psychic, the verbal utterance of them cannot but partake to a considerable extent of the character of the mechanism through which they are expressed.

This explanation, however ingenious, is certainly very unsatisfactory to the reasonable mind. The *fact* that the communication comes from the lips or the hand of the Psychic is not denied; but what is the rational inference from this fact? Surely, that having the aspect and the character of an emanation from the Psychic it does in truth proceed from him. It is difficult to believe that Spirits of the dead can be dependent upon the special physical organisation of a few persons for so important a power as that of communication with the living. It is more difficult still to imagine that a nerve aura, or whatever it be, emanating from those persons can be used for the formation of bodies substantial enough to raise heavy substances or to present to the touch a seemingly solid structure of flesh and blood. It is inconceivable that another entity, however unsubstantial, should enter into and take positive possession of the



body of a living man, and speak and act *its own* thoughts with *his* organs. The theory appears to me, as to many who have investigated with calm judgment these undoubted phenomena, to be extravagant almost to absurdity and to make almost any other possible explanation preferable to this.

The *facts* are proved. Let us briefly examine them, to see if they point to any more probable conclusion.

The sounds and motions are always without aim or object, until some intelligent Will is exercised upon the producing force and then they are directed to a definite purpose. In the neighbourhood of a Psychic, without any Will or wish on his part, the sounds often come and go upon the floor, ceiling, wall, table, chairs. Sometimes there are automatic motions of furniture. I know a Psychic who never travels without the characteristic sounds being made upon the roof, the floor and the windows of the railway carriage, to the amusing perplexity of other travellers. Another Psychic known to me is a positive annoyance to her neighbours in church or chapel by the incessant rappings upon the woodwork of the pew, which she in vain endeavours by her Will to prevent. When walking with her husband, the "rappings" are loud upon his walking stick, and if she stops in the street to speak to a friend they resound upon the pavement. When Professor PEPPER, of the *Polytechnic*, advertised to explain and exhibit the mystery of "rapping" by an elaborate mechanism laid under the floor, an amusing experiment was tried by a distinguished F.R.S., who was then investigating the phenomena. Mr. PEPPER had promised to shew him his rap-producing apparatus. The F.R.S. called accordingly, taking with him a Psychic of considerable power, personally unknown to the Professor. Soon, rappings were heard all about them, on floor, benches and table. "What can have set my machine in motion?" exclaimed the Professor. He looked at it, but it was at rest, and still the sounds continued. "What can it mean?" He searched about him for a cause, but vainly.

After enjoying his perplexity for some time, the F.R.S. told him that he had brought with him a *real Psychic*, purposely to compare the natural sounds with those artificially produced by his elaborate mechanism. The Professor frankly confessed that his imitation was very unlike the original and that the true *Psychic* had completely baffled him.

From all this it may be gathered that the psychic force, like the electric force, is in itself a mere force which, when undirected, moves to definite ends according to definite laws. But both are alike capable of being diverted and directed by Intelligence. The Intelligence directing the *Psychic Force* exists *within* the mechanism where the force is generated. The *Electric Force* also may be directed by Intelligence, for the purpose of communication with other Intelligences, (as seen in the telegraph), but that Intelligence is supplied from *without* and acts through some other medium.

Both sounds and motions are usually made in response to request. Asked to strike so many times, that number will be struck. In many cases it suffices merely to form the desire in the mind, without expressing it, and the number merely thought of will be given. Communications are sometimes made without preliminary request. Intercourse is usually established by repeating the alphabet, when, on naming the right letter of the first word, the characteristic sound comes from the table, the floor, or some solid body with which the circle is associated. But it is not always necessary to go through this somewhat tedious process. If the letters be written or printed in squares upon a card, and a pencil be pointed at each line in succession, the signal is given by three blows, if the letter of the word be in that line. Then it will suffice merely to pass the pencil over the line so indicated and when it touches the right letter the signal sounds. By repetition of this process whole sentences are communicated. It is equally effective when the *Psychic* cannot see the motion of the pencil.

If it be requested that the table or other furniture



should tip a certain number of times to imply an affirmative, it will so tip. Or, if desired that it should rise to the hand placed two or three inches above it, often it will so rise. The sounds will come from any part of the table pointed to by the finger, from the floor, from the wall, from the chair, from a bell, from a piano (being there indicated by striking the notes), from the chandelier above the table, from a sheet of paper suspended by a pin so that it is untouched, and even when held by some person other than the Psychic.

Nor is actual contact necessary to these results. If every hand is removed from the table, the sounds and motions often continue. I have seen the same phenomena produced under every variety of test that scientific ingenuity could contrive. If the evidence of the senses is not entirely to be rejected, no fact in science is proved more conclusively than these. If such evidence is not to be accepted, the pursuit of truth must be abandoned altogether.

These are a few of the phenomena. The force is manifestly associated, in some manner at present unknown, with the human organisation. This is acknowledged even by the most zealous advocates of the theory of Spirits of the dead.

That *Intelligence* directs the force is proved conclusively by the very frequent phenomenon of the playing of tunes on musical instruments. Many times I have heard the accordion played upon when the Psychic has been holding it suspended from one hand, his other hand lying full in view on the table. It has been so played several times when held suspended by myself and untouched by the Psychic or any other person. Moreover, the tune to be played is not chosen by the Psychic but requested by the experimentalist. To make assurance sure that the fingers of the Psychic were not employed in the operation, Mr. CROOKES constructed a wire cage, in the centre of which the accordion was hung; yet it played, as before, the tunes we asked for. On one occasion, my family had gone to Exeter Hall to hear

"The Messiah." Asked to name a tune to be played, I said jestingly, "Play what my daughter is hearing now." I had said nothing as to her whereabouts. Instantly the accordion played, with singular power and expression, "The Hallelujah Chorus." It would have been due, under COSTA's lead, about that hour. This occurred in my own house, where mechanism and confederacy were carefully excluded from what was part of a strictly *scientific* investigation and experiment. On another occasion, in the drawing-room of a friend, the tune asked for was "The Last Rose of Summer." It was played in varying tones, now loud, now soft, and then so gently that it was merely a thread of most delicate music. I whispered into the ear of the person next to me, "Surely no human hand could produce such tones as these." Instantly the music ceased; violent blows on the table indicated a desire to make a communication. Then, by the customary calling of the alphabet, but indicated by notes played upon the accordion instead of the customary rapping upon the table, this sentence was spelled; "Our hands are as real as yours." It had an obvious reference to my whispered remark. All this passed *in the light*.

The experiences narrated above are but a few out of a multitude witnessed with the accordion. But that is not the only instrument so used. I have repeatedly heard the pianoforte played upon in like manner, with equal skill but not with equal expression, as also the Pan's-pipe, the Jew's harp, the mouth organ, the tambourine, and the guitar. A musical box has been many times, at request, wound up, set to play, suddenly stopped, and then set to play again, and this when it has been far beyond the reach of the Psychic, even if his hands had not been held at the moment, as always they were by the scientific experimentalists who were investigating purely for the sake of science.

In my own drawing-room, myself and the Psychic being alone, the pianoforte *closed*, one of his hands laid upon it and the other holding the accordion at the end *opposite* to the keys, the two instruments played a duet



for ten minutes. I took the accordion from him as it was playing and it continued to play when I alone held it. It should be stated that I do not know a note on this instrument, and the Psychic, who is an excellent player on the pianoforte, is unable to play the accordion.

No proofs more conclusive than these could be given that the Psychic Force is not a blind force, like the physical forces, but is directed by and obeys *some* Intelligence.

Nothing so much disturbs the majority of Minds as doubt. Many are ashamed to say, "I don't know." Few have the wisdom or the courage to say, "Let me first learn what are *the facts*, without wasting time and thought in attempts to explain them. When the facts are fully known they will tell their own story and supply their own explanation. Labour and wait." Even with that which is strange only because it is new, if no immediate explanation of the phenomenon presents itself, it is still, as ever it was, the fashion to relieve doubt by flying to the supernatural and attributing whatever is inexplicable to supramundane influences. The agency of Spirits of the Dead is a ready resource for removal of any difficulty, while it saves a world of trouble in experimenting and thinking. Moreover, it is so conclusive. It disposes of every problem perfectly. It explains everything. No wonder that always it has received a cordial welcome and found more followers than the thoughtful few who say, "Exhaust all possibilities of Nature before you look beyond Nature." The formidable objection to the supramundane theory is that it is *too good*. Accept it and every book in the scientific library might be burned. There is not a problem in science that could not be solved by assuming the phenomena to be the work of Spirits of the dead.

Thus have the phenomena of Psychism been treated. Seeing some *Intelligence* at work, the too hasty conclusion was formed that it *must* be the intelligence of a supramundane being, and that can be no other than the Spirit of a person who has passed away from earth-life?

This argument solved the problem, and it is not surprising that it found easy and extensive acceptance.

Of course I would not be so arrogant as to assert that the holders of this theory are certainly wrong. I cannot dispute the *possibility* of Spirits of the dead having such a mission and so acting. But I contend that we have no right to set up such a startling theory until we have thoroughly investigated the phenomena, collected a vast body of facts, carefully digested and compared them, mastered all the conditions attending their production, and then are *compelled* to an irresistible conclusion which certainly, upon the face of it, teems with improbabilities.

But the conditions under which the phenomena of Psychism are manifested not merely fail to support the theory of Spirits of the dead; they point directly to an origin in the Psychic. The reasonable presumption is that the Intelligence governing the force proceeds from the same fountain as the force. They appear and disappear together. Both come with the Psychic and go with him.

Moreover, the communications rarely exhibit more than ordinary human intelligence. For the most part they are below the average mind. They savour strongly of the Psychic in whose presence they are produced. As stated above, they reflect precisely the character of *his* mind. If the Psychic is coarse in thought and speech, so are his communications. If refined, so are they. His theological opinions are faithfully expressed. This is the rule. The exceptions are extremely rare and may be accounted for by other mental conditions already described, without assuming them to be Spirits of the dead.

If, therefore, the Intelligence that directs the *Psychic Force* precisely resembles in character and degree the intelligence of the person from whom the force proceeds, is it not a rational inference that, *there* is the source of the Intelligence whose operations we witness? Why should we assert the interference of something not perceptible merely because we cannot at once discover



the connecting link between the force and the Intelligence that apparently directs it? Is not action by Spirits of the dead quite as difficult of acceptance as the imperceptible connection between a nerve force and a mental operation directing that force?

This way of escape from a palpable difficulty might have something to recommend it, but for a fatal blot. It is conceivable that the *expression* of a thought might be shaped by the instrument through which it is conveyed; but what of the thought itself? If a disembodied Spirit were desirous to communicate *its own ideas*, surely *these* would not partake of the imbecility, or the ignorance, or the idiosyncrasy, of the Psychic! In fact, the thoughts are the Psychic's thoughts and not such as, upon any theory of spiritual existence, can be attributed to the disembodied Spirit of the mortal it professes to be, and scarcely of any other. Even the Psychic's ignorance of science or of natural facts is faithfully reflected in matters about which a Spirit of the dead could not possibly be ignorant!

But the question, "What is the Intelligence?" is of such vast importance that it is necessary to state more fully the facts and arguments appearing to point to the conclusion that the intelligent communication is a purely Psychical operation, and not that of Spirits of the dead. Admitting to the full the difficulty that attends all attempts to explain the process by which the Intelligence works, the reasons for assigning it to the Psychic, or to some of the persons present, are overwhelming. It will presently be seen that almost all, if not all, of the conditions requisite to the production and manifestation of the force are consistent with the *Psychic* theory and *inconsistent* with the *Spiritual* theory. It must be understood that I treat now of the phenomena that are purely Psychic.

I will summarise these conditions of Psychic action as succinctly, but as clearly, as I can. Some of them have been submitted in the previous pages. But these and other repetitions are unavoidable in a treatise on a subject so novel and still so obscure.

## SUMMARY.

1. The presence is necessary of a person called by Spiritualists a medium, by Psychologists "a Psychic," who may be of either sex, of any age, of any degree of intellect or stupidity. The faculty does not depend upon any known physical or mental qualifications. Children in arms are often better Psychics than adults. No special condition of body or mind appears to accompany the possession of the Psychic Force. Its presence is in no way dependent upon the Will of the Psychic, who can neither cause nor prevent the operations of the force. No consciousness of any effort, mental or bodily, attends its exercise. All we positively *know* is, that when a Psychic is present a force is exhibited which moves heavy bodies without contact by any visible substance. The magnet does the like, but it does not equally surprise us, simply because it is familiar.

2. As a general rule (for I have been informed of, although I have not known, instances to the contrary), it appears to be necessary to the production or the operation of this force that other human beings should be present with the Psychic.

3. The persons present must form a chain of communication, more or less perfect, either by actual contact of hands, or by some connecting substance, such as a table or other solid body.

4. The force is materially affected by the arrangement of the persons forming the circle, as also by the state of health and other yet undiscovered conditions of those persons.

5. The force is greatly influenced by the bodily and mental condition of the Psychic. Sickness or mental agitation always weakens, and often altogether prevents, its production. The amount of the force varies, not only from day to day, but almost from minute to minute, according to the surrounding influences, the heat of the room, the dampness of the atmosphere, the excitement of conversation. Almost every incident that affects the



nervous system affects the force. Cold weakens and warmth increases it. When it flags, a cup of tea will often restore it. Whatever Psychic Force may be, it is plainly dependent, to an immense extent, upon the bodily and mental condition of the Psychic.

6. The force is much increased by whatever tends to harmonise the minds of the persons present. Music has a manifest influence, so has prayer, so has recitation, so has a lively conversation in which all join. But if the party converse in groups, on different topics, and there is consequently diversified employment of the brain, the force is feeble or non-apparent. Silence is adverse to its manifestation, probably because in silence each mind is occupied differently. The simultaneous molecular action of all the brains present favours the production and operation of the force.

7. The force is manifestly affected by light. A very bright light weakens it; a dim light strengthens it. Darkness is by no means necessary to its action.

8. The tappings on the tables and on the furniture and walls of the room are often made by request, or in answer to questions. Words and sentences are communicated by this process. But these communications, so far at least as I have heard them, or have been enabled to authenticate them, indicate no higher intelligence, and usually far lesser intelligence, than that of average human beings. They are always intelligible and sensible sentences, that is to say, they have a meaning and are intelligibly expressed; but they impart nothing that is not known to the Psychic or to some one or more of the persons forming the circle.

9. The character of the communication is always found to be in accordance with the mental condition of the Psychic. If the Psychic cannot spell, the words are misspelled. If the Psychic is ignorant of any subject about which inquiry is made, the answers partake of that ignorance. If the Psychic is ungrammatical, so is the message. His provincialisms are faithfully preserved. The communications through an American Psychic teem with

Americanisms; those of a London Psychic smack often of Wapping.

10. The language of the communication is that of the Psychic. With a French Psychic, the communications are in French, with a German Psychic in German—that is, if he is ignorant of English; but if he knows English imperfectly, the communication in England is in imperfect English.

11. The force is materially influenced by the electric and magnetic condition of the air and of surrounding bodies.

12. It is influenced in yet greater degree by the magnetic, or to speak more correctly, diamagnetic, condition of the Psychic and of the persons present, and their due arrangement as links of the chain appears to depend upon the relative conditions in this respect of the persons forming the chain, two persons negatively diamagnetised weakening the force by being placed together, apparently as if they acted as absorbents of it; whereas two persons in a positive state of diamagnetism sitting side by side appear to increase the force.

13. The sounds and motions do not come immediately and together, but by degrees. If a stethoscope be placed upon the table and the ear applied to it, the force will be found to operate thus: At first, very faint creakings in the wood are audible, as if the fibres were separating in the heart of the timber and not upon the surface. As you listen with this instrument, the creakings become, by degrees, louder and more frequent and are heard in many parts of the table at the same time. Then a strange quivering motion of the whole structure is perceptible to the touch, a rapidity of motion that cannot be produced by any muscular action—at least, all experiments made to imitate it have failed. As the sounds grow in strength, they cease to be creakings and become blows, but still preserving the peculiarity of seeming to be in the heart, and not on the surface, of the wood. These blows can be distinctly *felt* by the hand, even when not audible to the ear. Occasionally, they are as loud as if



the table or furniture had been struck by a sledge hammer. Sometimes they resemble a smart blow with pointed metal, sometimes a thump with a blunt, soft instrument. Sometimes it is as if the blow were with the point of a pin, and sometimes as if a heavy fist had descended upon the wood.

14. Generally the force is not exhibited until invited. The same party may meet, but if their minds be not formally directed to the common purpose, the phenomena will not occur. When a circle is formed, *and all direct their thoughts to the one object*, the phenomena speedily commence. Occasionally, however, they present themselves uncalled-for, when least expected, and sometimes when the Psychic is alone and occupied with other matters.

15. It is a popular error that the presence of a *sceptic* has a preventive or impeding effect. If the *physical* condition of the most determined sceptic favours the phenomena, it will increase the force. It is otherwise with an active *opponent*. Positive antagonism has a marked effect in diminishing the force and often extinguishes it. An open or a doubting mind has no adverse influence; but a mind actively hostile, treating the phenomena as impostures and the Psychic as a rogue, always impedes and often prevents the action of the force. Doubtless this is due to the operation of that mental sympathy, already treated of, which disturbs the mind of the Psychic and so prevents that *concentration of attention* which appears to be necessary to the production of the force—or rather to the condition of incipient trance, in which alone the force is active.

16. For the most part the communications, though framed in coherent language, are useless and purposeless, and sometimes have much of the character known by the name of “chaff.” They are rarely absolute nonsense; but as rarely do they exhibit anything above the average intelligence of ordinary society. Moral platitudes and common-place answers to test questions are the *usual* products. Not unfrequently they are false in fact—

manifestly *guesses*, not knowledge—and no reliance whatever can be placed upon them. Never do they add to our knowledge of the facts of nature, nor solve a problem in science, nor explain a difficulty in history, literature, or philosophy, nor impart such information as a Spirit of the dead *must* possess, and which would make clear much that is doubtful or promote the ends of truth and justice.

17. Their descriptions of death and of the future life are precisely the pictures which persons not accustomed to accurate thought usually form in their own minds, often revealing perfect ignorance of physical facts. Moreover, they do not agree with each other in their descriptions, a fact that proves these to be products of imagination and not the reports of personal knowledge.

18. These descriptions vary according to the age, sex and education of the Psychic. They are always the conceptions of death and of a future state which would be formed by such a person as the Psychic. No two of the Intelligences give the same account of themselves or of their abode; yet all assume to be the utterances of beings who profess to be (and if they be Spirits of the dead *must* be), personally acquainted with that which they are depicting.

19. When the Psychic in a state of trance utters a rhapsody, it is usually either a mere torrent of fine phrases, which convey no definite information, no novelty of thought, no original ideas, no new truths or old truths in a more striking form, or the narratives are fanciful pictures of an excited imagination, such as attend the first coming on of delirium.

20. If the communications touch upon religion, they reflect invariably the religion of the Psychic. If he be a Churchman, the creed of the Church is affirmed; if an Unitarian, the unity of the Godhead; if a Deist, Deism; Mahomedanism is expressed in the presence of a Mahomedan Psychic, and so forth. It might be reasonably expected of a disembodied spirit that it should at least know what religion is the true one, or at all events



that it should not represent a false one to be true. Yet is no such communication ever made. On the contrary, the faith of the Psychic is always presented as the true faith.

These twenty conditions attending the production of the phenomena appear to me to go far to negative the theory that Spirits of dead human beings are the agents in the work. All of these conditions are *inconsistent* with any rational hypothesis of spirit life. All point directly to the Psychic as the Intelligence concerned in their production. If it be said that Spirits, being immaterial, can manifest themselves only through some human organism and hence the undeniable expression in the communications of the mental characteristics of the Psychic (and possibly of others present) surely the reasonable conclusion is the obvious one, that the phenomena are to be attributed to some abnormal action of the nervous system of the Psychic or to some agent other than Spirits of the dead. I pass over altogether the still longer list of the reasons that make it improbable that the phenomena are the work of Spirits of the Dead, according to any notion we can conceive of spirit life, because I admit that, knowing nothing of the conditions of that life, we cannot positively assert anything of it.

I arrive, therefore, at the conclusion, that the Intelligence directing these phenomena, which are of undoubted occurrence, is *not* that of Spirits of dead human beings.

Surely these facts go far to prove that in some mysterious manner the phenomena are associated with, and mainly if not entirely dependent upon, some abnormal condition of the Psychic. Do not the conditions also point with equal cogency to the conclusion that, even if the controlling intelligence be *not* that of the Psychic, it is not that of Spirits of the dead? The argument may be thus briefly summarized:

The actions and communications are not such as by any stretch of imagination can be assigned to, or even associated with, disembodied spirits of human beings.

The exhibition is for the most part trivial, tricksey, and unworthy of the asserted agents. The motions of tables, chairs and other furniture are manifestly due to the presence of some *attractive force*, operating much as does the Magnetic force, to the passage of which molecular matter is no impediment. The Psychic seems to bear to the substances acted upon a *somewhat* similar relationship to that borne by the magnet to the substances it influences. The Psychic Force, like the Magnetic Force, acts without contact upon bodies within a limited range, even when other solid bodies are interposed. It is motion at a distance, like that of the magnet.

There are, undoubtedly, other phenomena not to be thus explained. But although it is impossible to doubt that some Intelligence is at work in these, it is equally difficult to attribute them to Spirits of the dead. The obvious effect of music, often upon the production, and always upon the amount, of the force, is in itself a remarkable taste for disembodied Souls to indulge and the more so when we find the preference to be given to comic songs! Why should laughter be so welcomed and echoed by Spirits who in their lifetimes were sage, grave men?

Again, Psychics are *developed*. Their power grows with practice. All the phenomena are not produced immediately, but come by slow degrees. None has ever found himself suddenly possessed of the power to produce any but the first indications of its presence—motions and sounds. If anything new occurs in the presence of other Psychics, a desire to produce the like seems to direct attention to it. Fixed attention by the Psychic appears essential to determining direction of the force. This given, the phenomenon is produced. If an entirely new manifestation of the force occurs anywhere, it never fails to be reproduced by our own Psychics, after they have heard and read much about it, simply by looking for it with strong desire and patient waiting. All the most remarkable of the recent phases of Psy-



chism were first witnessed in America. Almost certainly after the arrival here of reports of some new phenomenon, we learn that the same novelty is being exhibited in presence of our own Psychics. Imposture is, of course, rife in such cases. I refer now to such phenomena only as occur under crucial tests that preclude the possibility of fraud. It is very difficult to understand why the disembodied Spirit, which certainly possesses better capacities for information than any embodied Spirit, should require *development* and practice for its manifestations, should learn its lesson readily or slowly, according to the zeal and capacities of the Psychic, and wait for newspaper intelligence of what other Spirits are doing in other parts of the world before it is able or willing to exhibit the new phase of the phenomena. A Spirit, according to any definition of it suggested by any theory, is released from *some*, at least, of the bonds that necessarily limit human intelligence. Probably it is not subject to our laws of time and space (which are merely human notions). Certainly it is not subject to gravitation, which acts only on molecular matter, and the human Spirit, if it exists, is non-molecular. A disembodied Spirit must have perceptions vastly wider in range than ours, with larger powers of locomotion, and therefore must of necessity know more than it could have known when in the flesh. Is it then conceivable that such a being should be dependent for the revelation or the exhibition of itself to us upon the success of endeavours made by a Psychic to develope, by persevering practice, the abnormal powers belonging to his own organization? If they be really the doings of Spirits of the dead, wherefore should a new manifestation in America make no appearance in England until the post has brought the account of it to our own Psychics? Surely, if the "Spirit of the Dead" theory be the *true* one, the English Spirits could have procured the information with rapidity and certainty, and exhibited here the like phenomena, without waiting for the slow process of *educating the Psychic*.

Observe, that I am not now arguing against *the fact*, which I entirely accept, but against *the cause* or source that has been assigned to it. I admit that the acts are done, that the phenomena occur; but I question the means by which they are asserted to be done.

The communications are for the most part *below* the average of human intelligence. In no single instance within my personal experience have they exhibited the remotest trace of having come from an Intelligence superior to that of the Psychic or of some of the persons present. When the Psychic is uneducated, they are the commonplaces of the unreflecting conveyed in the language of the illiterate. When the Psychic is of intellectual capacity and education, intelligent and accomplished, the communications proclaim their origin in more profound reflection and are clothed in choicer phrase; but they betray no symptom of more extended *knowledge*, nor of larger or loftier mental capacity, than the Psychic would himself display when in a condition of great cerebral excitement.

It is true that they frequently *profess* to be made by the Spirits of deceased persons who were the relatives or friends of some of the persons present. But in one instance only have I been enabled to trace any truth in these signs of recognition. I have been personally assured many times that some member of my family, or some dear friend who had passed away from earth, was communicating with me by rapping or writing. I noticed that *always* the alleged Spirit was that of *some person whom I had strongly in my mind at the moment*, but who was not nearer nor dearer than many others who did not present themselves. Asked, "who are you?" the name was rightly given. Usually some common-place communications were made, such as, "I am glad to be with you;" "I am very happy;" "I am often by your side." Desirous to test the identity of my interlocutor, I have put questions that were answered readily. Some were right, but more were wrong, and others were so equivocal that it was obvious the com-



municant was *guessing*, not *knowing*. Occasionally I have put test questions, such as, "Do you remember when you fell from the horse and broke your arm?" In such cases the answer was, "Yes;" although no such accident had ever occurred. Never once did the alleged Spirit of my relative or friend correct me by answering that no such event had happened. I had long suspected that the *mental communion* described in a former chapter would explain much of the phenomena. Therefore I tried another test. Keeping the idea of a living friend strictly in my mind, I have received answers to my questions as if from *that* friend. Thus was I satisfied that the process is really that of mental sympathy and communion—better known as "thought-reading." In fact, the Psychic is in the condition of the Somnambule, and exercises the faculty exhibited so constantly in Hypnotism.

Moreover, the communications are, for the most part, unworthy of the persons to whom they are attributed, or not in keeping with their characters—(unless the Psychic has some knowledge of them, or the inquirer has those characteristics strongly in his mind)—Then they express just such characteristics as the Psychic might be supposed to attach to such a personage, often being very unlike the original. Or the description is an echo of the mental impression of the inquirer. When the Spirits of men who had been distinguished for genius in their earth-life declare their presence (as often they do) I have never found them to support their asserted characters in thought or in language; proving thus much, that they must have degenerated sadly since their passage from this life to another. For instance, A communication made to me was asserted to be by the late Dr. ELLIOTSON: "Do you remember me," I asked, "Yes, well." "My name?" Answered rightly—(it was, of course, known to the Psychic). "Do you remember my visit to your two patients?" "Yes, you were much interested." I now bethought me of a test: "Do you remember my asking Elizabeth to bring the

book from the library?" "Yes, well." "And reading it to me without opening it?" "Yes." "And what I said?" "You said it was marvellous. It convinced you." Now this was a pure invention, for the purpose of trying the identity of the alleged personality. No such incident had occurred. The thought was in my mind and that was probably imparted to the communicating Intelligence. But it proved that, whatever the Intelligence might be, it was not the Spirit of Dr. ELLIOTSON. Again, sitting with another Psychic, communications were made professed to be by a Spirit having prophetic powers. It was prophesied of me that in a few weeks I should put on a black cap and sentence a woman to be hung. It was, of course, known to the Psychic that I occupied a Judicial office; but he did *not* know that the jurisdiction of Quarter Sessions was limited, and that I had not power to inflict capital punishment. Here again the ignorance of the Psychic was manifestly reflected by the Intelligence.

Deceased persons, whose names are unknown to the Psychic or to any of those about him, rarely present themselves. When persons still living are purposely represented as dead, communications are often made as if from them.

Again, the Spirit of the same dead person usually attends the Psychic for many years. Is it conceivable that the Spirit of a dead man should thus be attached to a living one, not always entitled by moral character to such an attendant? And not this only, but the same alleged Spirit attends upon several Psychics in England and America alike. Thus "John King" waits upon four Psychics at least.

These are but a few of the facts that appear to me to *disprove* the theory that the communicating Intelligences are Spirits of the dead. In this I state the results only of my personal experience; but they were arrived at after much painstaking investigation, with an earnest desire to ascertain the very truth and not to confirm foregone conclusions. In so obscure a matter,



upon which our knowledge is as yet so limited, it would be rash and dogmatic to pronounce a positive judgment. But, in the honest pursuit of truth, I am bound to state, that not only have I been unable to obtain personally *any* satisfactory evidence that any of the purely Psychic phenomena are produced by Spirits of the dead, but *all the evidence I have been able to collect tends to negative that conclusion* and to prove that the communications are intimately associated with, if they do not directly proceed from, the Psychic or are excited in his mind by sympathy with the minds of the persons present.

I frankly admit, however, that it would be unjust to pronounce as yet a *definite* judgment. The facts have been very imperfectly observed, experiment and test have been but partially applied, the conditions have not been examined exhaustively. By but few of those who have observed and noted have the ordinary rules of evidence been obeyed. Therefore, wanting a sufficient body of *facts*, we are not yet in a position to arrive at a satisfactory solution of the problem.

But the weight of evidence appears to me to indicate the Psychic as being the immediate source of the Intelligence that undoubtedly directs the action of the Psychic Force. I have already set forth the facts which, carefully examined, are found to be not only consistent with such an explanation, but inconsistent with the more popular one that assigns them to Spirits of the dead.

The Reader, however, will probably ask if any reasonable suggestion can be offered to explain the process by which the Intelligence of the Psychic *may* be enabled thus to govern a force flowing from his nerve system, so that it shall express thoughts of whose very existence he is himself unconscious.

The Reader is entitled to an answer; but I can only proffer what must be accepted as little more than *conjecture*.

It will be remembered that, in Somnambulism, the brain performs its functions automatically, that is to say,

undirected by the Will and without the consciousness of the Individual.

From this we learn that, in certain conditions of the body, the brain can perform the functions of thought and feeling and control the action of the muscles, without the exercise of the Will, without consciousness, and without the guidance or knowledge of the Soul (or Self). In such cases the limbs act in obedience to the controlling brain as readily as if the brain had been controlled by the Will. There is no consciousness at the moment, nor any memory afterwards, until the recurrence of the same conditions, when the memories of the past conditions revive and the memories of the waking life are for the time extinct.

*Unconscious cerebration* is the name given to this psychological condition. It has been fully treated of in a former chapter (*ante*, p. 10). It is one of the most remarkable features of Somnambulism, as any Reader, who will take the trouble to try the experiment, may readily satisfy himself. The same mental condition occurs also in our waking lives and in our moments of active exertion as well as in the season of meditation.

Unconscious Cerebration is one of the conditions of *Dream*, and the cause of its most marvellous and mysterious characteristics—the presentation of many persons playing many parts, often with perfect propriety, all of whom are nevertheless creations of the brain, which pictures them to the mental eye as definitely and distinctively as if they were real, and assigns to them actions, and puts thoughts and speech into their mouths, appropriate to those imaginary personages and situations, the individual dreamer accepting them as true and being entirely unconscious that it is by his own brain the drama is improvised, every character invented, and the dialogue composed.

The practical conclusion at present to be drawn from this phenomenon of dream is, that in certain conditions the brain works automatically and that in such case it



can play many parts, assume many characters, and act them with appropriate conduct, ideas and speech, without the Individual Self being conscious of what his brain is doing.

The suggestion I venture to submit for the consideration of Psychologists, as being a probable solution of the problem, how the Psychic controlling the force (if the directing Intelligence be his, and not that of other unperceived existences) can present itself under so many different characters and maintain them so well is, that the Psychic is in the condition of Unconscious Cerebration; *that he is doing before us, while sitting in his chair, precisely what he does and what we do every night lying in our beds; that is to say, his brain is now, as then, inventing the various personages who profess to present themselves to us, and acting them with more or less of fitness, and that this is done, as in dream it is, without consciousness by his individual self (Soul) of what the brain is doing.* If so it be, it is not, as may be hastily concluded, an imposture, in the proper sense of that term. The Psychic so under the influence of Unconscious Cerebration is not knowingly deceiving. *He is deceived, as we are all deceived when we dream.* In the state of complete *Trance*, which is the most frequent form of Psychism, and certainly that in which the phenomena are most powerfully exhibited, there can be no doubt that the Psychic is unconscious of all external impressions, and the observer, who recognises Unconscious Cerebration as a Psychological fact, will certainly then recognise its presence in every word and act of the Psychic. The doubt that naturally presents itself is, if this process of Unconscious Cerebration is possible when the Psychic is awake and in apparent possession of his Will, his consciousness, and his ordinary mental powers; at least, to such an extent as would permit of a portion of his brain acting unconsciously to himself? But reference to the description of the phenomena of Unconscious Cerebration, contained in the chapter devoted to it (*ante*, p. 10) proves that it occurs often to ourselves in our

soundest health and in the most active condition of the mental powers and that, therefore, its occurrence with the Psychic, when awake, is not impossible nor even strange. It is merely a question of degree. The condition of Psychism being an abnormal state of the organism, it might be anticipated that Unconscious Cerebration would be much more powerful in its manifestations with the Psychic than with ourselves.

If this be accepted as a *probable* condition under which the Psychic may control the Psychic force, it will perfectly solve the perplexities and remove the difficulties that present themselves to every scientific investigator of the phenomena of Psychism. Thus we are enabled to explain many of the conditions found to be requisite to the manifestation of Psychic Force. It accounts for the fact, that the phenomena seldom occur save when the attention of the Psychic is directed to the production of them, as by sitting at a table and such like formalities, and but rarely when the same party are casually assembled in the same room, without any purpose of a *séance* or any thought given to the subject. It explains why more or less of time elapses before the coming of the force is perceived; why the presence of a Psychic is necessary; why anything that distracts the mind of the Psychic disturbs the action of the force; why the power is more or less according to the state of health of the Psychic; why it varies from hour to hour and is increased or diminished by the condition of the atmosphere and the temperature of the room; why scepticism in the spectators does not affect the phenomena, while positive antagonism obstructs it; why the force always obeys some Intelligence and yet indicates no Intelligence greater than that the Psychic would exhibit when in the condition of ecstasy that usually attends Somnambulism. This accounts for all that the communicating Intelligence does and fails to do, knows and does not know, its truths and its falsehoods, its accuracy and its blunders; why the communications always bear the impress of the mind of the Psychic, expressing *his* ideas, *his* information, *his*



opinions, religious, political, or social, knowing what he knows, ignorant of all of which he is ignorant, spells as he spells, and even accommodates its grammar to his. All of the facts above detailed as negating the theory of Spirits of the Dead are explicable in the manner I have ventured to suggest.

And here, in confirmation of this solution, I may conveniently introduce the conclusions arrived at by a careful, learned, and scientific Investigator. The profound interest of the extract will, I am sure, excuse its length. The book from which they are taken is entitled, "Modern Mysteries Explained and Exposed," by the Rev. A. MAHAN, of Boston, U.S., and was there published. It completely confirms what I have ventured to advance as to the *psychical* source of the physical phenomena. There are other alleged phenomena which undoubtedly do not admit of such an explanation. These, however, must be considered separately.

The facts on which the reality of the agency of spirits out of the body, in the production of these manifestations, is affirmed, are all, without exception, comprehended in the following classes, namely:—

1. Facts of a purely physical character, such as the moving of tables, chairs, &c., movements which sometimes accord with the thoughts and suggestions of inquirers.

2. *Intelligent* communications, by means of rapping sounds, speaking, and writing; phenomena which, in many instances, to say the least, occur wholly independently of the direct conscious agency of the mediums, or any other persons present, on the occasion.

3. Communications pertaining to subjects of which the *mediums* are profoundly ignorant, and yet found to be correct.

4. Correct communications pertaining to facts believed to be known only to the inquirer himself, and the particular spirit with whom he is professedly communicating.

5. Similar communications containing correct responses to purely *mental questions*.

6. Communications conveying, in some instances, correct information in respect to *facts unknown to the inquirer or any other person present*.

Facts falling under one or the other of the classes above-named are continuously occurring; it is claimed in all parts of Christendom, and can be accounted for but upon one supposition,

namely, that these communications proceed from disembodied spirits.

Such is the argument of Spiritualists, as stated by themselves, and stated as strongly as ever—to our knowledge—given forth by any writer or speaker who advocates the spirit theory.

Either of the following positions may be taken by those who deny this theory.

1. They may *deny the facts* put forward by Spiritualists, and then meet the evidence adduced by them in favour of the actual occurrence of such facts.

2. Or they *may admit the facts*, and then meet the arguments based upon them.

3. Or, finally, they may *deny both the facts and the conclusions* based upon them, that is, they may take the ground that the facts claimed by Spiritualists are impositions, on the one hand, and that, if admitted as real, they do not sustain the claims of spiritualism, on the other. In each and every case alike, the burden of proof rests wholly upon the advocates of this new theory. All that its opponents have to do, unless they choose to proceed further, is to meet the facts and arguments adduced by its advocates to sustain its claims. For ourselves, in conducting the argument in the present treatise, we shall admit the facts claimed by Spiritualists, and join issue with them simply and exclusively in regard to the conclusions which they deduce from them.

We admit the facts for the all-adequate reason, that after careful inquiry we have been led to conclude that they are real. We think that no candid inquirer, who carefully investigates the subject, can come to any other conclusion. While we honestly believe that there is more imposition connected with this movement than with almost any other that can be named, yet we as fully believe that a denial of the facts claimed by Spiritualists, as comprehended under the classes above-named, has its exclusive basis either in ignorance, or a state of prejudice which is blind to valid evidence. We have ourselves witnessed physical manifestations which, in our judgment, can be accounted for by no reference to mere muscular action. A lady, for example, places her fingers gently upon a table or stand. Soon the object moves after her around the room, while yet no other person is in contact with the object, or within many feet of it, and her own fingers so lightly touch the smooth surface, or top of it, that the parts touching it are not perceptibly flattened in the least, on the one hand, nor the blood at all driven from under the finger-nails, on the other. Who does not perceive that the movements of such objects, under such circumstances, can be accounted for by no muscular pressure and action whatever? Yet we feel quite safe in vouching for the reality of just such facts,—facts which are produced by individuals utterly repudiating spiritualism in all its forms,—facts utterly



fatal, as we shall hereafter see, to its claims as far as physical manifestations are concerned.

That *intelligent* communications are obtained in the spirit-circles, communications undeniably indicating their origin from some intelligent cause, is now doubted by none, and admitted by all. Equally undeniable is the fact, that correct responses are often obtained to questions pertaining to subjects of which it is honestly believed, and no reason exists for an opposite conclusion, that all present are profoundly ignorant but the inquirer and the spirit with whom he is professedly communicating. A stranger, for example, from the most distant part of this or from any foreign country, in passing through a place which he never visited before, and in consequence of an unexpected delay, goes immediately and unattended from the cars into some spirit-circle, where no one could have expected him, and where he meets not a solitary countenance or form of which he has the most distant recollection. To all present, therefore, he has the best possible evidence that he is an utter stranger, whose visit no one anticipated. This individual, under these identical circumstances, may call for the spirit of some departed friend, and, on inquiry, obtain correct answers pertaining to the name of that spirit, his age at the time of his death, &c., the only condition required being, that the inquirer shall himself know what answers should be given, and, at the time, have those answers distinctly before his mind. That facts of this character have occurred, we have the most valid evidence, and any one can verify them in his own experience, who will take the pains to do it. In the same circumstances, and on the same condition, individuals can obtain in some instances, to say the least, correct answers to purely *mental questions*. A gentleman of our acquaintance, for example, called upon the Misses Fish and the Foxes, when they were in Cleveland, Ohio, and to the supposed spirit of a departed sister put mentally, and in succession, twelve questions, and to each received a perfectly correct answer, he knowing in each instance what the answer should be, and having his attention at the time definitely fixed upon it. This, and cases of a similar kind, which might, without number, be adduced, establish the reality of the class of facts under consideration. The gentleman above referred to, however, wrote out these same questions upon twelve blank cards, and putting them together, the sides containing the questions from him, and having shuffled them so that he could not know what question he might put down in any instance, put each one successively upon the table, the question downward, and requested the same spirit to give an answer to the question laid down, while he should write that answer upon the blank side. Twelve answers were accordingly obtained, but one of which was, in any form, correct; the answers, in most instances, having no relation whatever to the question put.

## PHYSICAL MANIFESTATIONS.

As an example of the physical manifestations, we will adduce the following case, which is so well attested as to remove from all candid minds all rational doubt in regard to its actual occurrence. Among the signers of this document, which originally appeared in the "Springfield Republican," we have the names of such men as Professor Wells, of the Cambridge Laboratory, and other individuals of such character for intelligence and integrity, as to demand the credence of the public. The document is entitled "The Modern Wonder—a Manifesto!"

"The undersigned, from a sense of justice to the parties referred to, very cordially bear testimony to the occurrence of the following facts, which we severally witnessed at the house of Rufus Elmer, in Springfield, on the evening of the 5th of April:—

"1. The table was moved in every possible direction, and with great force, when we could not perceive any cause of motion.

"2. It (the table) was forced against each one of us so powerfully as to remove us from our positions, together with the chairs we occupied—in all, several feet.

"3. Mr. Wells and Mr. Edwards took hold of the table in such a manner as to exert their strength to the best advantage, but found the invisible power, exercised in the opposite direction, to be quite equal to their utmost efforts.

"4. In two instances, at least, while the hands of all the members of the circle were placed on the top of the table, and while no visible power was employed to raise the table, or otherwise move it from its position, *it was seen to rise clear of the floor, and to float in the atmosphere for several seconds*, as if sustained by a denser medium than the air.

"5. Mr. Wells seated himself upon the table, which was rocked to and fro with great violence; and at length it poised itself on two legs, and remained in this position for some thirty seconds, *when no other person was in contact with the table.*

"6. Three persons, Messrs. Wells, Bliss, and Edwards, assumed positions on the table at the same time, and while thus seated the table was moved in various directions.

"7. Occasionally we were made conscious of the occurrence of a powerful shock, which produced vibratory motion of the floor of the apartment. It seemed like the motion occasioned by distant thunder, or the firing of ordnance far away, causing the tables, chairs, and other inanimate objects, and all of us, to tremble in such a manner that the effect was both seen and felt.

"8. In the whole exhibition, which was far more diversified than the foregoing specification would indicate, we were constrained to admit that there was an almost constant manifestation of some intelligence which seemed at least to be independent of the circle.



"9. In conclusion, we may observe that D. D. Home, the medium, frequently urged us to hold his hands and feet. During these occurrences the room was well lighted, the lamp was frequently placed on and under the table, and every possible opportunity was afforded us for the closest inspection, and we submit this one emphatic declaration: *We know that we are not imposed upon nor deceived.*

"D. A. WELLS.

W. BRYANT.

B. K. BLISS.

W. EDWARDS."

To present the whole subject at one view, we now adduce the following from "Rogers' Philosophy of the Mysterious Rappings." The authority by which the occurrence of the facts stated is verified, is of such a character as to place those facts out of the circle of rational doubt:—

The following also were developed at the house of the Rev. Dr. Griswold, New York. Among the persons present were Mr. J. F. Cooper, George Bancroft, Rev. Dr. Haws, Dr. J. W. Francis, Dr. Marcy, Mr. N. P. Willis, William Bryant, Mr. Bigsloe of the *Evening Post*, Mr. R. B. Kimball, Mr. H. Tuckerman, and General Lyman.

The mediums present were members of the Fox family.

Only Mr. Cooper, Dr. Francis, and Mr. Tuckerman seemed to come into close rapport with the psychological and nerve-centres of the mediums. The others, according to the account, could develop few or no intelligent characteristics, and could obtain a development of the physical force alone; thus giving us a plain hint of the distinction we are to observe between the physical phenomena and the psychological characteristics which frequently accompany them.

The physical force stands alone as a physical force. It bears no characteristics in its actions but that of itself, unless some other is made to impress its characteristics upon it, as the intelligent will does in the movement of the arm. But the physical force may move the arm without intelligence, as in spasms, &c.

The following peculiar physical phenomena were developed during the evening: One little peculiarity hitherto unremarked (a) came to our notice. The questioner's seat (to give him access to paper and pencil) was on one side of the table, and, chancing to occupy the place between him and the ladies (mediums), we (Mr. Willis) had accidentally thrown our arms over the back of his chair. Whenever the knockings occurred, we observed that his chair was shaken, though our own intermediate chair and the two standing immediately behind were unmoved. We called attention to it, and it was corroborated by the other gentlemen.

---

(a) Taken from *Willis's Home Journal*.

"With such heavy weight in the chair as Mr. Cooper's or Dr. Francis', it would have taken a blow with a heavy hammer to have produced so much vibration." The table was not moved, though requested.

An experiment was tried as to what would be the effect with one of the ladies alone, or with two without the third, or with a gentleman and one or two of the ladies. "The strongest knockings were on the floor beneath, when the widow and her two sisters stood anywhere together. With two of them the knockings were fainter. We placed ourselves between the widow and one of the young ladies," says Mr. Willis, "and no sounds were produced as a consequence. With one of the mediums alone there were no phenomena." These peculiar characteristics of the conditions are worthy of careful consideration. We have found several cases where no decided physical phenomena could be evolved without the presence of two persons, both in a palpable abnormal state, and we shall give one case in a future chapter, where three clairvoyants were required.

All such conditions clearly indicate the physical agency to belong to the physical organism. These characteristics will be considered in a more fitting place. We would simply direct attention to them here. The most important phenomena of this character, however, have not been sufficiently observed to develop their laws.

But to return. An experiment was tried of another kind in this circle at Dr. Griswold's. Three gentlemen placed themselves on the outside of the door and three on the inside, and watched it closely, when suddenly it was knocked with great violence, without any visible instrument. "We witnessed this," says Mr. Willis, "with one hand upon the panels; and what can it be but the exercise of a power beyond anything of which we have hitherto known the laws? That it is subject to human control," he continues, "seems probable, for it acts at present in a certain obedience to human orders (not of the medium, however), and is most obedient to those who have used it longest."

Mr. Ripley, of the *Tribune*, in speaking of the same sitting, says: "The ladies were at such a distance from the door as to lend no countenance to the idea that the sounds were produced by any direct communication with them." "Other sounds were made which caused sensible vibrations of the sofa, and apparently coming from a thick hearth rug before the fireplace, as well as from other quarters of the room."

Rev. H. Snow, in his work entitled "Spirit Intercourse," gives an apparently well-authenticated case in which a medium was himself "raised entirely from the floor and held in a suspended position by the same kind of invisible power." For ourselves, we have no disposition to question such a statement, knowing as we do that cases perfectly similar and analogous are



attested by evidence which we are compelled to regard as valid.

That musical instruments have given forth musical sounds in these circles when no persons were touching such instruments, we also freely admit, and admit for the reason that the facts of the case are affirmed by authority which we cannot, with the consciousness of moral integrity, call in question. A very intelligent Christian lady, an utter disbeliever in Spiritualism, for example, told us, that in her presence a guitar was once placed in the middle of the room; that when no one was within several feet of it, musical sounds proceeded from it; and when she extended toward it, it was instantly raised up and attracted to her hand, just as the appropriate objects are drawn towards the magnet when it is placed near them; and that when she laid hold of the instrument, it was, by a force which she could not control, wrested from her hand, just as objects charged with electricity are wrested from our hands when we grasp them. Facts affirmed by such testimony we regard ourselves as bound to admit.

We now invite very special attention to a class of facts of the most absolute and decisive bearing upon our present inquiries. We refer to certain observations and experiments which individuals have made with this one specific purpose in view—namely, to determine the *location* of the cause of these manifestations, whether that cause pertains to the minds in the circles, or to disembodied spirits out of them.

We will now attend to a case of perfectly similar characteristics connected with these manifestations. A gentleman of our acquaintance, now a member of the bar in Cleveland, had a discussion on this subject, some years since, in North Adams, Mass. That he might be prepared for the discussion he called, in company with the leading physician of the place, upon a neighbour whose daughter was a medium, and requested the privilege of witnessing some of the "spirit" phenomena. The first evening was spent in witnessing physical manifestations. With these they were perfectly astonished, and even confounded. The medium, placing simply the ends of her fingers upon the top of a large table standing in the centre of the room, called upon the spirit of an individual who had previously died in that place to move the object referred to. It was moved accordingly. Our friend got under the table, and attempted to hold it still; yet the object, and himself with it, was drawn over the floor, his utmost efforts to the contrary notwithstanding. The physician placed a sheet of paper under the fingers of the medium and drew it out while the table was being moved, and that without any sensible indications of pressure upon it.

On the next day they agreed with three individuals, leading members of the three denominations of the place—one a Congregationalist, one a Baptist, and the other a Universalist—to meet

them the evening following at the house referred to, neither being informed at all of the object to be attained, nor of the fact that either of the others was to be there. When the circle was formed, the Congregationalist was introduced. The same spirit was present that moved the table the evening before. In answer to inquiries put by the individual last referred to, the Evangelical view of heaven, hell, and eternal retribution was absolutely affirmed as immutably true. To the question, What mode of baptism is correct? *Sprinkling* was rapped out. With a pledge of secrecy, he was then dismissed and the Baptist called in. In answer to inquiries made by the latter, the same view of eternity as before was given. To the question, What mode of baptism is correct? *Immersion* was rapped out. He being dismissed, the Universalist was called in. The same spirit, which had given the responses above stated, now denied the doctrine of retribution altogether, stoutly asserting the doctrine of universal salvation, and manifesting a total indifference to the question of baptism in any form. When the audience had assembled to listen to the discussion, these individuals were called upon to testify to the spirit-communications which they had received and did so with a result which we need not specify. In a similar manner, every sentiment held by every people or sect on earth might have been absolutely affirmed and denied by the spirit which responded in that circle, or by any other spirit which appeared there, or ever appeared in any other circle upon earth, and that for the identical reason, that precisely similar answers can be obtained from the mesmeric subject. Who, in the presence of such facts—and this is the immutable character of these manifestations, the world over—can doubt their origin? It would be an impeachment of the common sense of our readers to argue the question.

The above case, while it bears with the most decisive weight upon the question of the location of the real controlling cause of these manifestations, clearly evinces the reality of an important fact—the honesty and sincerity of some mediums—of one, to say the least. Any person who was voluntarily, and by known but occult and deceptive means, producing these rapping sounds, would never, at the same sitting, rap out such contradictory communications. Many other facts, equally palpable and undeniable, evince to our minds most indubitable evidence that many other mediums are not intentionally deceiving the public, but honestly suppose themselves organs of communication between the inhabitants of this and the spirit-land.

Precisely similar and analogous experiments were made by Miss Catherine Beecher, with precisely similar results; experiments made in the most decisive forms, and so varied and repeated that a mistake is hardly conceivable and by no means supposable. With the same identical results a gentleman made very extensive experiments in the various circles in Great Britain. At one time,



for example, he *imagined* that a great fortune had just fallen to him by legacy in a certain city. He immediately received from the spirits an important communication, corresponding in all respects to his own imaginings and having no other foundation in fact. What higher evidence can we have that any facts are exclusively mundane in their origin than is here presented in respect to the facts under consideration?

The case which we next cite is, if possible, more fundamental and decisive in its bearings than any others that we have yet adduced. A gentleman of the city of Cleveland made very extensive and careful experiments and observations, for the purpose of satisfying his own mind in regard to the origin of these manifestations. He entered upon the inquiry with the earnest hope of finding valid evidence that these manifestations come from disembodied spirits. He was equally dissatisfied with the doctrine of eternal retribution, on the one hand, and with that of Universalism on the other. The general teachings of the spirits appeared to affirm an intermediate view, which correspond with what, to say the least, he wished to find reliable evidence for believing. He accordingly put and received answers to upwards of one hundred questions, in the circles of Mrs. Fish and the Foxes in this city. A large portion of these questions, probably more than one half, as he says, were asked mentally. The following are the most important facts developed:—1. In every instance, without exception, the answer referred to the *subject-matter* inquired about. Here he found the immutable relation of antecedence and consequence, cause and effect. 2. In every instance in which he knew what the answer should be, a perfectly correct one was obtained. 3. When he was in doubt what the answer should be, those doubts were reflected and nothing positive asserted. For example, a sister of his had died of a lingering disease, of the nature of which there was doubt among the physicians and in his own mind, some five and six different diseases having been assigned and none fixed upon with certainty. He inquired of the spirit of that sister what was the disease of which she did die? All the diseases which he had heard suggested as the cause, and none others, were named, each designated with very feeble raps, and neither positively affirmed as the real cause. So in all similar cases. 4. When he was mistaken in regard to the facts about which he inquired, and when the spirits of whom he was inquiring did know, and could not have forgotten, the answers invariably corresponded with his mistaken apprehensions, and not with the real facts, as he subsequently became informed, and as they were known to the spirits professedly answering. For example, he inquired of the spirit of his own sister her age at the time of her death, he supposing, at the moment, that twenty-eight was the true answer, and that number was rapped out. On a subsequent reference to the family records, he found that she was really aged

at the time upwards of thirty years. A friend of his had lost his life in California by drowning, and that, as he had been informed, in a certain river, by accidentally slipping through a raft of logs. All the facts of the occurrence were given, professedly by the spirit of that friend, as he had supposed them to be. From four individuals present when the event occurred he subsequently learned that his friend actually came to his end in another part of the State, in another river and by a totally different accident. The answer corresponded with the supposed, and not with the real, facts as known to the spirit professedly communicating. He put a question to another spirit pertaining to a transaction about which, as he well knew, that spirit was perfectly informed and himself as he subsequently learned, had been misinformed. The answer corresponded with his misinformation and not with the real facts, as known to the spirit professedly responding. 5. To every question, without exception, pertaining to subjects of which he was ignorant, a wrong answer was obtained. As the result of his experience, he drew the following inferences:—

1. That disembodied spirits can have no connection with these communications. . . . 2. That no information is ever communicated, in these circles, beyond what is previously known to the inquirer. We suppose that not one person in a thousand would draw any different conclusions from similar investigations in these circles, investigations conducted upon similar principles. The only exceptions that do occur are, as we suppose, some solitary revelations through clairvoyance,—revelations which no one has reason to expect when he resorts to these circles, and certain answers corresponding to, and evidently occasioned by, acts of imagination and conjecture.

---



## CHAPTER IX.

## PHENOMENA OF PSYCHISM.

## THEORY OF AUTOMATIC MOTION.

THE hypothesis I have ventured to advance is, that the force emanates from the nervous system of the Psychic; that the Psychic is in a state nearly allied to, if not identical with, Somnambulism, in which the brain acts independently of the external senses; that in this isolated condition the Conscious Self obtains impressions of external existence through some other medium than the external senses and *perceives* without their aid. The phenomenon of sounds and motions made in intelligent response to intelligent questions may thus be rationally explained, without assuming the agency of disembodied Spirits of the dead—a theory to which the phenomena themselves present so many and such apparently insuperable objections. An entire volume would not suffice for all the evidence supporting this solution of the problem. In the present treatise, designed to be merely an outline of the Mechanism of Man, I must content myself with briefly submitting the most prominent of the proved facts to the patient consideration of those who may undertake a more profound inquiry, with desire and design to ascertain the very truth in a matter of such transcendent importance in its relationship to the present and the future of MAN.

There remains one other question. In the honest pursuit of Science we must frankly recognise failures as well as successes. Granting that the force proceeds from

the Psychic and is directed by *his* intelligence, *how* is it so directed? *How* can a solid body be moved by something non-solid and imperceptible? How can there be a mechanical force without a mechanical agent?

The honest answer is, that as yet we do not know. But we *know* that motion, caused by an unseen and unfelt force, without material contact, is neither a new nor a strange fact in nature. It is continually presenting itself to us, but especially in the operations of the magnet. After centuries of observation and experiment, Scientists have failed to discover what the *thing* is which, passing from the magnet to the steel, seizes the substance of the metal and drags it to the magnet. We can only know a force by its manifestations. It cannot be seen and handled. Something passes from the electrical machine to the finger and we feel the action of a force upon the molecules of which the finger is constructed. But investigators have failed to discover *what* the imperceptible thing is that strikes the finger and which, when concentrated, can paralyse the strongest arm. We *know* of the existence of this powerful thing, not by any sensible perception we have of the thing itself, but by its action upon other perceptible things. The thing we call Psychic Force is as imperceptible to the senses as is the thing we call the magnetic or the electric force. That unseen thing we call electric force passes into the electric battery and accumulates there; that unseen thing we call the magnetic force can clutch and draw the steel without *perceptible* threads of communication. Surely it cannot be more improbable that the Psychic Force should be conveyed to a table and cause it to move by some such invisible process as that by which the steel is invisibly moved by the magnet. Such an action would not be more wonderful, and certainly not at all more inexplicable, than the action of the other natural forces. To the objection that, as Psychic Force must have existed as long as Man has been, why was it not discovered until now? the answer is patent. The Electric, the Galvanic, and the Magnetic



forces (if they be not one force) have been about and controlling Man for the same period of time, precisely as now they are, and yet the discovery of them is recent, and such practical knowledge of them as we possess has been gained almost within our own day.

If the Nerve Force can contract the muscular fibre and impart to the arm a power which enables it to lift a heavy table by actual contact, surely there is nothing impossible, nor even improbable, in the suggestion that, in certain abnormal conditions, the same nerve force, that makes the muscles move the table by actual contact, may be projected beyond the extremities of the structure and do, without the touch of the fingers, what, in the normal condition, it can do only by actual contact. I am not asserting that so it is. The *modus operandi* of the Psychic Force is still as great a mystery as is the *modus operandi* of the Magnetic Force. Being ignorant of the thing operating in both of these forces, it is impossible for us to affirm of either that it *cannot* operate thus or thus. We must be content to note the manifestations of their action upon perceptible bodies (by which alone their existence is revealed to us) and, seeing what are the results of action, we may be enabled, perhaps, to form some judgment of their constitution from those results. In this, as in almost all scientific investigations, it is wholly a question of *fact*, to be determined, not by argument *à priori*, but by observation, experiment and test. We must first ask "*is it?*" before we ask "*how can it be?*" If it be, patient examination of the phenomena, exhibited under various conditions, will assuredly reveal to us, sooner or later, *how it comes to be*.

I may not pass without notice a phenomenon of Psychism which is often adduced as a triumphant proof of its supra-mundane nature. Psychics sometimes *write*, with what is certainly astonishing celerity, in the dark as well as in the light, with eyes closed as with eyes open. I have seen, for instance, a sentence of twelve words, every letter being distinctly and perfectly formed, written

in the twinkling of an eye, by a mere sweep of the pencil; that is to say, as rapidly as the hand could be passed across the paper. In another experiment, fifteen clearly legible lines of small writing (being a passage from *The Spectator*) which, with all possible speed, I was unable to copy in less than ten minutes, was written, or rather flashed upon the paper, in thirty-five seconds. I know a Psychic who, in the state of trance, always *writes backwards* ten times more rapidly than I can write in the usual fashion. In her normal state she is unable to write a word thus, save as slowly and with as much difficulty as others could so write. This phenomenon is at once assigned by the Spiritualists to the agency of Spirits seizing and guiding, as they contend, the hand of the Psychic. But wherefore Spirits? Why, when the Psychic visibly commands his own hand, should it be concluded that some other power has taken possession of it, and that it is the act of a Being of whose presence we have no proof whatever? Is it not more reasonable to seek for the cause (at least in the first instance) in the same organization that guides the hand on other occasions? Is this solution to be rejected merely because the action is abnormally rapid? The more reasonable course is to inquire if there be any abnormal conditions of the organism that *might* produce such a result. So inquiring, I suggest the following physiological and psychological explanation of this seeming miracle.

The Psychic is in a condition of Trance. In this condition, as already described, he *acts* the dream which we, when dreaming, *believe we act, but do not act*. In dream, the mind works with marvellous rapidity and has a measure of time of its own quite other than the measure of time in waking life. What to waking existence is a minute, in dream life appears often a day, a week, a month, a year. Why? Because in dream the mind, acting without the slow motions of the senses, passes through many conditions in a few minutes—that is to say, it entertains a crowd of ideas and of imagined actions which, in waking reality, under the drag of the senses,



would have occupied a month. If, for instance, we dream that we are writing. We believe that we are writing with the hand. The brain goes through the entire process it would have gone through if the action of the muscles of the hand had actually followed the mental action and we had really written what we dreamed we had written. Sleep has severed the communication between the brain and the muscles, and therefore the hand does not in fact obey the mind. But if the muscles, at the moment of the dream, *could* follow the direction of the brain, they would act as rapidly as the brain, to the limit of their capacity for motion. In such case, that which the hand could not have done in five minutes under the direction of the waking Will, (which works slowly) would be done in five seconds if the hand were directed by the dreaming brain, which works with wonderful rapidity. The Psychic, being in the condition of Trance, dreams that he is writing. But the special feature of Trance, as distinguished from sleep, is that the body obeys the brain and *acts* the dream. The brain rapidly conceives the entire process—the thought, the words in which to clothe it, and the writing in which to express it. The hand, obedient to the brain, in this state of Trance acts with almost equal speed, and thus may the rapid writing be explained by a purely Psychic process, without resorting to what is, at the least, a very improbable hypothesis—that some Spirit of the Dead has taken manual possession of the arm and is moving the fingers with the speed we see.

I cannot conclude this branch of the subject without reference to an objection often made to the reality of the Phenomena here described, that they or many of them are imitated by conjurors at public exhibitions. There is of course *no* phenomenon in Science that mechanical contrivance could *not* imitate. Every experiment exhibited by Professor TYNDALL at the Royal Institution could be exactly imitated to the eye at the Egyptian Hall by a little sleight-of-hand and a great deal of ingenious machinery. But this would not be accepted for a

moment as any evidence whatever that Professor TYNDALL'S exquisite phenomena, by which *he* proves the existence of the magnetic and other natural forces, are conjuring tricks only. The ready answer of Professor TYNDALL to such an argument would be, "Produce the same phenomena *under the same conditions* as I do. Come alone in a cab to this Institution; bring nothing with you; introduce no confederate; let me examine your pockets; stand at this table with me and with all eyes upon you. If *then* you produce the same phenomena, I will admit that my experiments are of no more worth than yours and cannot be accepted as evidence to support my theory of the existence of a magnetic force."

The same answer is given by the assertor of the phenomena of Psychism. "To *imitate* them is nothing; ingenuity and mechanism can imitate anything. To prove their unreality, you must produce them *under the same conditions*. Come to my drawing-room, where no mechanism has been prepared. Bring no person and nothing with you. Submit to be searched and everything but your clothes taken from you. Seat yourself with a party of *my* friends at the table. Suffer your hands to be held by two of the investigators and their feet to be placed upon your feet. *If in these circumstances and in this position*, with all eyes upon you, so that your slightest movement must be seen, you will do what is done in the presence of a Psychic—that is to say, if you will make the table resound with blows, rise and fall at command, mount into the air two or three feet and descend as gently as a feather; the chairs, sofa, side tables and pianoforte, far out of your reach, advance from their places to the middle of the room; an accordion play half a dozen tunes when held at the end opposite to the keys; two or three chairs mount upon the table; a handful of flowers on the chimney-piece, three yards distant, pass untouched from the vase to the table; ponderous volumes leap from the bookshelf over a space of eight feet; a musical box weighing 14lb. rise to the



ceiling and fly round the room, playing the whole time—you will be entitled to say you have produced the same phenomena by your art, but not otherwise.” I repeat, that if these things are done by any conjuror in the same rooms and under the same conditions as they are daily to be witnessed in the presence of Psychics, the phenomena would then be properly adjudged to be conjuring tricks only and not psychical phenomena that demand the investigation of Science.\*

Moreover, it is admitted that years of laborious practice are required for the performance of conjuring feats. If the phenomena of Psychism are merely conjuring tricks, the Psychics must be the most accomplished conjurors in the world. How or when have they learned that difficult art? Many of them are children not ten years old. One of the most powerful Psychics in London is a young lady aged eighteen. How could *she* rival Dr. Lynn? My friend, the M.A. of Oxford, is an accomplished classic, but he cannot even “force a card.” And as for the paid Psychics, if they really do it by clever conjuring, they would prefer the making of a certain fortune as avowed conjurors to the poor profit and infinite abuse they find as Psychics.

Again, the contrivances by which all the conjuring tricks are performed are well known to experts. The secret of the performance of most of them may be learnt for five shillings. The mechanical tricks can be bought at any toy shop. A few visits to the most accomplished conjurors enable a moderately keen observer to discover the *modus operandi* of every trick. But it is a significant fact that no person of intelligence has ever yet

---

\* Maskelyne and Cooke were invited to exhibit at a private house and informed the inquirer that he must send a waggon and horses for two tons of machinery necessary for their *spiritual* performances. Dr. Lynn was publicly offered 1000*l.* if he would produce the same phenomena as Messrs. Hearne and Williams, under the same conditions, in a private room, and he declined the offer, though publicly professing to reveal the mystery of their manifestations.

discovered *how* the phenomena of automatic motion and sound are produced. No man has patiently investigated them without coming to the conclusion that they are genuine.

There are other asserted phenomena, that have undoubtedly been made the subjects of impudent imposture, partly by the facilities offered for fraud, and partly by the credulity of persons who are attracted by curiosity merely and not for scientific research. *We are dealing here with those psychic phenomena only that are capable of demonstrative proof by satisfactory evidence.*

---



## CHAPTER X.

## MORE PHENOMENA OF PSYCHISM.

THE first and scientifically the most interesting and important of the Phenomena of Psychism are motions produced without muscular contact or connection — *apparently* “action at distance;” this action, whatever its source, being *certainly directed by some Intelligence*. What that action is and whence that Intelligence, are problems, the solution of which is the proper province of Psychology.

The phenomena of apparent automatic motion and sound are described in a previous chapter. Doubtless the details were tedious. But the importance of this phenomenon, if real, is so immense, the mass of evidence by which it is proved is so great, that briefer treatment of it was impracticable. If those phenomena be real, even though all others be false, the existence of a *Psychic force* is established, and other allied phenomena are made more probable. If, on the contrary, the proof of sound and motion fails, the rest must be discredited also.

Many other alleged phenomena claim notice as Psychic, but may be treated more briefly, for the greater portion of them are only further developments of the same intelligent force,—whether it be muscular, psychic, spiritual, angelic, or demoniac—for all these names have been given to it. There are some other phenomena in which, so far as investigation has proceeded, a Psychic Force cannot be traced and which, therefore, appear to demand a different solution.

This being admitted, it must be clearly understood that in this treatise we are concerned with so much only of the alleged phenomena as are *distinctly psychic* and therefore associated with the Mechanism of Man. If there be any proceeding from other sources, whether angelic or demoniac—whether from Spirits of the Earth, of Water, or of Fire, whether from Elementary Spirits (as the Theosophists contend), or from Demons as some Theologians contend, or from races of beings non-molecular and therefore imperceptible to us, but inhabiting the world with us (as many think), *such phenomena are not within the purview of these pages.* The question “If the agents in the alleged phenomena be Spirits of the dead?” is pertinent to the present inquiry into the Mechanism of Man, for if, of the multitude so asserted, *but one be proved*, the existence of Soul, as a part of that mechanism, would be *demonstrated* beyond further doubt or question. So also would be determined the still greater and more important question, does the Soul survive the destruction of the body? For this reason, whatever of the phenomena appear to be *Psychic* come properly within the province of Psychology. I say, with sorrow, that having sought earnestly and laboriously for a satisfactory solution of this problem, I have not found it. Nothing that I have seen, under the most severe test conditions, has sufficed to bring to my mind, although eagerly desiring to find it, *proof sufficient for conviction* that Spirits of the Dead are the agents. Indeed, the more I have experimented and weighed the *proved facts*, the more I am compelled to the reluctant conclusion that Spirits of the Dead are *not* the intelligent operators in the phenomena.

Let us briefly examine the most interesting of them.

Intelligent ideas, expressed in correct language, are often written by what appears an *automatic* action of the pen or pencil. The Psychic grasps a pencil; his hand writes with extreme rapidity, while he is seemingly in the unconsciousness of trance, with eyes closed, or, if awake, conversing on quite other topics. The *planchette* was



the instrument at first employed in this experiment; but it was found that the hand could act without it. Writing is as readily performed by the left as by the right hand, and backwards as forwards. Sometimes the words are in a language unknown to the writer. Sometimes they are the exact imitation of handwritings and signatures of persons the Psychic had never seen. But always some person near him knew the language or the writing. This is a frequent phase of the phenomenon with private Psychics. Professing to be a communication to me from a near and dear deceased relative, the signature resembled hers so exactly that, when placed among others, it was impossible to detect a difference. But this was written *in my presence*, when the Psychic whose hand inscribed it was in a state of apparent unconsciousness and could not see what the pencil was doing and I am sure he had never *seen* the signature. The psychological explanation is, that it was in *my* mind, not in *his* memory. The impression in my mind was sympathetically echoed, as it were, by his mind, and the idea so excited in his mind was drawn by his hand.

The popular theory is, that the invisible Spirit of the person supposed to be communicating seizes the hand of the unconscious Psychic and guides it in this writing. But it is not merely a motion of the rigid limb. To write thus, the whole mechanism of the hand, arm, brain and intelligence must be employed.

Others, recognizing this difficulty, say: "The Spirit takes possession of the *brain* and so commands the mechanism of nerve and muscle." But this is only the substitution of one difficulty for another; it does not advance the solution by a step.

I venture upon a more reasonable explanation—at least more in accord with science. The writing is an act of *Unconscious Cerebration*. One brain is working thus, while the other brain is otherwise employed.

But whence comes the *knowledge* contained in the writing? By *mental sympathy and communion*, improperly termed "thought reading." It has been

observed that nothing is thus communicated that is not known to some person present. I had in my mind the imprint of my relative's signature that was impressed upon the mind of the Psychic by the physical process described in the chapter on mental communion (*ante*, p. 22) and by his hand it was transmitted to the paper, precisely as all of us are enabled to express, by drawing it with our hands, a picture that is in our thoughts.

This automatic writing is, as stated before, often accomplished with wonderful rapidity. The eye cannot follow the motion of the hand. As a spark whirled at the end of a string seems to us a continuous circle of fire, because of the slow movement of our nerve mechanism in the act of perception, so does this motion of the pencil seem to the spectator almost as one stroke.

The scientific explanation of this seeming wonder is, that in our normal condition the mind moves far faster than the bodily mechanism it directs. In writing, it frames a sentence before the hand can write a word. In the Psychic condition, the mind, partially severed from the senses, is less clogged by the conditions that attend action in the normal state, and therefore moves the hand with something approaching to its own rapidity of action.

Writing with the *planchette* may be explained in like manner. It is effected thus. The Psychic places his hand upon the platen. After an interval, more or less (the facility being increased by practice), the instrument begins to move. The pencil traces, sometimes slowly, sometimes rapidly, intelligible and intelligent sentences. In this manner a large sheet of paper may be often seen to be covered with very legible writing. In this there would be little to surprise, were it not that, for the most part, the writing is manifestly *automatic*—that is to say, it is accomplished without any apparent guidance of the hand by *the Will* of the owner. This is shown in various ways, such, for instance, as maintaining conversation on quite a different subject while the hand is upon the instrument—or reading aloud a book, or employing the other hand in some work requiring mental attention; or still



more conclusively, when the hands of *two* persons are upon it, for it is very improbable that they should mentally agree to write the same words. If any reader deems it possible thus to conduct at the same moment two distinct operations requiring distinct action of the mind, he should make the experiment by trying two different motions with his hands or fingers at the same moment, or while reading a book aloud to write a letter on another subject. He will at once discover that the writing in question cannot be so accounted for. The explanation, however, is readily found, if it be looked upon as an act of "Unconscious Cerebration" (as it is termed by Dr. CARPENTER), meaning by this that one brain is *unconsciously* directing the hand, while the other brain is *consciously* reading or talking.

This is the more probable if we examine the character of the greater portion of these automatic scribbles. When they are not the reflexes of other minds present and *en rapport* with the Psychic, they are identical with the mental character, the knowledge, and the sentiments of the Psychic. For the most part they are pretty platitudes. When statements are made, they are as often false as true. If they relate to something the Psychic knows to a small extent only—the additions to the facts are manifestly merely guesses. In short, the brain, which is working unconsciously, is really doing nothing more than *dreaming*, and for the explanation of the physiology and mental action of dream reference must be made to the chapter on that subject in a former part of this volume (*ante*, p. 109).

Another phase of Psychism admits of explanation in accordance with known natural mental conditions. The Psychic falls into a state of Trance that bears a marked likeness to the somnambulistic condition and which appears essential to the development of this as of many others of the phenomena of Psychism—its physiology being a temporary severance of the mechanism of the mind from the external senses. With eyes firmly closed and his aspect and demeanour changed, the Psychic takes your

hand. He says he is about to read much of the history of your past life. In fact, he proceeds to do so. Marvellous as it appears to you at the moment, he tells you of events in your existence, long past as well as recent, of persons, of things, of places, sometimes even naming them and always describing them with more or less of truth and fullness. Incidents known to yourself only, or at least which could not possibly be known to him, are narrated, not elicited by question and answer (as is the "explanation" of objectors who have never witnessed it), but spoken without a word on your part to suggest the thought. This phenomenon of Psychism occurs too frequently to be merely a "happy guess," as some have called it, or "accidental coincidence," as it has been termed by others. If any reader doubts, he may readily satisfy himself by trying, with two or three strangers, to "guess" at incidents in *their* lives. He would find that "the coincidence" will not occur to him once in a hundred guesses—whereas the Psychic is right in *his* reading at least four times out of five.

But this apparent marvel also admits of scientific explanation by reference to the scarcely disputed phenomenon of *mental sympathy and communion*, treated of in a preceding chapter (p. 22). If so it be, the process is very much in this manner. You are told that your past life is about to be narrated to you. This at once calls up in your mind the most vivid of the memories of that past life and all the associated memories come with them involuntarily and unconsciously. If you carefully examine the condition of your mind, you will discover that these recollections vary in distinctness of form and vividness of colour. Some are as definite as are objects seen by the eye; some are hazy and only partly conceived, like objects in a dream. If you note carefully the descriptions given to you by the Psychic, you will find that they reflect your own mental pictures as nearly as words can paint them. If your own idea is imperfect, so is his sketch of it. If your mind is wandering about, seeking, as it were, for memories, so is his. When he describes



some event, that description, echoing your own mind, calls up other associated memories, which again are reflected upon his mind and described by his lips. It is in fact what is popularly, but improperly, called a case of "thought-reading." The process by which this very interesting mental condition is produced is fully stated in the chapter devoted to it, and to that the Reader is referred.

## CHAPTER XI.

## OTHER PHENOMENA OF PSYCHISM.

I HAVE preserved careful notes of one hundred and twenty-seven experiments in Psychism, tried for purposes of science only, with strict regard to scientific methods of observation, and the great majority of them with the assistance of practical Scientists. In the course of these investigations, which have extended over a period of twelve years, I have witnessed all the alleged phenomena, under the strictest tests scientific ingenuity could devise, coming to the inquiry without prejudice or prepossession and with no other desire or prompting than for love of Science to ascertain what the truth is. In the course of these protracted experiments, I have witnessed a considerable amount of imposture among Psychics, real and pretended, and a still greater amount of credulity and self-delusion among spectators, attracted by merely vulgar curiosity, or influenced by unreasoning enthusiasm. Of these the great majority did not come to *learn* what the truth was, but with faith already formed, and so eager to find confirmation, that any evidence was accepted, however worthless. But it must be admitted also that as many came with an equal prepossession of absolute scepticism, closing their senses and their minds against *all* evidence, and as credulous in their incredulity as the votaries. When the facts were too plain to be denied, these sagacious observers contented themselves with explanations more improbable and impossible, and, if correct, far more marvellous, than the phenomena they professed so to account for.



In the preceding chapters I have dealt with some of the most frequent and familiar, but from a scientific point of view the most interesting and important, of the phenomena of Psychism. But almost every experiment presented, not automatic motions and sounds only, but other phenomena so closely associated that it would be impossible to describe each one separately and deal with it in a distinct section of this treatise. The only practicable course will be to report some of the most interesting of these experiments, selecting such as exhibited, under the most satisfactory conditions, the most instructive features, and then to comment upon those inviting remark or for which scientific explanations can be suggested.

I do not therefore propose to present the entire of the notes taken on each occasion. The full reports would claim another volume larger than this one. They will be given in a condensed form.

It is necessary to premise that all here reported is upon my own voucher. I shall relate nothing that has not been personally witnessed by myself, under strict test conditions, in *private* houses, where *mechanism* and *confederacy* (the two necessary conditions for conjuring) were absolutely excluded, and at which other witnesses were present who unanimously confirmed the reports I have preserved; these attesting witnesses being for the most part Men eminent in practical Science, Lawyers practised in proofs, and Men of Business skilful to detect imposture.

The facts being stated, an examination of them, with an inquiry into their probable causes, will appropriately follow.

#### EXPERIMENT VII.

On the evening of March 30th, 1878, at the house of a private friend, and therefore without possibility of aid by mechanism, nine persons being present, by all of whom the phenomena were witnessed, I was lifted, seated in my chair, and placed, so seated, in the centre of the table. It was done suddenly and with apparent ease. The whole party was at the time sitting round the table,

all hands being held and placed upon it. A few minutes afterwards Sir C. J., Bart., who was sitting opposite to me, was with and in his chair lifted upon the table in like manner. He was a much heavier man than I am. I have frequently seen the Psychics thus raised with their chairs and placed upon the table, but this is the only instance, in my own experience or in that of other investigators of whom inquiry has been made, of a person other than the Psychic being so treated. At the close of the experiment, trial was made of the capacity to accomplish the same feat by muscular effort. We found that the two strongest men in the room could not, without the utmost difficulty, lift me to a level with the table; but by no effort could they place me on the centre of the table, where I had been deposited instantly and easily by the Force (Psychic or otherwise) then in operation. As to my friend, the stout Baronet, they could not lift him two feet from the floor.

Was this an hallucination? Were we "biologised," and merely imagined the occurrence? The answer is, that I had to return from my unexpected eminence by jumping from the table; that it was seen by all present and made the subject of much jesting; and that all of us had the free use of our senses. If not an illusion, it was a reality. Both of us *were* so elevated. Was it accomplished by some trick of the Psychic? It is at least certain that he could have employed no mechanism, for he was in a private house. He had not the use of his hands and body, for he was being held in his seat on the other side of the table by two of my friends. Moreover, as proved by subsequent trial of it, he had not the physical strength so to lift us, even if he had so desired.

At the same experiment, in full light, the table was violently rocked and then thrice raised more than two feet from the floor, nobody touching it. Then I mounted upon it, and again it was lifted, *untouched*, with myself sitting upon it, upwards of two feet from the floor.

I have seen four times the Psychic suddenly raised in his chair and put upon the table. On one occasion, the table was so placed under the gaselier that there was not space for the chair and its occupant without passing his head between two of the arms of the gaselier.



This difficulty notwithstanding, instantaneously, and without any adjustment of the position at the moment or after, although the divergence of a tenth of an inch would have inflicted a stunning blow, the chair, with its living freight, was placed upon the only practicable spot upon the table, and with such precision that the head was lodged between two brackets, into which it could pass in the light only with difficulty and effort. Afterwards, repeated endeavours were made to perform the same feat and to place ourselves in the same position without a blow ; but when attempted slowly and carefully we could not accomplish it. This occurred in my own house.

The Psychics in the above phenomena were "professional;" but they were subjected to crucial test conditions. The experiments were conducted in private houses and therefore were not aided by machinery. Hands were held and feet pressed by two of the experimental party during the exhibition of all the phenomena reported.

#### EXPERIMENT VIII.

At the private house of a friend, Mr. HOME being the Psychic, *in full light*, a chair came slowly gliding along the floor from the inner room into that where we were sitting. It came up to me, turned, and its back was presented to my hand. I placed my hand upon it and instantly it rose into the air so high that I was obliged to stand on tiptoe, my hand merely touching—not holding—it. Having thus risen to the full stretch of my body, I forcibly withdrew my hand, and the chair fell upon the *table*. It was a light cane-bottomed chair, and I wanted to replace it upon the floor. I was unable to lift it, although applying to it my whole strength. If it had been made of lead it could not have been more immovable. It had not been touched by any person. It was still lying as before. I grasped it again, applying the same force. Not merely was it not heavy now ; it was as light as a feather. It seemed to have no weight, and I staggered and fell down with it from the excess of force I had applied. No person was near it at the time.

#### EXPERIMENT IX.

*July 15th, 1870.*—The Psychic was a lady, unpaid and in private life. A page of note paper was inscribed with the initials of the

persons present, for purpose of identification. It was brought to the room by a friend. Being placed with a pencil in the middle of the table, the gas was turned down. Instantly we heard the pencil lifted and the sound as of writing in the air. In thirty seconds, by my watch, light was turned on. The entire of the half sheet of paper was covered on both sides with very small but legible writing. I took it home to copy. Although written in the dark in thirty seconds, it required sixteen minutes for me to copy it, and I am a fast writer. It concluded with a long quotation in Latin, citing AULUS GELLIUS, and giving the vol. and page. I had some difficulty in finding so obscure an author, but on reference at the British Museum I discovered that the citation was correct, and so were the references to volume and page. The Psychic being a lady, it may be supposed that she was not likely to know Latin, and still less the works of that writer. It was, however, known to two of the investigators, and one of them, a learned Doctor, had seen the passage before, as an extract, although he could not remember where.

Here again we can trace the communication to mental sympathy and communion (or thought reading).

#### EXPERIMENT X.

A sitting, with Mr. C. FOSTER as the Psychic, in the house of a friend. A party of nine, chiefly authors and artists of distinction. No possible confederate; the Psychic, who had arrived in England two days before, being a stranger to all of us. Our names were purposely not stated to him, and he had no personal knowledge of any of us. Writing paper, purchased by us at a neighbouring stationer's, was placed at the far end of the room, wrapped in the parcel as we had bought it. We were invited to go to the table and write on small slips of our paper there the names of any persons deceased, then to crumple each slip into a small pellet. This was done, some writing three, some four or five names. I wrote three. Dr. Carpenter suggests that the Psychic must have watched the motion of the top of the pencil, and thus learned the name written by the point of it. This was impossible, for we all wrote where he could not see the pencil.

The pellets were thrown by us upon the centre of the table at which we sat. They were thirty-one in number. They were never touched by the Psychic, and being mixed together none of us could recognise even his own. The room was brilliantly lighted with gas which burned in the full blaze of a gaselier above the table. We were directed in turn to take some of the paper pellets from the heap and drop them slowly. When certain of them fell, vigorous blows were heard upon the table. That pellet



was separated from the rest unopened. Then a name was spelled by the usual process of calling the alphabet and answering blows. Fourteen were thus signalled, and always the names were correctly given, some of them being very uncommon ones. On the completion of the spelling of each we were directed to open the pellet. The name written upon it was in every instance that which had been indicated. The Psychic then inquired who had written it, and the writer was told that answers would be given to questions he desired to put to the person so named. Inquiries as to the date of death, the cause of death, the place of burial, the age, and such like, were thus answered, and, as the persons so answered asserted, with perfect accuracy. One series of questions by one of our most eminent authoresses was very remarkable. She had written the name of a governess who had died some years before, purposely to try if it could possibly be from information obtained. Miss M. inquired the age, the date of the death, the disease, the place where buried, and the inscription on the tombstone. All of these were, she said, answered correctly, although the name of the parish was one of those unpronounceable Welsh names which puzzle an Englishman, and which a stranger would not know, or knowing, would never rightly spell.

Presently a pellet was welcomed by sledge-hammer blows upon the table. Name spelled. "Any relation here?" "Yes, his widow." The following sentence spelled: "Do not fret, your son is innocent. It was the servant who did it." This was unintelligible to us. The lady was fearfully agitated. She took a letter from her pocket. "This," she said, "came by post to-day. It was opened by myself. No human eye has seen it. It is from my son, who is at school in Liverpool. He says that he has been accused of stealing a watch; that appearances were against him; that he feared he should be expelled in disgrace, but he assures me that he knows nothing of it."

So far I had only the testimony of others as to the correctness of the answers, but as all were persons of highest reputation and honour, I could not doubt them. No name that I had written had been recognised. I placed my hands under the table, unseen by any, and wrote on a slip of paper the name "William Trenchard;" it was that of a cousin who had died twenty-three years before. We had been fast friends. I had not mentioned his name, nor had he been in my thoughts until that moment. When it came to my turn to drop the pellets, I mingled this one with the rest. I had not done so ten minutes when the Psychic turned to me and said, "I see a form standing behind you—a young man with light hair and dark eyes, very pale—he is laying his hand upon your head as if to bless you. His name is William Trenchard. He wishes me to make you a communication from him." The Psychic then seized a pencil and wrote with immense rapidity, "Dear Edward, I am glad you have called me. I have

long wanted to communicate with you. Doubt no more. Be assured there is a communication between the two worlds. William Trenchard." This he handed to me. The party present could not understand its object. I did. The *facts* were these. My cousin was a clergyman. I was then sceptical (as are most devotees of Physical Science) as to a life after death. We had repeated discussions upon the question, he having a firm faith in the immortality of the Soul. A few days before his death (of consumption) he wrote me a long letter, saying that he was nearing to his grave, and should soon solve the problem we had so often debated, and that if God would permit him to communicate with me, he would make known to me the truth.

This was an obvious reference to an incident of long ago, and then and long after it impressed me very strongly as being a message from the dead—as doubtless it will appear to many readers. But further investigation and a longer experience of the phenomena of Psychism have satisfied me that all the incidents reported above admit of satisfactory and scientific explanation by reference to the mental condition, of the existence of which I had then no knowledge—*mental sympathy and communion*—popularly termed "thought-reading." The Psychic had in his mind an echo of the impressions upon my mind, the impressions upon the minds of Miss M., of the widow, and of the seven other persons whose friends had been rightly described. He was *en rapport* with each of us in turn. The impressions communicated to his mind by our minds appeared to him by a well-known mental deception as objective realities. Necessarily I had in my mind the form of my friend, the fact of our controversy, and the promise contained in his dying epistle. I could not recall his name without recalling by association the likeness of him, and some of the strongly-marked incidents connected with him. My recollections were attended by motion of the brain fibres. The same motions were set up in the brain of the Psychic by the process described in a former page. The same motions of the brain fibres produced the same ideas—that is, the same mental conceptions—in his mind, and with him, as so often with ourselves, mental impressions seemed



objective realities. This, it may be said, is conceivable, but how with *names* of persons and places? But a name cannot be placed upon the memory, nor recalled, without some brain action, and this particular brain action is as easily excited by sympathy as are other brain actions; and if the brain action of two persons be identical, so certainly will be the mental impressions conveyed to the Conscious Self.

Apply this simple solution to the phenomena of Psychism generally, and it will be found to account rationally for the great majority of them. The next incident proved that it was not merely a happy "guess."

I had written the name of "Rosalinda Butler" on one of the slips. Some time after the incident noted above, as it came to my turn to drop the pellets, the usual blows indicated that the one just fallen was to be marked. As I did this, the Psychic said to me; "I see by your side a young lady, fair, with long ringlets, about seventeen, her name is Rosalinda Butler." After a pause he added, "Another girl is by her side. They seem to be sisters. She nods assent. She shows me her name. Dorinda Butler. Are they related to you? 'Tis very odd. They are the same age. Were they twins? They shake their heads. Have you summoned them?" The pellet I dropped upon the table was opened and was that upon which I had written "Rosalinda Butler." The facts were, that I was much attached to Rosalinda, who was a cousin of my wife and died at the age of seventeen, almost suddenly, a few days after a visit to my house. She had a sister called Dorinda, who died at the same age, of the same malady, but of whom I had known little and who was not in my *thoughts* that evening, and but dimly in my *memory*.

A similar incident occurred with another of the party—Miss MULOCK, the author of "John Halifax." The Psychic described, as being seen by him at her side, an old lady with a queer cap and a curiously twisted stick. Miss M. informed us that it was an exact description of her mother, who wore such a head-dress and always carried a stick curled like a corkscrew. She was one of the names written by her.

These also were manifestly not objective, but subjective, impressions on the mind of the Psychic. The forms were pictured in *our* minds and so reflected upon *his* mind. I was not *thinking* of Dorinda; but the one sister was, by an association with the other sister, according to a

well-known law of mental action, actually present in my mind, although not consciously. Another proof of this is, that if the name of a living person be written, the description is often given with equal accuracy, showing that it is the *mental* picture and *not* the real person, or spirit of the person, which the Psychic has in his mind.

#### EXPERIMENT XI.

*February 4, 1874.*—Experimental sitting with Mr. WILLIAMS, Psychic, in the dining room at the residence of Mr. CROOKES, F.R.S. The Psychic came alone in a cab, wearing ordinary evening dress. Confederacy impossible, no person being present but Mr. CROOKES and myself. Personal action by the Psychic impossible, for we sat on either side of him, Mr. CROOKES holding one hand, his foot upon the Psychic's foot, and I doing the like on the other side. Both of us assert positively that our hold upon him was never relaxed for a moment during the presentation of the phenomena. In this position, precluding the possibility of confederacy, mechanism, or use of hand or foot by the Psychic, or moving an inch from his seat, the following phenomena occurred.

An arm chair and a heavy oak dining-room chair were brought from the other side of the room, a distance of seven feet from us, and placed *upon* the table at which we were seated. A large china jug, nearly two feet high, and weighty, was brought from the sideboard and placed before us. A heavy musical box was wound up, lifted from the table, and carried round the room, playing the whole time. A handbell was repeatedly taken from the table and rung violently at each corner of the room and up at the ceiling. Asked that it might be brought nearer to me, it was immediately brought from a distant corner of the room, then circled round my head for several minutes, ringing furiously, until I was almost deafened by the noise and begged that it would cease the din; a request refused for some time. My watch was taken from my pocket, wound up, and returned to me. Many lights, like small shooting stars, or tiny rockets, continually descended from the ceiling to the table, and ascended from the table to the ceiling. All the customary sounds and motions attended this experiment, with other phenomena similar to those already reported.

The value of this experiment consists, not so much in novelty of phenomena presented, for all of them have been repeatedly witnessed, but in the exceptional excellence of the conditions under which they appeared.



Collusion, confederacy, mechanism, were *impossible*, nor could it have been conjuring, for no conjuror can perform any trick when his hands are held and in the absence of a confederate. Mr. CROOKES and myself had in our manual grasp, and under our entire control the only human body in the room, and therefore we possessed the most absolute security that nothing that was done could have been done by that body. The door was locked and sealed. We were alone with him for an hour. Conclusive proof that it was not an illusion is supplied by this, that after the experiment had ended, the chairs and jug were upon the table and the furniture of the room displaced. Unless, as the poet sings,

The world is all a fleeting show,  
For man's delusion given,

the recorded incidents were *realities*, whatever the cause to which they may be assigned. The senses of one of the greatest of our Scientific Experimentalists were not likely to be so deceived. I am sure I was in the full possession of my own senses. We were not mere curiosity-mongers, seeking for excitement, but sober and calm inquirers into the laws of nature and the truths of Science. We were but endeavouring, without prejudice or prepossession, to ascertain, for the sake of Science alone, if the alleged force actually existed and if the asserted phenomena were realities or only illusions or impostures. What conclusion could we, as men of common sense, as practical and experienced men, draw from the phenomena described? As honest and truthful men, what verdict could we pronounce upon *such* evidence? What would the Reader, if not a fool, have concluded in his own mind,—and, if not a coward, have avowed,—had *he* witnessed what we witnessed under the same satisfactory conditions?

The most remarkable of the experiments at which I assisted is, perhaps, the following. The phenomena there presented are certainly inexplicable by any theory

hitherto broached; the suggestion of illusion is simply absurd, and that of imposture impossible. It may be taken as certain, that there was no illusion on the part of the practical experimental observers by whom the experiment was tried. It is certain that the incidents narrated actually occurred. They were vouched by all present. *How* they were produced is another question; but none of the distinguished Scientists who witnessed them doubted the intelligence of their senses, and although many conjectures as to the possibility of this or that means of performance were afterwards discussed, the *facts* were not disputed. All of us saw and heard as here reported.

#### EXPERIMENT XII.

It should be premised, that the experiment was conducted at the private residence of Mr. CROOKES, F.R.S., purposely to test the alleged psychic power of Mrs. Fay. With this object the Scientists present had devised a test which, in the judgment of all of them, would instantly detect the very slightest attempt at trickery. I am not sufficiently acquainted with magnetic instruments to be enabled minutely to describe the one there employed; but it worked thus. Two handles, about 24in. apart, separated the two poles of the coil. Touching or removing the hands from these handles performed what Professor TYNDALL calls "make" and "break." A conductor from the machine indicated the "making" or "breaking" of the magnetic current by a small light. As long as the current was maintained by holding the handles at the poles, the light remained at rest; but if either hand was removed, the "break" in the magnetic current was instantly betrayed by the quivering and darting way of the light. The perfection of this instrument as a detector of any removal, however slight, of either hand of the person holding the handles, was vouched for, after personal trial and careful examination, by all the eminent Scientists present. They were agreed that by no means known to Science, as the machine was set, could the Psychic quit it for an instant without detection.

It was designed for the purpose of enabling the experimentalists in the one room to be assured that the Psychic did not move in the other room, entirely obviating the use of ropes and other mechanical binding, said to be inefficient, inasmuch as skill and practice are supposed to enable any person to escape from any knots however ingeniously complicated—a feat, by the bye,



never yet performed by prisoners, who are invariably incompetent to secure their freedom by the means said to be so easily discovered and resorted to by Psychics. As the conditions of the phenomena were stated to be that the Psychic should be in a darkened room or "cabinet," the place chosen for the experiment was Mr. CROOKES's library, which opens by folding doors into his laboratory. It was arranged that a curtain should be drawn between the two rooms; that the Psychic should sit in the library and we in the laboratory, where was brought the conductor and its tell-tale light, to play the part of detective in full view of the entire party. The mechanism was out of reach and the Psychic could touch no part of it but the handles. No information was given to the Psychic as to the mechanism that had been devised, nor of the nature nor uses of the instrument; nor, indeed, what test would be employed. Even if she had been told its action, it would have been at least as unintelligible to her as it was to myself, who had some knowledge of scientific apparatus, this one being quite a recent invention. It was designed to work thus. The Psychic, seated in a chair, was to hold the two handles connected with the opposite poles of the coil, and so "make" and maintain the magnetic current. If she released her hold for a moment, the light before our eyes in the other room would as instantly betray the movement by flashing from its place. As none of the asserted phenomena, if produced by a trick, could occur without the use of her hands, she must remove them from the handles, and then the mechanism (which could not be "biologised" or be subject to "illusion") would at once betray the fraud to all of us.

To be assured that it was perfect for its purpose, it was tried by each of us in turn grasping the handles. With each in turn, so long as he held on, the light was seen by the others in the adjoining room to be steady. When the hand moved, the light told the tale plainly and instantly to those in the lighted laboratory.

The mechanism was pronounced by all the Scientists to be perfect for its purpose; and discomfiture of the Psychic was anticipated.

The persons present were Mr. CROOKES, F.R.S., Mr. GALTON, F.R.S., Mr. HUGGINS, F.R.S., Mr. IONIDES, and myself.

It is necessary now briefly to describe the library in which the Psychic was to be placed. It is a small but lofty room, fitted with bookshelves from floor to ceiling, and the shelves are filled with books arranged in no other order than that of size. The upper shelves, where the smaller books are placed, are far out of reach, without mounting a library ladder, which is kept in the room for such use. The books are many hundreds in number. A library table and a writing cabinet with locked drawers occupy

the floor. On the chimney-piece are a clock and a variety of scientific instruments.

The entire party examined this room with care. The ladder was placed erect against the wall. The clock was ticking on the mantel-shelf. The bookshelves were in due order. Only some newspapers and magazines lay on the table.

The Psychic was conducted from the drawing room to the library by one of our party. She was at once seated before the machine described and made to grasp the handles. The light was declared to be steady in its place, showing that the current was "made" and complete. The Psychic was then told, for the first time, that if she moved either hand from the handles, however slightly, it would be detected instantly by us in the next room; but by what means she was purposely not told. Some of us went into the laboratory to see if it answered its object, and on the withdrawal of her hands the light went. On her grasping the metals again, the light was restored to its place. She had been introduced, and at once seated, without an opportunity to inspect the room, the light of the laboratory sufficing when the curtain was open. All being pronounced by the Experts to be arranged to their perfect satisfaction, the curtain was dropped, and the Psychic was left in the library alone, in complete darkness, seated at the machine, holding the handles, the door being locked and sealed. We seated ourselves in the laboratory before the curtain, our eyes fixed upon the light that beamed steadily before us.

With this preliminary description, essential to understanding the conditions under which the phenomena were presented, I proceed to transcribe from the notes taken what occurred.

In three minutes a hand was thrust through the curtain, and a voice (precisely like that of Mrs. Fay) said, "I want to give you something." One of us went to the curtain and received from behind it the clock that had been upon the chimney-piece. Then some newspapers were brought from the table and thrown out into the laboratory. A noise was heard as of the ladder being moved. Presently the voice said, "Come here, Traveller, I have a present for you." For a moment we all forgot who "the traveller" was; but, on the request being repeated, Mr. GALTON went to the curtain and a volume he had published some years before was presented to him. Mr. Huggins was then called. "Here's something for you, astronomer," and in his hand was placed his book on "Spectrum Analysis." Presently the voice said, "Serjeant, I have got something for you; come here." I went up to the curtain, and received the first volume of this treatise.

In doing this, I separated the curtains about a foot, and there full in view stood the Psychic, or an exact duplication of her—the same satin dress, with the same lace, the same long curling hair. As the book was given to me, the hand touched mine; it was



warm and moist and fleshy, and the same rings were upon the fingers. Looking, I saw another form, like that we had left upon the seat, grasping the handles, still there, still in the same posture, but too much in shadow to enable me to note the dress. On my retirement, carrying my book, Mr. IONIDES said, "Have you got nothing for me?" "Here" said the voice, "is something you will like better than a book," and into his hand was given a box of cigarettes. During all of these occurrences the detective light burned steadily, proving beyond question that the magnetic current had never for an instant been interrupted. After this had continued about half an hour there was moaning; the tell-tale light flashed away, showing that the current had been "broken." Instantly the curtain was drawn and the Psychic was found lying back in her chair, in an unconscious state, her hands fallen by her side. Some time elapsed before she could be restored.

We now examined the room. The ladder, which we had left standing against the wall, was lying on the floor and some other things that had been upon the mantel-shelf when we left the room were placed upon the table.

Whence did the books come? All from the *upper* shelves, which could not be reached without mounting the ladder. But this was the least perplexing part of the phenomenon. The room had been left in such complete darkness that it would have been impossible for *any* eye to read the titles of the books upon the backs of them. But even with the help of a candle it would have taken a long time to have found any one of these three volumes among the hundreds upon those shelves. The title of mine was printed upon the back; but that of Mr. HUGGINS was *upon the cover*, and it would have puzzled himself to discover his book amongst the rest. As for Mr. GALTON's work, Mr. CROOKES stated that he had forgotten that he possessed it. He added that he could not have found those three books in half an hour, with light to aid him. How, then, were they found by the Psychic in the dark, in the course of ten minutes at the most, and when found taken from the shelves? But whence the box of cigarettes presented to Mr. Ionides? There had been none about the room. Mr. Crookes said: "I have a drawer full of them in my cabinet, but it is locked." The drawer was then unlocked. It had been filled with packets of cigarettes. There was the blank in a parcel left by one box that had been removed. Examined, it proved to be that given to Mr. IONIDES. How that box was taken out of a locked drawer is as inexplicable as how the three books could be selected in the dark, by a stranger, from the upper shelf of a large library.

These phenomena occurred under conditions that appear to preclude the possibility of imposture, with a

scientific test, pronounced by the experts present to be conclusive that, during the whole time of their exhibition, the magnetic current had *not* been interrupted. If it was herself we had seen and talked with at the curtain, and by whom the clock and books were handed, how was the current maintained? The handles were twenty-four inches apart. What conductor could she have used to supply her place there? But even if she possessed one, she must have employed her hands to use it, and any motion by them would have been betrayed instantly. This, however, is only the preliminary difficulty. Granted the possibility of removal from her seat undetected, how did she, in the dark, find the books and present to each the right one? An explanation might be found in the world-wide theory of "a double"—accepted in Scotland, recognised in Germany, and supported by some curious evidence among ourselves. But to admit such an hypothesis is only to encounter one difficulty with another. Whatever the agent, it certainly was *not* a Spirit of the dead. It was undoubtedly the *living* Psychic (or a duplicate of her) we saw and spoke with. If a Spirit, it was the Spirit of the *Quick* and not of the Dead. But one query remains. Did some other *non-human* being maintain the needful contact while she moved about? Certain it is that *no* human being did so.

The following experiment was tried at my own residence, Mr. Home being the Psychic:—

#### EXPERIMENT XIII.

We were lying on the grass of the lawn, and three feet from us was the gravel walk. Our discourse was of the phenomena and their causes. While we were debating them, distinct and loud rappings were made upon the walk behind us and beyond our reach. At the supper-table, when only my wife, Mr. Home, and myself were present, very loud rappings were made repeatedly upon a wooden cheesestand, which stood in the centre of the table, three feet at least from Mr. Home. As Mr. Home and myself were entering the drawing-room, lighted with gas, a very heavy chair that was standing by the fire, thirteen feet from us, was flung from its place through the whole length of the room,



and fell at our feet. No other person was in the room, and we were crossing the threshold of the door. Mr. Home seated himself at the piano, and commenced to play and sing. As I was sitting by his side listening, it occurred to me to try if the accordion would play in my own hand as in his. I took, from the box in which it had been sent, an instrument I had that day purchased at the Soho bazaar, and re-seated myself, holding it by the end *opposite to the keys*, and suspended thus between myself and Mr. Home as he continued to play the piano. Presently I felt the accordion lifted up and down, and then some notes were sounded, and then it joined, though but imperfectly, in the tune he was playing. This was in the light, and, therefore, I am sure it was not, and indeed could not be, touched by him, for he was playing the piano with *both* hands. I then requested him to hold the accordion with his left hand (I was sitting on his left), and play an air on the piano with his right hand. He did so, and immediately the accordion, held by him with the keys under, played beautifully an accompaniment to the piano for at least a quarter of an hour three or four tunes. The accordion was then passed to my hand, and, while I held it by *the end* opposite to the keys, played a tune perfectly. The force of the upward pressure of the bellows was so great that it required all the strength of my arm to resist it.

It is important to note that all of the experiments reported were tried where pre-arrangement of machinery was *impossible*. It would require a considerable quantity of mechanism first to throw two very heavy men flat upon a table, and then lift one of them, over the heads of the persons assembled, to the end of a large room, and to such a height as to knock down a picture in passing. But these phenomena are, in fact, simply instances of Psychic Force exhibited with uncommon power. From this and many other experiments it would appear that the Force not only flows from the Psychic and permeating external substances produces motion in them, but sometimes it seems to be pent up in him or it reacts upon himself and in such case induces upon his person precisely the same effect as when it permeates other solid bodies, throwing, shaking and occasionally lifting him. It is never seen to operate upon the person of the Psychic and upon a foreign body at the same moment. But, whatever the causes, there is obviously nothing in the

phenomenon that affords the slightest evidence of the agency of Spirits of the dead. On the contrary, the exhibited action is altogether *inconsistent* with any possible conception of disembodied Souls or of their doings. (a)

---

(a) It is but simple justice to Mr. D. D. Home to state the obligation under which I feel to him for the generous and cordial manner in which he placed at my disposal, for the pursuance of the psychological investigations in which I had been so long engaged, the rare and remarkable Psychic power with which he is gifted. He has freely permitted to myself and my scientific coadjutors the application of every test proposed by us, and the trial of every experiment desired, under any conditions suggested for our own satisfaction, and thus enabled us to satisfy our own minds and my own experience in the sifting of evidence, as to the facts and characteristics of the various phenomena. This was the more commendable, for being himself firmly convinced that all that occurs in his presence is through the agency of Spirits of the dead, and knowing that I held a different opinion and was looking for their causes in the human organisation itself, I was acting in opposition to his own theory. Nevertheless he assisted our researches with hearty good will—still to the last, however, expressing a hope and belief that our investigations would lead us to the same conclusion as had been arrived at by himself. To this end Mr. Home gave me opportunities for examination under circumstances most favourable for observation, and under conditions that made imposture impossible. Spending some days with me at my house in the country, I enjoyed the advantage of being with him alone for many hours, in my own rooms and in my garden, where mechanical contrivance was impracticable, and I witnessed there precisely the same phenomena as I had seen in the *salons* with a numerous circle, in which mechanism and confederates, however improbable, were not impossible. In my own rooms in the country, with none present but Mr. Home and myself, such explanations of the phenomena were impracticable. Nor were they fancies and imaginations, for the furniture had changed its position, the music had been heard by others, and the sounds sometimes echoed through the house. I may add that it is a creditable characteristic of Mr. Home that he invariably *invites* tests and *courts* examination. The phenomena with him are produced in the full light of day or of gas, and he refuses to hold a dark sitting, save to oblige some intimate friend who may desire to witness the more extraordinary phenomena that are then exhibited.

It is well known that the late Lord Brougham accompanied



Does not this Experiment admit of solution by re-

Sir David Brewster to a private experimental sitting with Mr. Home. It was reported at the time that both of these distinguished men had been perfectly satisfied with the reality of the phenomena they had witnessed. A few months afterwards, however, Sir David Brewster, being ridiculed by some of his friends who had *not* seen for believing what he *had* seen, and wanting the courage of his opinions, declared that what he had witnessed was a trick. Recently, however, in a memoir of Sir David, published by his sister, a letter appears, written at that very time, in which he expresses privately his conviction of the truth of that which he was publicly proclaiming to be a fraud. Moral cowardice is, unhappily, too often found allied with scientific eminence for such a revelation of it to create surprise. It is indeed the weak side of the English character.

In conversation with Lord Brougham, I asked him as to what he had witnessed with Mr. Home on that occasion, and his opinion of it. At that time I had never seen Mr. Home nor any of the phenomena of Psychism; for I had accepted the newspaper assertions that it was mere conjuring. Although making Psychology a study, I had deemed these alleged phenomena to be unworthy of serious investigation. I was startled by the account he gave me. "I went," he said, "with Brewster, to Home, who behaved like a gentleman. He invited examination: he certainly brought nothing with him. It was a room of our choice, so there was no prepared mechanism; it was as light as this room" (his library in Grafton-street). "Nobody was near us; the table rose from the floor and jumped about; a bell passed behind us, ringing; and was put into my hand first, and then into Brewster's; an accordion played tunes, held keys downwards; there were rappings on the door and the cabinets far from us; chairs came to us untouched from the other side of the room. Beyond doubt this was done, but I don't know how it was done. We were both perfectly satisfied at the time it was no trick, and that some unknown power was in action."—"What said Brewster to it?" I asked.—"After walking on in silence some way, I said, 'Well, Brewster, what do you think of it?' and he said only, 'There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in our philosophy.'"—"He changed his opinion afterwards," I said.—"But he never said so to me."—"Did you?"—"Never; I was satisfied then, and am convinced now, there was no trick whatever—it was genuine."

In answer to my inquiry, why did he not pursue the investigation, he said that he was then deeply immersed in experiments in optical science, and had not leisure to enter upon so vast a field as the phenomena he had witnessed with Mr. Home appeared to open.

ference to some psychic (or Soul) power of the Psychic in the state of trance, so often witnessed, when the links of the chain that in the normal condition binds the Self (or Soul) to the body, are loosened and one can act to a certain extent without the other? May it not be that the material mechanism of the Psychic was doing what we witnessed with Mrs. Fay, under the direction of the non-molecular part of the mechanism, which was maintaining the magnetic current by some power unknown to us?

This, of course, is merely a suggestion thrown out for thought.

#### EXPERIMENT XIV.

At the residence of Mr. WALTER CROOKES. The Experimentalists present were Mr. CROOKES, F.R.S., Mr. F. GALTON, F.R.S., Mr. WALTER CROOKES, and myself. Mr. D. D. HOME and two ladies completed the party. The place was a double drawing-room, separated by a sideboard and a curtain. The Psychic was taken by us into the smaller room, and being seated in a chair, his wrists were tightly bound with copper wire, and fastened with wire to the back of the chair. His feet were then bound by the ankles in the same manner to the legs and rungs of the chair, and the chair itself was fastened by wire to the grate. The wires were then soldered at the fastenings with melted solder procured by us, and then he was pronounced by the Scientists who had secured him to be absolutely immovable by any human power without cutting all the wires. His person thus bound was then enveloped in a dressing-gown, the sleeves of which were sewn together, inclosing him as in a sack. Thus was he placed wired to the fire grate at the distance of eight feet from the curtain dividing the rooms. He had no friend, nor confederate. He came to the house alone, in a cab, wearing the ordinary evening dress. Having secured the door with lock and seals, and also sealed the window, to be sure that no aid could come from without, leaving him in total darkness, we went into the front room, which was fully lighted with gas, and seated ourselves before the curtain.

In *four minutes* a bell that had been previously placed upon the table far from the imprisoned Psychic was rung violently. Then a footstool, and then a chair, and then successively the greater portion of the movable furniture of the room in which the Psychic sat, were passed through the curtain into our room. Presently the curtain was partially drawn and exhibited a man, dressed in the fashion of a sailor, but whose features resembled exactly those of the Psychic, and whom



we all were satisfied *was* the Psychic. He stood there, leaning over the sideboard, talking to us for more than half an hour, addressing each of us by name and freely answering our questions. He was brisk at repartee. The tone of his voice and the manner of speaking were the same as all must have noticed in Somnambules, who act with such abnormal ability whatever character is suggested to them. One instance will suffice. I said, "Are you substantial, or only a shape?" "I am as solid as you are," was the answer. "Have you blood, and spittle and sweat?" "Yes," he said, "will you trust your finger in my mouth?" "Certainly." "Put it in, then." He opened his jaws and I fearlessly thrust in my finger. The tongue was warm and moist; the teeth were solid and sharp, for he gave me a bite that made me cry out with pain. Having held me thus for nearly a minute, he let me go, and with a loud laugh, said, "Do you call that Psychic Force, Serjeant?" I was compelled to acknowledge the presence of a powerful physical force. Upon the table in the room where we sat was a large iron ring, manufactured for us for experimental purposes. He asked me if I should like to have the ring put upon my arm. None of us had witnessed this feat. I readily assented. "Give me your hand, then." He took my right hand. "Now, hand me the ring." I gave it to him with my left hand. He pressed it with some force against my arm, and in an instant it was hanging upon it. *How* it was done I cannot even conjecture. Our hands had not parted, at least *consciously* to myself. The ring was pressed against my arm at the upper part near the shoulder. It was a momentary act, done with a touch. It was our own ring of solid iron half an inch in diameter. I carried it upon my arm back to the table, and we examined it to be sure that it was the same ring. We now went into the other room. The Psychic was as we had left him, only in a state of unconsciousness. The wires were upon all his limbs uncut, the solder perfect, the chair bound to the grate, the dressing-gown upon him. The door was locked, and the seals on door and window unbroken.

We had no doubt, and I have none, that at this experiment we saw and conversed with the Psychic in person. How he was removed from the wires soldered round his ankles and arms to the chair and the grate, and still more how, if he could get out he could get into them again, is a problem for which no reasonable solution has suggested itself. The fact is certain. The wires were afterwards *cut* from him with some difficulty, as the only means of release, and taken away by Mr. GALTON, who had bound and soldered them upon him, and who perhaps still

possesses them. We had no doubt that the Psychic got out of them and into them somehow; but the question of Psychological interest is, by what process this was performed? That it is a psychic and not a supernatural action is the reasonable conclusion of Science. The entire series of the phenomena of Psychism proves at least this—that we are only upon the threshold of our knowledge of psychic laws; that they differ altogether from *physical* laws; and that we must be content to retrace our steps and renew our researches into the *Science of Soul* from its very foundations.

#### EXPERIMENT XV.

In this case the Psychic repudiated Spiritualism. He frankly admitted that he could discover no trace whatever of the presence of Spirits of the dead. "You bind me. I fall into a trance. I become unconscious. I wake and I am free." The experiment was conducted under very simple conditions. A light frame of wood over which canvas was stretched was placed upon the floor of my sitting-room. It was 5ft. in length, and just deep enough to receive a chair. A curtain was hung over it in front. He had been tied with ropes by our most skilled knot-tyers, but was released in three minutes. This, however, was looked upon as a conjuror's trick and therefore we resolved to apply to him a crucial test.

I borrowed from the prison at Clerkenwell, by favour, two pairs of their most secure handcuffs. They were of special make. Each pair was so constructed that it could neither be locked nor unlocked, closed nor opened, by any key but its own. Both pairs of these "darbies" (as they are called by the class for whose wrists they are designed) were fastened by ourselves upon the wrists of the Psychic, securely locked and the keys placed in my pocket. The curtain was drawn, and in one minute and a half the handcuffs were lying on the floor *unlocked and open*. The curtain was again drawn, and in another minute both handcuffs were restored to the wrists *and locked*. An explanation of this marvel was at once suggested—he had small hands and they were squeezed into and out of the handcuffs. The fact that he was not only free from the irons, but that *they were unlocked and opened, and then closed and locked* (a process only possible by using the two keys which I had in my pocket), was not taken into consideration. To meet this objection, another more conclusive test was suggested and at once we proceeded to try it. We locked both the handcuffs to the rung of the chair on which the Psychic sat. In two minutes they were unlocked and removed



from the chair and locked upon his wrists. Then the experiment was reversed, and again in one minute and three quarters the locked handcuffs were unlocked, removed from the wrists, and locked upon the rung of the chair. We made trial of the time required by ourselves to unlock the handcuffs, take them from the chair to which they were fastened, place them upon the wrists and relock them. With our utmost speed we could not accomplish this process in less than three minutes. It was done by the Psychic Force (if such it be) in one minute and a half. With the irons on the wrists we found that we could not apply the key to the lock when put into our hands. On another occasion, an officer from the Bow-street Police Office was employed for the purpose. He brought *three* pairs of handcuffs from the office, which himself placed upon the arms of the Psychic, warranting that no man in England could escape from them. To his amazement, in three minutes they were removed from the wrists and lying unlocked and open upon the floor. Questioned as to the means by which it was effected, the Psychic said he was as ignorant as we were. He was certain that it was not Spiritualism. Asked what he called it? he said, "You may call it *Everettism*, if you please" (his name was *Everett*). Afterwards he approved of the term "*Psychism*" as appropriate. At the close of the experiment, of which there were several competent witnesses, scientific and general, the keys were in my pocket where I had kept them throughout the trial of it.

I can suggest no reasonable explanation of this remarkable experiment. Under the influence of Psychic Force, organic matter is undoubtedly subject to extraordinary compression and expansion, as very little experience of the phenomena will satisfy the observer. We should have ascribed the freeing of the hands from and their restoration to the handcuffs to this, but for the further inexplicable fact, that the handcuffs were also at the same time unlocked and re-locked, and only by actually unlocking and opening them could they be removed from the rung of the chair. But further observation and experiment, a wider range of facts and phenomena, will doubtless supply a solution of this problem that will be found to be in strict accordance with some of the many laws of Psychological Science yet remaining to be explored.

I cannot conclude these reports of the result of my personal experiments without citing a case of Natural

Somnambulism lately published to the world, on the highest authority, since the printing of the chapter on that subject in the earlier pages of this volume. This remarkable case presents every phase of that abnormal condition of the Mechanism of Man in so distinct and definite a form, and under conditions so determinate in themselves, and prolonged through so many years, as to permit of the most exhaustive examination and the most accurate observation of the various phenomena exhibited, and conclusive proof of the facts. The subject of this extraordinary affection is a lady by connection and education. The scene of it is her own family circle. Publicity has been strenuously shunned by her friends and by herself. Imposture on her part could not possibly have been sustained for twelve long years, even if there had been a motive for it. But there was none. She is in affluent circumstances, is much loved and highly respected. If a desire for notoriety be a suggested motive, the answer is that she has shrunk from it. Her wonderful case had been whispered about among the Profession, but no particulars of it had been permitted to be given to the world by her medical and other attendants until now that an accident has made them known.

The narrative is extracted from the *New York Sun*, where it was published only after the most cautious investigation. But I have received from a correspondent in that city the most positive assurance that the report is strictly true, himself having witnessed many of the phenomena. Some of my friends here have received similar assurances from other friends in New York, so that the narrative may be accepted as an authentic report of a case which, in all its features, sustains by overwhelming evidence the contention of this treatise, that the Mechanism of Man is constructed of Soul as well as body, or rather, that Man is an embodied Soul, and that the entire series of phenomena from *Dream* to *Psychism*, are the results of abnormal conditions of the relationship between the non-molecular Soul and the molecular body.

The report, which fills two closely printed pages of the



newspaper, is necessarily abbreviated here. But the more important parts of it are preserved intact.

In Downing-street, Brooklyn, has lain for thirteen years Miss Mary J. Fancher, much of the time in a trance-like condition, with feeble heart pulsations, sluggish, and almost imperceptible respiration, and the chill of death upon her flesh. At times she has been transformed into a cheerful, vivacious, intelligent, entertaining young woman, and then she has relapsed into speechlessness, blindness, deafness, and entire paralysis of the senses. She has developed most astonishing powers, resembling second sight or clairvoyance, reading with ease the contents of sealed letters, describing articles in hidden packages, perusing books while absolutely blind. Sometimes her powers are voluntary, at other times they are unconsciously exercised. So little nourishment has she taken that it may be said she lives without food. She is surrounded by persons of social standing and refinement, and has always been exceedingly sensitive to any public mention or knowledge of her condition. . . . Clergymen, physicians, men of letters and of intelligence have visited her. Among many who have taken a special interest in her are the Rev. Dr. Joseph T. Duryea, pastor of the Classon Avenue Presbyterian Church; the Rev. Dr. Henry J. Van Dyck, pastor of the Clinton-street Presbyterian Church; Professor Charles E. West, Principal of the Brooklyn Heights Seminary; George W. Benson, Henry M. Parkhurst, the astronomer; James B. Smith, the well-known architect; the Rev. Mr. Moore, former pastor of the Washington Avenue (Brooklyn) Baptist Church, but now of Geneva, N. Y.; the Rev. Dr. Prime, editor of the *New York Observer*; Dr. R. Fleet Speir, of 162, Montague-street; Dr. Robert Ormiston, of 74, Hanson-place; Dr. Mitchell, of 129, Montague-street; Dr. Kissam, of 100, Joralemon-street; and Dr. Crane, of 163, Clinton-street. Of these gentlemen, Messrs. Speir, West, and Parkhurst have made voluminous memoranda of Miss Fancher's physical and mental changes and conditions. Miss Fancher herself has written at great length descriptions of her feelings and sensations.

At the age of eighteen, she was thrown from her horse and broke three ribs. Soon after her recovery from this accident, she was alighting from a car, when her dress caught in the step, the horse moved on and she was dragged a considerable distance upon the pavement. A permanent injury to the spine and frightful lacerations of the head and face were the consequence. Violent convulsions ensued. She was carried to her aunt's, Mrs.

Crosby, in Downing-street, New York, and placed in the bed from which she has not since been moved. This happened thirteen years ago, in the beginning of the year 1865. The accident was followed by a series of remarkable physical effects. At times there was violent nervous excitement, and at other times total paralysis. She lost in succession the senses of sight and hearing, and the power of speech. Violent spasms preceded a state of trance, from which no efforts of her physicians could waken her. This continued for twenty days of apparent death. Then her senses were restored one by one in the order in which they had departed. Then the like series of affections occurred at intervals of ten days. Her jaws were locked. Her limbs were contorted by the spasms and so remained. For two months no food whatever could be administered to her. Afterwards a few drops of lemonade and some beef tea were poured into her throat at long intervals. Her physicians report that, during the thirteen years of her malady, she has eaten altogether "not so much food *in the aggregate* as an ordinary healthful girl of her age would eat in forty-eight hours."

Three months and a half after the accident she went into a rigid trance for twenty-one hours, and then passed into a relaxed trance that lasted for three days. Her throat became paralysed, and she could neither swallow nor utter a sound. Her right arm doubled up back of her head, and became fixed there with the rigidity of death. A year later this condition was followed by absolute rigidity of body, with the exception of the left arm and hand, which she was able to use. This latter condition lasted for nine years, in all of which time she was continually drifting into and out of trances. She continued to be blind, the pupils of the eyes being rolled upwards, and the whites only visible when the lids were parted for examination. Very tightly indeed were the lids sealed, and with difficulty were they opened. She had the power of speech, however, almost all the time, although it left her at intervals.

Three years ago the rigidity of her body relaxed, and sight and hearing were restored. Memory of everything that had happened in the nine years disappeared. She could not recognise friends whose acquaintance had been made in that period. Her thoughts went back to events that were happening when she sank into the



nine years' stupor, and she began to talk of them as though they had occurred an hour before. In all the nine years she had been in a semi-unconscious condition, possessed, however, at times of astonishing mental vigour and of mechanical ingenuity. She refused food when offered to her, saying it made her sick. Dr. Speir and Dr. Ormiston forced food into her stomach with the pump, and, after paralysis of the throat came on, tried to feed her through a silver tube inserted in the neck. Food sickened her, however, and, eventually, all efforts to induce her to take nourishment were abandoned. At long intervals she expressed a wish for the juice of some fruit or for a bit of candy, but she rejected solid matter, and for weeks and months, according to her own assertion and that of her attendants, she swallowed nothing. Her physical condition was constantly changing. One day she was without sense, except touch; the next she could hear, and taste, and talk. But her eyes did not open until at the end of the nine years.

At intervals during these nine years the body frequently became as cold as though in death, no warmth being detected except in the region of the heart. That organ kept up a slow, measured pulsation, except when she went into trances; then its beating was often imperceptible. Her head and shoulders retained their normal condition, but soon after each of these attacks her legs would be drawn up and contorted, her feet contracted. At the same time, to quote the language of her physicians, "her intestines shrivelled and wasted away, leaving little more than a coating of skin over the backbone in the cavity they had occupied. They became almost entirely inoperative, and for years were completely so." She was so sensitive to heat in the nine years' period of rigidity that fire was not lighted in her room, nor was the temperature raised in any manner. In midwinter her only covering was a single sheet, and the window was kept partly open. In all these years her right arm remained bent behind her head, and when relaxation returned at the end of that period, the member was not released from its tension, as was the rest of the body. The arm remains still in the same cramped position.

Such was her physical condition, as described by the eminent Physicians who attended her. Her *Psychological* condition, however, is that which most concerns us here. Emerging from her trance, she describes as having seen, while in that condition, persons and places far distant. She narrates in minute detail what her friends were doing in different parts of the City, and events that happened to persons many miles away. Although in bed and out of sight, she names the persons coming to the door long before their arrival. She reads

sealed letters when in the pockets of her visitors, closed books, and unopened newspapers. This trance condition is thus described :

It is in the condition of trance that Miss Fancher makes her most astonishing revelations. At these times she suddenly starts as though charged from an electric battery, and instantly becomes rigid in every joint and muscle. Her face takes on sometimes a most painful expression, at others one of the most positive pleasure; yet oftener it is as the face of one who is dead. To those unaccustomed to seeing her, the conviction that she is indeed dead is irresistible. A deathlike pallor creeps over the already pale face. Not the slightest movement is perceptible in any of her muscles. She ceases to breathe. Her body becomes cold. Her heart gives out no pulsations that are easily detected — although her physicians have not convinced themselves that it does not beat. The initiatory start oftentimes raises her up into a half-sitting, half-reclining position, in which she remains as immovable as though she were of marble. Everyone who has seen her in this condition speaks of the beauty and the pathos of the scene—the ashen complexion; the brown, fine, waving hair streaming towards her shoulders, yet not reaching them; the faultless features, neither wrinkled, nor drawn, nor wasted, and yet not rounded and ruddy as in her school-girl days; one hand and graceful arm transfixed in its position at the instant of attack, perhaps pointing upward, perhaps extended to receive a visitor's salutation, perhaps folded over her breast; the other arm bent behind her head as though she were resting upon it, the eyes closed.

The trance is her only rest. She never sleeps. Day and night are alike to her. She can see in the night quite as well as in the day. Here are presented the precise phenomena exhibited in the cases of Somnambulism and Hypnotism already reported :

Oftentimes, when worried over the absence of some loved one, she has said, "I must search for her," and has gone into the trance. On emerging therefrom, if asked whether her search was successful, she answers promptly if in the affirmative: "Yes, I saw her in — street; she will soon be home," and very soon in walks the wanderer. Sometimes she is not successful in several attempts, but she ceases not until she is satisfied. At other times her vision wanders. It has gone to a summer seat on the Hudson, where were several of her friends, and she has afterwards been able to describe minutely the houses, the barns, the meadows and fences, the water in front of and the woodland



in the rear of the dwelling, and with a fidelity that is instantly recognised by those familiar with the region. When scientific men and physicians have produced some extraordinarily difficult tests, she has been obliged to wait until the trance condition came upon her; for it does not seem always to be voluntary. But if it is a simple question of reading an ordinary sealed letter, or announcing the arrival of a person at the street door, she easily solves the difficulty without recourse to the trance. As she rests continually upon her right side, her face is averted from the entrance to the room. Yet she oftentimes knows who enters, although unable to turn her head, and is quick to discern any peculiarity or change of dress. If a gentleman friend puts on a white necktie in early spring, after having worn a black one, she is quite likely to cry out, her face averted: "Good afternoon, Mr. —! Where did you get your necktie?" It has been deemed necessary to darken her room, and the shades are tightly drawn; yet the darkness does not affect her vision. She is ever busy in the darkness reading, or at needle or wax work, or casting up the accounts of the family, for she keeps a record of every expenditure. She writes letters with astonishing rapidity, in a neat, legible hand, although it is certain she cannot see with normal sight; and, mindful of the interest that her condition may excite among scientific men, she has kept a complete record of her feelings, her sensations while in trance and out of it, her religious beliefs as strengthened or shaken by the revelations of her peculiar state, and of everything that she thinks will interest her friends. This record she guards with care. She is willing that it may be given to the public after her death, but not until then.

Her fondness for dogs and cats, birds and squirrels has amounted almost to a passion, yet, strangely enough, her pets do not live long. Whether she draws the life from them has been an interesting study for some of the men of intelligence who have visited her.

Persons who have entered the room have found her apparently doing nothing, and have asked her why she was idle. "Oh, I am reading such and such a book."

"Well, where is it?"

"Under the bedclothes, here," and she produces it and talks of its contents.

Like other somnambules, while her sense of sight was sealed, her *mind* perceived external objects without the aid of the eyes.

While Miss Fancher's eyes were absolutely sightless, the eyelids being closed, and the eyeballs fixed as though in death, she was able with facility, and without seeming effort, to make marvels of fancy work. For her gentlemen friends she embroidered sus-

penders and worked slippers and watch pockets, and for companions of her girlhood she made needlework of all kinds, pincushions and wax flowers. Every stitch was in proper place, every shade of coloured thread and worsted was correctly drawn. Her handiwork was as near perfection as could be. Some of it was sent to fairs, where, its maker being unknown, it was pronounced superior to all others of its kind exhibited. Sometimes she worked from paper patterns purchased at a fancy store, sometimes from other fancy work, but oftener she originated her designs. It was impossible to deceive her in the quality or shade of the materials with which she worked, her rare power of so-called second sight enabling her to detect any flaw with greater accuracy than did the natural vision of her friends.

Yet more astonishing are her effects in waxwork. Without having taken a lesson, and without knowledge of botany, and, too, without pattern, she fashions in wax beautiful designs—windows filled with flowers, and vines, and butterflies, bouquets, crosses, and anchors. Once asked how she was able to do all this, she answered, "Oh, I see the leaves, and then make others like them."

All this waxwork making and embroidery, and needlework on canvas is made while one hand is rigidly held back of her head. With this hand she holds her work, and plies the needle with the other. Even though she had the sight of her eyes, it must be impossible for her to see the work in the position in which she is compelled to hold it. She works or reads by night, no light whatever being in the room, with the same facility as by day, and not for an instant hesitates to select the proper shade and size of worsted from the score of colours and sizes that are within her reach. She works monograms of her own fancy into the silk handkerchiefs of her gentlemen friends, and puts butterflies, and leaves, and birds upon them with rare taste and skill. One of the most beautiful of her waxwork productions, an exquisite and delicate bower of roses and creepers, adorns the parlour of Professor West's Brooklyn Heights Seminary, 126, Montague-street. She has neglected none of her friends; all have some little gem of her own fashioning.

It is a fact of some interest to Psychology that in her clairvoyant state she cannot follow two persons who separate and go in different directions. She describes both while together, and what they do, and their parting; but she can note the further actions of one of them only.

Dr. DURYEA tried her as to some doings of his own at a distant place. She described the dress he wore (an



uncommon one), and a dog barking at the steps, and the minute particulars of a funeral at which he was present. This, however, might be "mental communion," *i.e.*, "Thought Reading." Dr. DURYEA broaches a theory as to this somewhat like that suggested here. He says:

"Being convinced, then, that Miss Fancher practises no deception, how are her powers to be explained?"

"It is impossible to satisfactorily account for them. That she has most astonishing powers of seeing friends in different parts of the country and city, and of doing other almost incomprehensible things, I have not a doubt. The child cannot deceive; she is beyond that; she does not wish to practise imposition. But her physical changes have in some measure released her mind from the imprisonment of the body, and she does with it what other mortals cannot do with theirs. Here she is deprived first of hearing, then of sight, then of speech, her throat paralyzed—sealed up so that nothing could be passed through it—in such a state that you might as well expect her to swallow a ramrod as a piece of bread: her abdominal organs in the same condition. The mind or spirit was absolutely confined. May it not with a mighty effort have burst away, and once partly freed from the confines of the physical body, have been governed by other and higher laws than those that control it while under the bondage of the body? That men's minds are largely subject to their physical condition is well understood. Occasionally, as in this instance, under peculiar conditions, we find this power, which we call second-sight or clairvoyance. What it is we have not yet ascertained, for the reason, possibly, that so few of the cases have been scientifically investigated; no critical comparisons of one case with another have been made to discover the analogies. I think such instances should have the most wide-spread publicity of descriptions of their mental and physical phenomena. The more we know of them the sooner we shall solve their mysteries."

"Miss Fancher sees the images of those who have gone before her to the spirit world."

"Miss Fancher unquestionably thinks that she sees them and communes with them. Yet this is not so incomprehensible as some of her other acts. She has known their faces upon earth. With increased mental powers naturally comes increased imagination. I can readily understand how little increase of imagining it would require for you or for me to think in our dreams, or out of them for that matter, that we are talking with those who are dead. Men imagine they are sick while they are well, and imagine they are well while they are sick; imagine almost every conceivable thing; nevertheless, they always have had something from which

to work. Miss Fancher may think she is in heaven, yet she has read enough in her Bible to give her a basis for making a picture of heaven in her mind. While I do not say that she has not seen so-called spiritual sights, I can see an explanation of why she thinks she has seen them. It is her power of sight of things upon earth that are concealed from the sight of others that puzzles me. Tests are made of the powers in which she has absolutely no foundation from which to work. How does she arrange and decipher the contents of a letter that has been cut into pieces and sealed within an envelope—a letter, the contents of which those who gave it to her had not the slightest notion. Let us settle that before we get into the merits of what it is possible may be produced by a heightened imagination; it is the more astonishing performance.”

Mr. HENRY M. PARKHURST is an astronomer of high reputation at Brooklyn. He has closely watched this remarkable case for many years, and taken careful notes of the phenomena he has witnessed:

He has spent hours at her bedside, and, wishing to satisfy himself from a scientific basis, has made many tests of her powers and has reached many interesting conclusions. Mr. Parkhurst was at first inclined to suspect that Miss Fancher's power of second sight was derived from an ability to read minds. It was noticed that she rarely extended her vision beyond her friends, or some one who in some way was interested in her. “She reads their thoughts,” said Mr. Parkhurst to himself. To prove or disprove this theory he made two tests. “If I take to her a sealed letter, the contents of which neither myself nor any of her friends has any knowledge, and she is unable to decipher it, my theory will be strengthened,” mused he. From the waste basket of a New York gentleman acquaintance he fished an unimportant business letter, without reading it, tore it into ribbons, and tore the ribbons into squares. He shook the pieces well together, put them into an envelope, and sealed it. This he subsequently handed to Miss Fancher. The blind girl took the envelope in her hand, passed her hand over it several times, called for paper and pencil, and wrote the letter *verbatim*. The seal of the envelope had not been broken. Mr. Parkhurst himself opened it, pasted the contents together, and compared the two. Miss Fancher's was a literal copy of the original.

Nevertheless, Mr. Parkhurst wished to make a severer test. He called two friends to assist him. In his house was hunted up an ancient report of a mining company that was yellow with many years of keeping. Turning at random to a page, the other gentlemen standing too far away to be able to read the text, Mr. Parkhurst cut out a fragment of the leaf containing tabulated



figures, and beneath the tables explanations of them. He averted his face as much as was possible, that he might not know even to what the text or the figures referred. Then he folded the fragment in his fingers, and with the scissors cut it into a score of pieces. Some of the bits fell upon the floor, and were allowed to remain there untouched. The others were put in an envelope by Mr. Parkhurst, and the envelope was sealed. Then Mr. Parkhurst handed the envelope to one of the gentlemen, who put it within a second envelope and sealed it, affixing a waxen wafer. In turn it was given to the third of the party, and he inclosed it in a third envelope in the same manner. Then the gentlemen went to Miss Fancher's room and asked her to give them the contents of the envelope. She took it from them, passed her thumb rapidly over it several times, and then began to write. "It is nonsense," said she. "Figures in which there are blank places; words that are incomplete; sentences in which words are missing." But the girl wrote on. Some of her sentences skipped three or four words, and began with the last five letters of a word that had ten letters. The tables of figures that she made contained blank places, but she wrote it out, and taking it with them the gentlemen went back to Mr. Parkhurst's. The original fragment from the pamphlet was pasted together, the parts that had fallen to the floor and had not been put into the envelope being designated with an ink mark. The comparison revealed that Miss Fancher had made a faithful copy of the contents of the envelope, even to writing the parts of incomplete words that had been cut in two by the scissors, the other letters of the word having fallen to the floor. Sentences, too, had been rendered intelligible by the same process; but they were written just as they appeared after mutilation.

Fix it as he might, Miss Fancher was always able to decipher Mr. Parkhurst's tests, and the result of those in this particular direction seemed convincing that mind-reading was not necessarily the secret of her second-sight seeing. That she does read minds has been established, however, by a different line of experiments. Whatever her aunt, Mrs. Crosby, knows, Miss Fancher very soon has in her possession, and it seems to matter very little what is the nature of the information.

PROFESSOR WEST, the Principal of the Brooklyn Heights Seminary, a well known scholar and man of science, reports his experiences. Among others, he says:

"I have taken clergymen and physicians to see her. She mystifies every one. They are charmed by her cheerfulness, her vivacity, her Christian faith. It is impossible not to admire her; yet when they see the beautiful works of art that she fashions

without the aid of the natural eye, and when they get a glimpse of her wonderful power of so-called second sight, they become mute. I have seen persons who were afraid of her as they might be of a veritable ghost or supernatural apparition. None in all the hundreds whom I have seen at her bedside have I heard express a suspicion that she is an impostor. To see her seems to carry conviction. There is no more doubt that she does these wonderful things than that we sit here. I have seen her do them. I have sat in the twilight of a summer evening and watched her make fancy-work articles in colours, her right arm bent back of her head and resting upon a pillow, the hand capable of being slightly bent at the wrist, her fingers clenched and almost immovable. To this hand she carried the work in her left one, of which she has had the full use, and then the needle danced in and out of the canvas, drawing every thread to its proper place and tension, every colour to the exact spot. I knew she was absolutely blind; but even though she had vision she could not have seen her work while it was held in that position.

"She distinguished colours with an accuracy that made the rest of us ashamed of ourselves. One evening a physician was there, and he boldly said that he believed she could not detect the different shades. Mollie had a ball of worsted thread, in which were probably ten or twelve colours. She asked the physician to select one, and he pulled out a piece. Mollie's face was turned from him, but he had no sooner separated it from the others than she cried out: 'Brown.' It was dark in the room, and he went to the window, pushed aside the shutter, and examined the worsted.

"'You are wrong,' said he, 'it's black!'

"'It's brown, most assuredly,' reiterated she.

"The physician supposed he was right; so he said, with the utmost confidence, 'For once you are in the wrong; it is certainly black.' Miss Mollie quietly reached for the ball of many-coloured worsteds, and pulling therefrom a thread, said: 'Here is a piece of black—that you have is dark brown.' The physician compared the two, and then saw that he was in error and that she was correct.

"She does all sorts of little things that fill you with astonishment. Sometimes I have carried to her a photograph of someone whom she knew before the accident. She always saw and recognised it before it was taken from my pocket. I know of many instances in which she has read letters while they were in an envelope in the pockets of gentlemen. As for books and newspapers she reads them readily, no matter what part of the room they are in. When first taken she seemed to read by sense of touch—which, by the way, was for many months the only sense she possessed. Drawing her thumb over the printed lines with great rapidity, she was able to tell for a long time thereafter just what the text was. Her memory of things that happened while



she was in that rigid condition was astonishingly accurate. I took her a book one day, and she drew her thumb rapidly over the title-page and began to laugh. Of course I asked the cause of her merriment, and she answered that ———, mentioning the name of a very dear friend, had two years before given her the same book; and with that she gave me a running sketch of its contents in a highly intelligent and surprisingly accurate manner.

"She soon ascertained, however, that it was not necessary to touch the words to understand their meaning, but absorbed the contents of printed or written matter. . . . To my knowledge she never has made a penny by her gifts, although having many opportunities to do so. . . . She knows who her visitors are long before they are ushered into the hall below, and she allows them to see her, or refuses, just as the whim takes her. I took Kossuth's sister there just before her departure for the Old World. Miss Mollie refused to see her. Afterward I asked Mollie for an explanation. "Why, I didn't like her looks when she entered the door," was the reply. The door is on the floor below. Another time I took a gentleman of reputation as a scholar. She directed that he be kept from her room, for the same reason—she did not like his looks. While she was blind I took a large man with a great black beard to her, and said, 'What do you think of this little man with a smooth, sharp chin?' and without turning her face, which was from us, she answered, 'He is very large and has full whiskers. I can see him.' She knows what is going on all over the country, but whether from her marvellous sight-seeing, or because she reads it, I am unable to say. She is not willing to talk to visitors about her gifts. The topic is painful to her. To her friends, however, she is more free, and she is quite willing, at times, to explain her sensations. She tells them where she goes and what she sees.

As always, the facts are denied *by those who have not witnessed them*. A certain M.D. of note was as confident as other M.D.'s have been here that *he* would detect an imposture. "So," says the Professor, "one day I took him up to see her."

"'I'll warrant she will perform none of her miracles while I am there,' he said, while on the way. We were not fairly seated before the postman's rap was heard, and down went Mollie's aunt, Mrs. Crosby, for the letter. 'It's from my friend so-and-so,' said Mollie, when her aunt was half way down stairs. Back came Mrs. Crosby with the letter, and Mollie began to tell what was in it. 'Take the slate,' said I to the unbelieving physician, 'and Mollie will dictate the contents of the letter.' Mrs. Crosby

held on to the epistle, and the doctor took the slate, and Mollie began to repeat the letter. She did not take it in her hand, and she was not within eight feet of it. After the doctor had filled the two sides of the slate, Mollie asked Mrs. Crosby to open and read the letter aloud. This she did, while the doctor examined what was on the slate. The letter was exactly the same as Mollie had dictated. The doctor went home convinced of the girl's marvellous powers."

Dr. ORMISTON, one of the physicians who has attended her from the commencement of her illness, thus reports :

"Can you explain why she does not die?" he was asked.

"I cannot; it sometimes seems incomprehensible to me how she lives with no nourishment except occasional drops of fruit juices. Her stomach instantly rejects food if food is forced into it. At times she has lost all her senses, and her body has become cold as though she were dead. Then she has rallied and has become better. She has had many ailments that of themselves were sufficient to have caused death in an ordinary person. Last month she had hay fever, and just now she has a sort of bloating of face and body. She is at times intelligent and sharp-witted, and is entertaining in her conversation. She has the worst spasms I ever saw a person recover from, and is a victim to the most violent attacks of hysteria. She has not exhibited to me much of her power of second sight, yet I am aware that she is capable of most astonishing things. I have known of remarkable tests that she has withstood."

Two other physicians, Dr. CHAUNCEY MITCHELL and Dr. GEORGE HOPKINS, who also were and are her medical attendants, certify to the phenomena, and their perfect satisfaction that the case is genuine :

Dr. Chauncey L. Mitchell, of 129, Montague-street, one of Brooklyn's oldest and most trusted physicians, said that he had known of Miss Fancher's condition for many years, and had been interested in it. He had called upon her several times with Dr. Speir, and at the request of her friends and brother physicians, and to satisfy his own curiosity, had made some very severe tests. He added: "While all the circumstances and surroundings from the first disarmed me of the suspicion of deception, it was nevertheless difficult for me to believe that the young woman could subsist upon as small a quantity of food as I was assured she had received. Her mind, too, was capable of such astonishing flights as to absolutely compel one to doubt: hence I was careful in my tests. I may say that they convinced me that Miss Fancher was not practising or attempting deception. They were perfectly



satisfactory, and they have left me at a loss to account for or to understand the laws by which her mind and her body are governed. These tests were at an early stage of her sickness, and I have not repeated them. We physicians are as a class inclined to look with suspicion upon any case in which nature's known laws are for a long time disregarded, yet I believe that, so far as human testimony can prove it, it is proved that Miss Fancher lives without partaking of food to any considerable amount, and that she possesses in an extraordinary degree the gift of so-called clairvoyance. I am not able to explain how she lives. Her case is very generally known to the physicians of New York and Brooklyn, and I have talked with many of them about it; but I never have heard given a satisfactory explanation of how she can continue to live so long in such a condition."

Dr. George G. Hopkins, of 375, Grand-avenue, said that the physicians of Brooklyn generally knew that Miss Fancher was living from year to year without partaking of enough nourishment to sustain life under ordinary circumstances: also that with her change in body came change in mind, and ability to make second-sight manifestations. He had not seen her himself, but from many conversations with physicians and others who had, he did not doubt the genuineness of what was pretended for her. He had not heard a hint that she practised imposition.

The report of this remarkable case, so instructive to Psychology, so invaluable as a revelation of the true Mechanism of Man, concludes with the curious question: "Can she ever die?"

Miss Fancher's present condition is blindness, the eyelids closed, the pupils sightless and staring; laxity of body save in her right arm, that remains rigid and doubled as above described; inability to take nourishment, with no desire for it except at long intervals, when she puts a bit of fruit or candy in her mouth for a short time, and then rejects it; torpidity of the system, with sluggish pulsation and not vigorous respiration; cheerfulness, with increasing sensitiveness to being made the theme of public gossip and to receiving strangers; enlargement of the heart and soreness in the ribs that were broken by the fall from a horse; rheumatic and neuralgic pains; frequent changes in bodily state, with tendency toward pulmonary troubles; power of speech and of hearing.

Miss Fancher longs to die, yet she tells her friends she is afraid she cannot die. "There is nothing of me to die," she says. Once, after a most death-like trance, in which it required hours of vigorous efforts to restore her, she uttered: "Why did you not let me alone? I think I might have died, had you allowed me to." . . .

Some of her friends have seriously said: "If death is the parting of the spirit from the body, and if Miss Mollie's spirit has been released from the bondage of the flesh, can she indeed ever die?"

I could fill another volume with notes of other experiments, exhibiting very similar phenomena; but repetition would be tedious, and do little to promote the objects for which alone the investigation should be pursued—addition to the store of human knowledge and the opening of a new realm to science. Some of them are, I must frankly admit, in the present stage of the inquiry, inexplicable by any of the processes here suggested, or indeed by any that have been advanced anywhere. The theory of Spirits of the dead is as inadequate for the purpose as any other. I must repeat that I have found it to fail wherever it has been applied to solve problems that the existence of a Psychic (or Soul) force does not reach. The proof of identity of the alleged spirit with the person it professes to be invariably fails when tried by the test of *knowledge*. I have been often questioned how otherwise I could account for what are called "form manifestations"—that is to say, the appearance of apparently living, breathing, intelligent beings, who come out of a room into which the Psychic has been placed alone, clothed in manifold costumes, and talk, touch, and act like ordinary mortals. I have witnessed these many times, in hope thus to solve by positive evidence a problem which mere argument can never determine. I have seen *alleged* materialised forms, touched them, spoken with them. But, in no single instance did the investigation satisfy me that the form was not the Psychic in person. Suspicious precautions were always observed that precluded sufficient tests; conditions were imposed that made detection difficult if not impossible. Faces were so disguised by head dresses that tracing of resemblances of feature was forbidden to the keenest eyes. The clothing was always such as could be put on and taken off with great speed, so as effectually to conceal



any dress that might be under it. When the hand was taken there was a nervous shrinking, as if to avoid a possible grasp. The slightest movement among the company caused an instant retreat behind the curtain. Never once could I witness, nor from friends who have better opportunities than myself could I learn that they had witnessed, *full in view* of all the persons present, at the same instant and in bright light, the Psychic and the "form." One such exhibition of the two, distinct to the eyes and palpable to the touch, standing together before half-a-dozen experimentalists, would determine the inquiry beyond further question. And yet it is not given! In every instance where devices for detection have succeeded in escaping the jealous scrutiny of the exhibitors, they have resulted in disclosing the Psychic in person as the "materialised form." In no one recorded instance has the form, when seized, proved to be any but the Psychic in disguise. I have, indeed, read of cases alleged to be more satisfactory than my own experience has been. But upon close examination of the reported evidence, always I have found some flaw that has invalidated it as *proof* of the asserted fact. Another significant circumstance is that, where only one Psychic is present, two forms never appear together. If they be, as asserted, independent existences, why should not the stage be graced, not by a succession of individuals merely, but by a simultaneous group of "forms"?

Mr. D. D. HOME, whose psychic power is surpassed by few, and whose experience has been greater than that of any other Psychic, is decidedly of opinion that complete substantial bodily forms, such as are said to be exhibited, are never produced. It is said that to this he is moved by jealousy of other Psychics who rival him in this particular. But in frequent conversations with him about the various phenomena, his interest in the investigation of which, with a view to the discovery of their causes, is as great as is my own, and his ignorance of them the same, I have heard him many times make the same remark long before the

presentation of these modern "form materialisations." Mr. HOME does not at all dispute the existence of some non-molecular agencies—indeed, he differs from Mr. CROOKES and myself in believing them to be spirits of the dead. But, he says, they do not walk about as solid flesh and bone, with blood, sweat and spittle and all the belongings of the mortals with whom they mingle.

It may well be, nevertheless, that all of them are not *conscious* impostures. Many of the Psychics by whom they are presented possess undoubted psychic power, proved by innumerable experiments made upon them with decisive tests. But they hear and read of these things being done by other Psychics and they feel a strong desire to rival them. All Psychics are, in fact, somnambules, and the psychic condition is only a form of somnambulism. In this state, as the reader has already seen, the somnambule *acts* the dream suggested to him. A dream that he is a spirit would shape itself accordingly into action such as, according to his conceptions of a spirit, would be its movements. He dreams that he is a spirit and acts a spirit. Where disguises are used, this would not account for cases of concealed clothing; but even then some of the more curious features of the exhibition would admit of the explanation, that the Psychic is a somnambule while acting the part, although he consciously comes prepared to act it.

It is scarcely necessary to refer to the further objection of the inconceivable and apparently impossible manufacture in two or three minutes of an entire human body, with *all* its marvellous mechanism, and its as sudden melting in the air, which must be the actual nature of the phenomenon if it were really as it is asserted to be by Spiritualists.\*

---

\* NOTE.—The manufacture of a perfect human body in five minutes out of material taken as rapidly from another human body is so monstrous a suggestion that its acceptance shows either entire ignorance of Physiology, and of the complicated



human structure, or an unreasoning credulity. If continued investigation should hereafter establish the asserted fact by the exhibition of the Psychic and the form together, under perfect test conditions, we may be sure that some other explanation than this of their production will be found. But, first, the fact itself must be proved.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

## COMMUNICATED PHENOMENA.

THE publication (a) of some of the facts and arguments contained in preceding chapters appears to have attracted much attention to the subject. Two large editions of the pamphlet were called for. It was reprinted in several of the States of America. It was, as I am informed, translated into French, German, Russian, Spanish, Italian, and widely circulated in the countries speaking those tongues. Opinions were everywhere divided, not upon the question of the *existence* of a Psychic Force (this was not denied) but upon the contention of the Spiritualists that, although Psychic Force will explain the greater portion of the phenomena, it fails to explain sufficiently others no less true. "We admit," they say, "the existence of your Psychic Force. We go further and allow it to be the instrument by means of which the phenomena are produced. But we assert it to be the instrument only. It is, in fact, that which we term 'animal magnetism.' The name you have given to it is certainly more appropriate and we accept it accordingly. But our contention is, that Psychic Force is one agent only and not the principal one. It is merely the material which the governing and directing Intelligence employs for the purpose of manifesting itself to the human senses. What you have called *Psychic* (or

---

(a) *Spiritualism answered by Science, with the Proofs of a Psychic Force.* By Edward W. Cox, S.L. Second edition. London: Longman and Co., 1872.



*Soul*) Force is the *Vital* or *Nerve* Force, generated in the nerve centre and distributed by the nerve system, which some persons have in excess and with whom it is projected beyond the limits of the body, enveloping it as with an atmosphere. This is the material which the Spirits of the dead, who are always about us, but imperceptible to us, are enabled to use for the purpose of clothing their atomic structure with molecular matter, and so making their presence known, either by forcible motion of other molecular structure, or by presenting themselves personally to the senses of touch and sight. In this manner they are enabled to hold communication with the molecular world, to impress a motive force upon solid bodies, to produce in the atmosphere the waves that cause sound, and to present perceptible forms to the eye."

Science replies thus:—"Having admitted the existence of Psychic Force, and that it is, as we contend, the medium by which the phenomena are produced, we journey far together. I care not what you call it if we mean the same thing. I object only to your use of the term 'magnetism,' because it is a misleading term. The force has no relationship whatever to magnetism. We agree in this, also, that some *Intelligence* controls and directs the action of the Psychic Force. What, then, is that *Intelligence*? The divergence between us is Here. You assign it to Spirits of the dead. We say the facts do not justify your conclusion. You are too impatient; you have not fully questioned nature. Your experiments have not been numerous enough, nor your examination conducted with sufficient scientific accuracy, to justify your inferences. You are bound to exhaust all possible natural and scientific explanations before you resort to supra-mundane solutions that attempt to explain a proved fact by an unproved fact. So many problems have been already solved by Science, which formerly were universally accredited to supernatural action, because they were at the moment inexplicable, that it is not permissible at once, on the presentation of certain facts the causes of which cannot be

instantly explained, to resolve that the problem is altogether insoluble by the known laws of Nature and Science, and therefore forthwith to attribute the phenomena to Beings whose presence is imperceptible to any sense and whose existence is as yet unproved. Even if an imperceptible Being be operating, why conclude it to be the Spirit of some dead man?"

To this the Spiritualists reply :—"Because the Intelligence so asserts of itself. The communications are stated by the communicants to proceed from Spirits of the dead. Why should we doubt them?"

Science rejoins :—"Not knowing the nature of the Intelligence you cannot know if in this it is telling truth or deceiving. It *may* be that you are right. To reject your theory hastily would be to do that for which you are blamed by us—namely, leaping to a conclusion on insufficient premisses. Against the assertions of the unknown Intelligence we set all *the facts*, and we say that none of them, nor all of them together, bear out your contention. On the contrary, their tendency is to negative such a conclusion. The evidence is overwhelming that the Intelligence is in some manner associated with the Psychic, either alone or by connection with the nerve systems of one or more of the persons present. Granting this, however, there still remains the problem, which neither *Science* nor *Spiritualism* has yet succeeded in solving—how it is that the Intelligence of the Psychic directs the force? What physical conditions attend upon the operation? Or is it within the limits of probability, or even of possibility, that some other agents than either of those assigned by either party should be the producers of the phenomena?"

The discussion thus invoked brought to me a deluge of communications from many countries and from persons of all ranks and callings. I had invited reports of psychic phenomena that may have been witnessed by any competent and credible person who would authenticate his statements with his name and address. I was



astonished thus to discover how universal and frequent they were. The reports so volunteered to me did not come from professional mediums, nor were they of phenomena seen at public exhibitions or at private paid *séances*. All of them were cases that had occurred to the narrators themselves, or witnessed by them among their own children, in their own households, under circumstances and conditions that precluded the possibility of sleight-of-hand or mechanical contrivances. All of these correspondents were persons of social position, many of them high in rank, not a few distinguished in the worlds of politics, science, literature and art. Among them are noblemen, bishops, physicians, statesmen, lawyers, authors, artists, and practical men of business. Fear of the ridicule with which it has been the practice of the press to treat the phenomena, and of the abuse and misrepresentation which it has lavished upon all who dared to assert their reality, had deterred the writers from bearing public testimony to the facts that had come under their personal observation, and they were imparted to me only because I had pledged myself to hold their names in confidence. But all are authenticated to myself by name and address, and the greater portion of them are from persons whose names and fame are familiar to the world. In a popular treatise such as this, which professes to be no more than a mere outline of a great subject, it would be impracticable to do more than present to the reader a small selection from these communications, the entire of which would fill a goodly volume. Some of the phenomena thus exhibited are, I must admit, not immediately explicable on the scientific theory of a Psychic Force. But that theory is not to be rejected because it will not instantly solve *every* problem that may present itself in a field of investigation so new and strange. The marvel is that it explains so many of them. Seeing how much it has already accomplished, we may reasonably expect that further experiment will be equally successful in solving such as remain.

The following was communicated to me by a near

relative holding office in America. It relates to my daughter, who died some years ago.

New Orleans, February 13, 1873.

I was with a Medium or Psychic, or whatever else you may call him, on Tuesday last, and amongst the names of those I wished to communicate with I put down your Florry. A lady had asked me to put questions which would prove if there were an after life. I did not put any, but the question was in my mind.

After some time, and after answering some of our party with wonderful correctness, the Medium said, "A very beautiful influence is moving over me from your (my) direction. I see a young lady stooping over you with a bouquet of flowers in her hand, on which is written 'Florence.' Has anyone asked for Florence?" Before I could answer he added, "I see the whole name now—Florence Cox—and she wishes to speak to you through me. She says she is delighted to be able to communicate with you, to know that you think of her, *and to tell you that the dead live.* She says she is very happy in her present state."

I had only written her name on a piece of paper, which was tightly folded up, and I know was never opened. All took place in broad daylight. I also communicated with a man I had known in Carthage, but the result would not interest you. He wrote his reply *on* the table, and the signature is almost exactly like what he wrote when living, and it is a peculiar one.

This is extremely mysterious at first sight, but readily explicable on reflection. It must be remembered that my relative had written the name of my daughter on the pellet, and therefore had the idea or image of her in his mind at the moment, and by the process already described, the idea in his mind was impressed upon the mind of the Psychic. It was clearly a case of what is incorrectly called *Thought Reading*.

The next, though long, is extremely interesting and valuable, inasmuch as it describes minutely the sensations that attend the possession and exercise of Psychic Force. The writer is a Psychic of rare power and possesses a thinking and observing mind, which has minutely noted its own condition.

Barre, Mass., U.S., Sept. 2nd, 1872.

SIR,—It is not till within a few weeks that your work, "Spiritualism answered by Science," has come into my hands, though I have sought for it ever since its publication. At the close of



your book, an invitation is extended to any reader who had experimented or investigated the subject to communicate to you the result of his experiences. This, sir, is the excuse I have to offer for thus introducing myself.

Allow me, sir, *first* to state, that my joy knew no bounds when I learned, through the reviews, that a society had actually undertaken to investigate these phenomena, and that their report was *adverse* to the spiritualistic theory, *first*, because I had so long desired that the subject should be treated scientifically rather than theologically, and *second*, because your theory, as near as I could judge from the criticisms, was *my* theory; and I then looked forward to something like a correct solution of the whole mystery. I knew it was not speedy, that the ice only was broken, and that future associations and experiments almost infinite, must take place ere the goal would be reached. But I perceived you were on the right track, and hailed with thanksgivings of joy any approach to the long-desired explanation, so earnestly wished for by myself and every true lover and friend of scientific phenomena.

*Second.* Let me say, that all my life long I have been subject to these influences, but not until the last twenty-two years have these manifestations been so visible as to be particularly remarked by myself or others. It was during, and upon the recovery from, a spinal illness of four years that this phenomenon developed itself, and then *mainly* in the direction of mentality instead of physical demonstrations, though sounds and movements accompanied the other manifestations. It will be impossible for me to give you any just idea of the extent and variety of this influence in this paper, therefore please excuse me if my statements are fragmentary and somewhat tangled.

In the autumn of 1849 I developed (as the spiritualists would call it) in my own sick room, without the aid of any medium or magnetiser, into a clairvoyant for seeing physical conditions, mental conditions, and all other conditions; examined and prescribed for disease; laid my hands on invalids and healed them; wrote out facts of which I had no knowledge, nor any other person present; personated character; spoke and wrote on religious and literary subjects, of which I had no knowledge; and in process of time spoke and wrote in foreign languages, improvised in prose and poetry, possessed the power of influencing others, so that they, too, would speak, write, sing, have the sounds and movements, examine and heal as I did myself; most of these phenomena being entirely new to me, to those upon whom it was exercised, and to those by whom it was witnessed.

During all this time I gained in strength, and in process of time was *more* than restored to my usual health, having a feeble constitution and chill temperament,

I was never *unconscious*, but more *inwardly* conscious than

when in a natural state, extremely sensitive, hearing all that was said and done around me, yet usually appearing as perfectly normal as any one, though the language spoken by me was scarcely ever retained, while the idea remained the same as if I was reading a book in the natural state.

From the first objections rose in my mind to the spiritualistic theory, many phases of the phenomena as felt by and manifested through myself being unaccountable upon that supposition. My own sensations and convictions finally gave the lie to the solution on that basis. Being always conscious and able to note and test all my internal sensations and physical conditions, to observe external facts as well as internal evidence, to examine others when similarly influenced, aided me in my investigations and conclusions. As my doubts were unfolded from time to time, believers rebuked me for "*want of faith*," &c.; but all to no purpose, for my convictions became so strong that I "refused longer to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter," or a spiritualist.

Now for my third statement, which is my present theory. When first influenced, it seemed as if a second self prompted me from within, as though it *was myself*, an unknown part of myself, moving me by impulse to say and do that which I had never heard of before, *which was a fact* in most cases demonstrable, such as repeating the names of persons absent to their friends present, giving dates, events, &c. When I personated other individuals, which was as easy as to act myself, it seemed for the time that I was endowed with another nature, acting out their most minute peculiarities, even when I had never seen or heard of them, connecting myself with them simply by having accidentally come in contact with some friend or acquaintance of theirs.

I could always resist these influences if I chose, but did not wish to make the effort; besides, they were very pleasant and health-giving to me. Sometimes my appearance was like a half-magnetised person, though quite frequently no perceptible change was observable.

When the sounds followed me or accompanied the influence, I could never converse through them or control them in the least; yet they would come in showers around me, when alone and writing under this influence, in little taps upon my person, or loud thumps upon the table or on the floor. Not unfrequently I could feel a thrill pass over or through me as they escaped from my person. They appeared to me to be mental vibrations from my own mind, and to be caused by a superabundance of this electrical element which you have called *Psychic Force*, which was set free by my mental activity, producing a concussion, by striking some hard substance; or that it burst in the air in a series of little snicks, not unlike what can be produced by snapping the nails of the thumb and forefinger together rapidly. It seemed as if it emanated from the pores of my skin, and spun out like little



glass threads breaking all around me, making the sounds that I have attempted to describe.

I was often like a person insulated. While dressing my hair, it would crackle like the fur on a cat in cold weather, and followed my hand, flying out from my head as if in a breeze. My flannel clothing also would crackle and sparkle; the odic light would play around my fingers; some persons, on touching them, or my forehead, could attract it to themselves, and would receive a shock, like as from a galvanic battery; while others would be completely magnetised by taking my hand, or while I was talking in private or in public, without my will or knowledge. In these experiments this force was strongly manifested, though not frequently, the exercise exhausting me greatly. Twice, while sitting at the breakfast table in New York City, in 1855, without being aware of the fact till I *felt* it was so, I remarked to the family, "this table is held down," and it could not be raised from the floor. It seemed to me that ten thousand of those little threads, before spoken of, extended or projected from as many pores in my body, and entered the pores of the table, and, instead of inflating it, as usual, to cause it to rise, held it down; and that the table became charged with the force, which seemed *tons*, while my system was relieved, of the corresponding weight. When I placed my own hand beneath the table, it seemed as if it increased the force, pushing it down all the stronger as I vainly attempted to raise it. Several times, at intervals, this charging process would come upon me and pass upon the table, lasting perhaps half a minute or a minute at each time. At this time I had never heard of a table being held down, consequently was not experimenting.

At another time, and at another place, when a table moved after me, my sensations were as if my right side, which was next to the table, was filled with those little projecting threads, finer than mind can imagine, and as if like electrical wires they were fastened into as many pores of the table; and when I turned to the right or the left, as I did for the experiment, the table moved precisely as I did, and whirled with me as I whirled, and as would a broom if I had held the handle in my hand, though I was not within a foot or two of the table and did not touch it.

I spoke of pores in the table. Pardon me, sir, but it appears to me that the Psychic Force, like insensible perspiration, is continually emanating from the body; and, as you have stated, is possessed by all persons in different degrees of quantity and force, and by the same person at different times more or less; and that it is so subtle, so refined, and yet so permeating in its nature, that even solid substances like wood can become inflated with it, and be buoyed in the air and float about. We all know that wood is porous, not so dense but that it will admit of shrinking, and may not this etherealised, humanised, electricity

be as powerful in its own sphere, mental and physical, as is atmospherical electricity in its own sphere—the air? It so seems to me, sir, as my sensations during these exhibitions of power are analysed by myself, according to facts; and that Sir Isaac Newton's luminiferous ether, Dr. Carpenter's "Unconscious Cerebration," Messrs. Cox, Crookes, and Huggins's "Psychic Force," and my own "vitalized mental electricity," are all one and the same force.

I wish it was in my power to describe my sensations while being lifted from my bed by this unseen influence and laid upon the floor. It was as if a sustaining power, proceeding from myself, was beneath me, gently assisting me to descend, floating me, as it were, upon a surface of ether that evaporated gradually till the floor was reached. While sitting, both myself and chair have been often lifted, producing similar sensations though not so vivid. Your theory will gain adherents, and call even the spiritual believer to your side, since he admits the existence of the force, though claiming it to be used by a disembodied spirit for the purpose of communicating and performing the other antics of spiritualism. Here is where we differ. You, with myself, do not believe in any spiritual agency whatever, except such as is exercised consciously or unconsciously by mortals.

Unlike yourself, my experience proves to me, that very often my inner unfolding and outward manifestations are very far beyond or superior to my *then* present development, though I cheerfully admit never, I think, above my *possible educated capacity*. It is not possible to project through any person aught beyond his capacity. You cannot drive an inch stream through a half-inch auger hole. Excuse the comparison, but it illustrates the point. If, by the friction, the auger hole increases in size, then the stream may be correspondingly increased. And so of the perceptive faculties; a person may become educated *permanently* by these entranced ideas enlarging his mental capacity.

Permit me, sir, to add, in closing, for I feel you will like to know, that these influences have never left me (though unexercised except on ordinary occasions) for nearly ten years; most of their phases being now recalled at will, or rather the condition that can manifest them in *some* form.

I deem it just to myself to say, that I esteem the force and its results to be of equal importance as when under its constant and immediate influence; but the theory of spiritualism has been for many years discarded by me, never having more than *tolerated* it or its advocates.

I have always felt that I should live to see spiritualism controlled and explained by science; therefore the dawning of that day is hailed by me with the sincerest pleasure, second only to the rise and progress of the influence itself.



Any way in which I can be of use to you hereafter in your investigations will be a favour which I shall greatly appreciate, as my life is reckoned by its ideas obtained and imparted, rather than its dollars gained.

The following was addressed to me without any injunction to secrecy. The writer is sister to Mrs. Stowe, the authoress, and of the Rev. Beecher Stowe, America's most famous preacher. I should state that I was an entire stranger to her.

69, West 38 Street, New York City.

For more than twenty years I have investigated the phenomena of clairvoyance and spiritualism, and have facts, both in print and MSS., which may perhaps be serviceable to you. I will mention one which I should like to have investigated, and this is a short statement of it.

While Mrs. Stowe (my sister) was noticing certain letters in private, purporting to be Lady Byron's, at a *séance* with Kate Fox and several of my brothers and sisters, Mrs. Stowe inquired of Lady B. if these letters were authentic. The answer was, "Partly so." Mrs. S. said, "How can I find out?" The reply was, "Go to Bentley."

Now, no one of the party could think of any person known to them with that name except Professor Stowe, who said, "I believe that is a London publisher." Mrs. Stowe wrote to Macmillan to inquire, and I think, though I am not sure, that he replied that Bentley had some letters. I should like to learn the exact facts.

This is one of many cases where I have heard from the invisible agent what no one present could have known.

I am clear that some intelligent agents not present in the bodies of those present make these communications; but that they are spirits of departed persons once living on earth I cannot perceive to be *capable of proof*. That they are in many cases *not* the spirits of the persons they profess to be *can* be proved.

Truly your friend,

CATHERINE E. BEECHER.

This also is explicable by the Psychic Theory, which accepts as a fact what is called "thought-reading"—and which is in truth *brain sympathy*. As previously shown, *Memory* and *Recollection* are distinct acts of the mind, although so commonly confused in thought and speech. It is highly probable that every impression made upon the

brain, even if we are not conscious of it at the moment, is stored in the *Memory*, and that many of our unaccountable thoughts are revivals of these unconscious memories. *Recollection* is dependent on conditions of which we are as yet wholly ignorant. Therefore, before it can be affirmed that a fact was not in the *memory* of some person present, we must be assured that it could *never* have been unconsciously impressed upon the mind. The explanation of all the cases I have seen, or which have been reported to me, of communication of something that is said not to have been known to the Psychic or to any of the persons present is, that they have mistaken *Recollection* for *Memory*. Because no person could *recollect* the circumstance, it was hastily concluded that no person had received into his mind the impression of it, either consciously or unconsciously. *How* the Psychic's mind comes to be impressed by memories in another mind is, of course, a problem, of which I have ventured to suggest the solution (*ante*, p. 22.) Of the *fact* that such a mental sympathy exists, and that such "thought readings" occur, there is overwhelming evidence. The instance narrated by Miss Beecher is manifestly one of them.

To these I will add another, to which the same explanation will apply. The writer is an officer of rank in the English Army.

Hamilton, Canada, 24th Sept., 1872.

I have read with much pleasure your pamphlet containing the answer of science to spiritualism. I observe that you invite your readers to furnish you with any facts which may tend to dissipate the mist which at present hangs over this, as you truly deem it, most important subject.

Some years since my mother was told by a Mrs. Thrale, a sister of Agnes Strickland, the authoress, that she had received communications from her husband about matters which she alone knew of. Upon one occasion a series of letters were received, which the recorder could make nothing of, but which she syllabled off, and found them to be an intelligent communication from an Italian, in Italian, to her daughter. The principal reason why I trouble you with these, I fear to you, wearisome details, is that what I have to narrate appears to me to conflict with your



assumption, that the matter received is "always in the mind of the medium, or some one present."

I was at a sitting one night, when the spirit of a brother of Mr. McB. was announced as present; his relationship, age, and peculiar manner of death were given correctly. No one at the table but Mr. McB. himself knew of his existence. His name was now asked for. "Alexander John" was the reply. As far as it goes, the reply was true; but his name was "*John Alexander*." By the cerebral operation theory, the name should have been rapped out correctly, as it was evolved from the brain of McB. Perhaps it changed *en route* to the table? The message he received at this time was "all happiness." At another time it was one of warning and advice!

Still another: a short time previous to the sitting at which what I am about to narrate took place, we had been told by a writing medium that my sister, a few months deceased, had met the spirit of a friend, Fanny C. At the sitting my wife asked, "Is there any spirit friend with you now?" "Yes." "Who?" "Fanny." At this point I said, "I know what is coming," thinking of Fanny C. "So do I," replied my wife, expecting Fanny C. But to our surprise Fanny M. came. Now this Fanny M. was my wife's favourite sister, who died eighteen years since. We of course knew, after the first syllable had appeared. The only other person at the table of my own family was my little girl, eleven years old, to whom Fanny M. is a myth, as Fanny died years before my child was born, and the other three persons knew nothing of her. I may say that, calling out the alphabet, I instinctively paused at C., expecting it to be the first letter, and I could not think what was to follow. This, of course, will be to you hearsay; to me it is fact.

E. R. R.

This again is a clear case of thought-reading (or rather of *brain sympathy*) which will sufficiently explain all the seemingly marvellous communications.

Another phenomenon requires to be noticed here, although its existence must be pronounced problematical as yet. There is, however, so large an amount of evidence in its favour that it deserves some examination. If there be any truth in it, most important material will be provided for the assistance of the Psychologist in the great work now before him.

The Reader is doubtless acquainted with an alleged psychological phenomenon reported as existing in many countries, but especially among the people of Scotland,

to which the name of *Second Sight* has been given. Whencesoever coming, the reports are substantially the same. They allege the appearance of ghostly forms, not of the dead, but of the *living*! and many of the narratives are by persons who aver that they have seen their own *wraiths* or spirits. This faculty of Second Sight is said to be hereditary. The spectral appearance is supposed to indicate coming death or impending misfortune to the person so visited. There are few families in Scotland who have not a tradition of this nature, and not a few living men and women affirm, with evident conscientiousness, that they have themselves witnessed the warning vision.

The obvious explanation of this phenomenon is the same as that which applies to ghost stories generally. They are merely mental illusions—waking dreams—pictures formed in the brain, which in sleep would have been taken to be dreams, but occurring when the patient is awake they are, by the law of association, mistaken for impressions brought to the brain by the senses, and therefore are accepted as being objects actually existing without. As with ghost stories generally, this simple explanation disposes at once of ninety-nine cases in every hundred.

But in the investigation of psychological phenomena some cases are found which certainly do not admit of such an explanation. None have been experienced by myself; but I have received reports from friends, whose capacity for observation is unquestionable, whose veracity I have no reason to doubt and whose statements I have questioned with care. If these can be relied upon, they indicate the existence of some species of psychic communication between distant *living* persons, thus to some extent sustaining the superstition of second-sight. It has been stated to me by intelligent and truthful witnesses that, sitting with Psychics, they have received communications from far off *living* friends, which could not be accounted for by Thought-reading, inasmuch as the information conveyed was of facts not



known to themselves at the time, but which afterwards were found to be true. (a)

It will be remembered that, in a previous chapter, it was shown how a vivid idea or conception of a person will cause in the mind of the inquirer communications made through the Psychic to appear as coming from that person. This is another proof that the Intelligence, whatever it be, directing the Psychic Force receives its knowledge from what is in the mind of the inquirer and not from perception of objects actually existing without. This does not explain the communication of facts not then known to any person present; but always the question comes in such case, if the fact had not at some time been impressed upon the mind, although not *remembered* now?

I have received from a man of great distinction, whose name and fame are familiar to every person who reads a newspaper, and who moreover to that time had been an entire sceptic as to all the phenomena of Psychism, the following curious narrative.

He had been induced to join a sitting with some friends, expecting to see an imposture that would give him abundant material for jest. He witnessed much that surprised him, but was the most startled by correct answers that were returned to a series of questions, *merely formed in his mind* (not spoken, nor written), relating to deceased friends, and which answers stated minutely names, places, dates, and incidents, and not merely vague generalities. The Psychic was a young lady of social position, a relative of his host. Instead of the anticipated frauds he had found a serious fact. Being desirous to pursue the investigation, he repeated the experiments with the same Psychic, with the same results. A few

---

(a) Is it possible that there be any truth in this world-wide belief in the Double? That it may be in some manner connected with the duplex structure consequent upon the double germ by which organic being is produced? I submit the query for reflection.

days afterwards he made trial of it in his own house, with only a male friend present, of the same social rank as himself and who had never exhibited the slightest psychic power. The two seated themselves at a table to try if anything would occur to them. Presently came rappings and tiltings and the usual signs of the presence of the force. Questions were asked and answered in the customary manner. "There was," said my informant, "a dear friend in Scotland, with whom I had a slight difference that troubled me. This was strongly in my mind, but I was at the moment asking for a communication from a dead friend. The signal was given of a presence. I inquired who was now addressing me. The name given was not that of the dead friend whom I sought for, but of the *living* friend, who was in my mind, but whose name was not anticipated. 'Where are you now?' I asked.—The answer was, 'In Edinburgh.'—'Whereabout there?' Answer: 'At Mrs. —,' (naming her).—'What address?' 'No. — Street,' (naming them).—'Are you alive?' 'Yes.' " A long dialogue followed, relating to the difference between them, which it is not necessary to report, and then my friend said, "Give me some token of your regard." "Upon my saying this" (said my informant) "the table, untouched, glided gently to me, as I was sitting at some distance from it, and touched me twice." In this experiment no Psychic was present. The two distinguished men sat alone.

Communications and motions of the table are of course daily to be witnessed. The remarkable feature of this case is, that the communication came not from the dead, but from the *living*. My instant conclusion on the narration of it was, that it was a case of thought-reading and a strong confirmation of the existence of that curious psychological condition. But the sequel seems to negative this conclusion. In answer to a question, my informant stated that his friend resided in another part of Scotland, and that he had no knowledge she was in Edinburgh at that time, but believed her



to be at her residence. The name and address of the lady with whom she was staying were alike unknown to him, and he only learned the fact by writing to her on the following day at the address that had been thus strangely communicated to him. In reply, he was informed that she was alive and well, and that she had unexpectedly gone to Edinburgh, on the day the experiment was made, to visit the lady whose name and address had been given. At my request an inquiry was made if the friend was waking or sleeping at the time of the communication, for it is said that this phenomenon occurs only when the person supposed to be seen is sleeping or in the trance condition. The answer returned was that she was in bed and in a sleep unusually profound.

A case of a somewhat similar mental communication between distant *living* persons will be found narrated (*ante*, p. 131), on the authority of Dr. ABERCROMBIE.

If cases similar to this should be confirmed (and the subject should receive the most careful investigation by Psychologists), they will throw a new light upon the relationship of soul and body and the capacity for mental communication when the Conscious Self is released from the limitations imposed by the conditions of the machinery through which the normal process of mental intercourse is conducted. If, under the special conditions exhibited in Psychism, Mind can impress Mind, or Soul Soul, at an indefinite distance, another proof will be given of the existence of Soul as distinct from body. It will also go far to invalidate the conclusion, that the communicants are Spirits of the dead; for if precisely the same intercourse can be had with the Souls of the *living*, it is plain that the actual presence of Souls of the dead is not necessary to the production of the phenomenon.

I might fill a whole volume with similar experiments. The exigencies of space forbid. These few must suffice.

---

## CHAPTER XIII.

THE PHYSIOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY OF  
PSYCHISM.

SUCH are the facts, such are some of the phenomena, of Psychism. That these things *are*, whatever may be their causes, nobody who has patiently pursued the investigation through a dozen experimental trials with crucial tests has ever doubted, or, if a sane man, *could* doubt. If they be not proved as objective facts presented to our senses nothing is proved. We must doubt our own existence and the existence of everything about us. If the evidence of the senses is to be rejected in this, it can be accepted in no instance, and there must be an end to all human testimony, to all knowledge and to all action based upon knowledge. We must close our Courts of Justice. We must burn our books.

But acceptance of the phenomenal *facts*, as presented to the senses, does not carry with it of necessity acceptance of any of their asserted causes. It may still be contended that they are impostures. Various physical causes may be suggested. They may be looked upon as supernatural. All these propositions are fairly open to discussion.

That not all nor many of them are *impostures*, the experiments reported (a few from a multitude) will satisfy the unprejudiced reader as it satisfied the scientific observers.

If not impostures they are *realities*, and then the question comes, whence and what are they?



Conclusions or conjectures must resolve themselves into these few.

Some intelligent force being undoubtedly in action, this force must proceed

1. From the Psychic, with or without the assistance of the psychic force of the persons about him; or

2. From some external and independent entity, which must be either (1), The disembodied Soul of a dead human being; or (2), Some beings about us imperceptible to us in the normal conditions of the mechanism, inhabiting this world with us, and who in certain conditions are enabled to manifest their presence by exercising a mechanical force upon molecular matter, and occasionally by becoming perceptible to our senses.

The reasons for the conclusion that the force proceeds from the Psychic, and is directed by his intelligence, have been already stated (*ante*, p. 409), and need not to be repeated.

From what part of the organism the force proceeds is a problem yet to be solved. It is manifestly associated with the nerve system, for it is to a great degree dependent upon the nervous condition, flowing when its energy flows and flagging when that flags.

But the force is greatest when the nerves of the senses are paralysed; and in proportion to the extent of that paralysis is the power and range of the force. It is greatest in the condition of *Trance*, which appears to be the severance of Conscious Self from its material mechanism, the force being then directed with more of Intelligence. The Conscious Self then appears to control and determine the direction of the Force without the normal employment of the mechanism of the brain. Hence the reasonable conclusion that the force is other than the nerve force that moves the mechanism in its normal state—that it is, in fact, the other force which, in the normal state, *determines and directs the action of the mechanism*. The difference between these two forces—the psychic force and the nerve force—is that which makes the distinction between a machine

and a Man. A machine cannot *determine the direction* of its motions. A Man can do so.

This directing and determining force being guided by Intelligence, my contention is that it comes from an *Intelligent Thing*. In this treatise that Intelligent Thing is called the *Conscious Self* (or Soul), and therefore it is that I have ventured to call the force that comes from it—the *PSYCHIC (OR SOUL) FORCE*.

The phenomena described disclose the presence of some special faculties as attaching to the force, or more probably to the Conscious Self or Soul when directing the force, and which will explain many of the most mysterious of the phenomena presented to us.

Conspicuous among these is the power of what is popularly called "thought-reading," but which Science would more correctly describe as "*Mental Sympathy and Communion*." In the special conditions of the mechanism that admit of abnormal development by the psychic force, the Conscious Self is sensitive to the mental action of other persons having at the time a certain relationship to it, known as being *en rapport*. The scientific explanation of this is that the motions of one mind are sympathetically set up in the other mind (*ante*, p. 26) and mental motion makes an idea or a sentiment.

Mechanical action has been already considered.

The condition of the Psychic is the same as that seen in Somnambulism and Hypnotism. The normal relationship between the Conscious Self (or Soul) and the mechanism of the body is disturbed. Instead of working in perfect co-ordination, as in the normal state of the mechanism, they act more or less independently. Then the Conscious Self (or Soul) receives impressions from the external world *directly*, without the intervention of the senses and through some other medium, and also is enabled to act upon that world directly, without its normal and usual medium the molecular mechanism of the body.

Such is the explanation of the ordinary phenomena of Psychism which, after patient and protracted examination



of them, and much reflection, I venture to suggest for the consideration of those who desire the advancement of knowledge, for the sake of Science.

Undoubtedly there are other phenomena, described in the experiments here reported, and exhibited in the many more from which these were but a selected few, that will not admit of this explanation. Intelligent forces are seen to be in active operation which a mere force projected from the Psychic will not account for. A personality of some kind is often manifestly present.

This presence of a personality admits of one of three explanations only.

1. The popular theory is that this acting and active intelligent personality is the disembodied spirit of some human being who has passed away from this life.

In a prior chapter (*ante*, p. 384), the powerful reasons have been stated for rejecting this solution of the problem.

On my own part, that conclusion was forced upon me with extreme reluctance and much sorrow. I had investigated the phenomena with an earnest hope that I should receive, as many enthusiastic friends assured me, conclusive and convincing proof that, *as a fact in nature and not as a faith merely*, the Soul survives death, and that the dead communicate with the living by touch and sight and speech. On the first aspect of the phenomena I was inclined towards this conclusion. But the more I witnessed of them, and the more I reflected upon them, the greater grew my doubts as to the sufficiency of this explanation. As the observed facts multiplied, the evidence lessened in amount and weight. To one fact that confirmed the desired conclusion ten went to negative it. Having closely investigated a vast number of phenomena that were confidently adduced as demonstrating the presence of Spirits of the dead, I must candidly avow that I have not witnessed one that could be accepted as satisfactory by any judicial mind, or that did not admit of some other explanation, physically or psychologically. Scientists and others who,

like myself, have examined the phenomena *as a Science* and not as a Religion, have, I know, arrived at the same conclusion, and are confident that, *whosoever the agents be, they are not Spirits of the dead.*

Whatever prepossession we had was in favour of that theory. We were anxious to prove it true, as who would not be? It would have determined for ever, beyond question, the problem of Man's future. It would have decided the question as to the Mechanism of Man, and reduced to a single page in this treatise an inquiry which now occupies half a volume.

2. Another suggested Agent is the Spirit of the Psychic, and three-fourths of the evidence supports that hypothesis. The reasons for it have been already set forth (*ante*, p. 334), and need not be repeated. The relationship, in all their characteristics, between the phenomena and the Psychic are obvious to every impartial observer—so obvious, indeed, that Spiritualists are driven to strain their ingenuity in order to account for this resemblance. On the other hand, it is fair to admit the difficulties that surround the psychological theory. The force exercised is either "action at a distance," or there is positive contact of the moved molecular structure by something itself molecular or non-molecular. Science questions the possibility of the former. The latter involves the projection of something from the Psychic, which not only can impart motion to solid bodies, but be itself directed by his Intelligence. If there be such a projected *something*, there is but one conclusion, that an intelligent something within the Psychic is acting outside of and in practical severance from his body.

It is contended by some that the mere Will, strongly directed, can exercise a force that affects external objects. It is certain that a strongly exercised Will can move other *minds*, slightly in the normal condition, but to the extent of entire control of them in somnambulism and other abnormal conditions. In Psychism the position is reversed. The Psychic is the Somnambule who controls, and not the Entity that is controlled. In fact, none of



the Phenomena are produced, or in any way governed, by the Will of the Psychic. He is a wholly unconscious agent. He feels a certain nervous shock when he passes into the condition, and again when he passes out of it, exhibited externally in a convulsive action of the muscles that invariably precedes the exhibition of the phenomena. But during the entire of their occurrence he is purely passive—often is wholly unconscious,—and always he is more or less in a condition identical with that of Hypnotism.

The explanation by the spiritualists of these features attending the production of the phenomena is creditable to their ingenuity, but is it probable? They say that the disembodied spirit clothes itself, as it were, in something (the very existence of which is unknown and unproved) that is supposed to emanate from the body of the medium, by appropriating which it is enabled to take shape and substance, to become perceptible to the human senses, and to exercise mechanical force upon molecular matter. Hence, they say, the necessity for the presence of a Psychic.

This hypothesis appears sufficiently extravagant. Examined, it refutes itself. There is no evidence whatever that the body of the Psychic can emit molecules enough in five minutes to build another human body; nor that any perfect human body could be as quickly built, even if the material for it were provided. If it be said that it is merely nerve force, and not the substantial constituents of body, that the Psychic supplies, it remains to be shown how nerve force alone could do what all see, hear, and feel.

The inconclusive conclusion is that we know very little about it. Probably there is some fundamental error in our reasoning, or we build upon a wrong basis. When the truth is found, doubtless it will differ entirely from anything we have ever conjectured; and when we learn it we shall be surprised at its simplicity, and wonder that it should not have occurred to us before. We start with certain *assumptions* as to man's structure and the

structure of the Universe, and the nature of matter and non-matter (or spirit), upon which assumptions we base all our reasonings, and try to account for all the facts and phenomena we witness. If we err as to these assumptions, we may readily understand why it is that we fail to find a clue to the causes of the phenomena, and why ingenious conjecture based upon some facts is, almost as soon as proved, contradicted by some other facts.

The touch of fingers is often felt; hands are sometimes seen. When held, they are found to be soft, warm, moist, seemingly true flesh and bone. If forcibly held, they are withdrawn by force or they melt in the grasp. The strongest man has never yet succeeded in retaining his hold, although apparently of the hand of a child. When seen—as often they are—they are invariably of an ashen grey hue, quite unlike that of any living hand, but perfect in shape and motion. A hand can be seen playing an accordion, striking the keys of a pianoforte, carrying a flower from one person to another, ringing a bell, winding up a musical box, writing with a pencil, patting the cheek, pulling the hair. One remarkable experiment was witnessed by the entire of a party of eleven persons. It was on a summer evening on the 23rd May, 1873, at the private residence of a friend. It was in full daylight. The table at which we sat was by a bow window, over which muslin curtains were drawn to exclude the sunbeams. In the centre of the table was a vase filled with spring flowers, among which were some large branches of lilac. Suddenly the curtains moved. A hand emerged out of the daylight and drew them aside, first one and then the other. Presently a hand—as of a delicate lady—appeared passing over the table. Slowly it moved before our wondering eyes to the vase of flowers. With finger and thumb it took one of the pieces of lilac and made repeated attempts to break the flower from the branch. But the wood was stout and half a minute, at the least, was occupied in bending and twisting the branch, shaking and almost upsetting the



vase in the process. At length it succeeded. Then it carried the plucked flowers across the table to Lord D., who was sitting by my side, and placed it in his hand; not six inches from me. I requested that it would touch my hand. It moved to me, patting it thrice, during all which actions I and the others examined it curiously and closely. It had the cineritious hue above described, but in all other respects it was a perfect and beautiful lady's hand. I could distinctly see the blue veins and the pink nails. Its touch was warm and soft. The daylight fell full upon it, and it was as distinct, definite, and apparently as solid as any hand upon the table. I could discern no arm. The hand was plainly visible as far as the wrist, but there it seemed to end, not with a definite outline, but melting away, as it were, into a hazy cloud or shadow. It returned across the whole width of the table—a space of eight feet—as slowly as it had come, vanished, and we saw it no more. That it was not an *illusion* is proved by this, that it was beheld by all with equal distinctness, and all agreed in description of it. It was not a momentary mental impression. It was distinctly seen, in broad daylight, by eight persons, at the same time and doing the same acts, and the large sprig of lilac that remained in Lord D.'s hand, and the broken bough in the vase, testified that an *act* had been done which could not have been a mere imagination, and a force used which could not have been fanciful. During this phenomenon the Psychic was with us at the table, lying in his chair in a condition of profound trance, far from the hand we had seen, apparently unconscious and certainly unmoving.

This, however, is only one instance of a phenomenon not uncommon, whose value consists in the satisfactory conditions under which it was presented—in daylight, in the presence of eleven spectators, at a private house, and in circumstances precluding trickery. Again the question comes, whose is the hand? The explanation of many who reject the Spiritualistic theory is based upon

the belief in "the double" that has prevailed in all countries, at all times, and still is widely held in Germany and Scotland. This means that the Soul (or Self) is a distinct entity from that body, can sever itself from the body in certain abnormal conditions, and present itself in the shape of the body to mortal senses at far distances. (a) Assuming that the Spirit can quit the body, wholly or partially, it must be further admitted that it can take any shape it pleases, and mould itself, not in appearance only, but in substance, to any character.

3. There remains yet a third solution of the problem, and one that daily finds more extensive acceptance with those who have devoted to the subject the most careful and profound reflection.

The hypothesis seems strange and startling when first presented, and would be at once dismissed as utterly incredible by those who had never witnessed the phenomenon. I cannot call it their *conclusions*, for to that stage their judgment has not yet advanced—but their *opinion* inclines strongly to this, that the traditions of all mankind are not so baseless as we of the nineteenth century have assumed, and that this world of ours is really inhabited by another race or other races of beings, invisible and impalpable to us, as it may be we are to them, save in certain exceptional conditions. That these existences are our inferiors in intelligence. That being of non-molecular structure they are subject to physical laws other than those that govern molecular structure. Under various names and with many different attributes

---

(a) Overwhelming evidence appears to establish that such communications occur in certain conditions. But these instances do not require the acceptance of "the double" to support them. They are sufficiently explained by that "Mental Sympathy and Communion," which explains so many others of the seeming marvels of psychological phenomena. The form of the distant friend is in the mind, and seen with the mind's eye, and that mental vision is mistaken for an objective vision. I cannot recall any instances of an alleged "double" being seen by two or more persons at the same time.



a process would require no manufacture of flesh and blood, and possibly a very slight change in the position of the particles of which the structure is composed. If this be a reasonable *suggestion* (and it can be nothing more with our present very imperfect knowledge), it still would leave in entire obscurity the question, what *is* the condition, limited as it certainly is in its range, by which the transformation is brought about.

For my own part, so far as I have been enabled to collect the evidence, and form a judgment upon it, I have arrived at some conclusions. I am satisfied,

1. That Spirits of the dead are *not* the agents that perform the actions and supply the Intelligence that undoubtedly attends and directs the phenomena of Psychism ;

2. That the Psychic (or Soul) Force of the Psychic is the active agent in a large portion of the Phenomena, and that it is directed by *his* Intelligence ;

3. With reference to other Phenomena that cannot be so accounted for (although far from having formed an *opinion*) the inclination of my judgment, upon a review of all the evidence, is in strict accordance with the teachings of the Bible, and the records of all history—that they are due to the agency of some non-human beings who inhabit this earth with us, but our inferiors in intelligence—beings of non-molecular structure, and, therefore, imperceptible to us. But whether they be, as they have been variously termed, angels, demons, Pucks, gnomes, Souls of the dead, imperfect Souls not yet embodied (as the Theosophists contend), there is absolutely *no* evidence. We must still be content to collect facts by patient and protracted observation and experiment, before we can venture with any confidence to broach a theory.

---

## BOOK VIII.

## THE ARGUMENT.

## CHAPTER I.

## THE SUMMING UP.

HAVING thus noted the Mechanism of Man in action, alike in its normal and its abnormal conditions, treating the latter as being the best, if not the only, avenue to knowledge of the functions of the various parts of that mechanism, it will be useful, perhaps, to present a summary of the results of that survey, showing how nearly allied are the various phenomena, and how all of them converge to the conclusion that there is an *Intelligent Self* (or *Soul*), as part of the Mechanism of Man, or rather that Man is a Soul clothed with a molecular body, as being necessary to existence in a molecular world.

In the normal relationship of Soul and body there is little to be seen that would indicate a separate existence, or from which the conclusion might not be reasonably drawn that the Mechanism of Man is nothing more than that which the scalpel reveals to us; that is to say, a structure of bones, moved by muscles, governed by nerves, whose action is determined and directed by the Intelligence that has its source and seat in the brain.

This, shortly stated, is the theory of Materialism, and it is indisputable, so far as it goes. It is the contention



of *Psychology* that this is not the whole process of intelligent life, nor the entire of the Mechanism of Man. We assert, and it is the purpose of this treatise to *produce evidence to justify the assertion*, that there is a *Consciousness of Individuality*, which brain and nerve cannot account for; that there are emotions, and sentiments, and intelligence, which cannot be mere secretions of brain matter; *memory* and *recollection* that are inconsistent with the molecular changes which every particle of the brain undergoes many times in a course of a life. Therefore, that the Mechanism of Man, *as we see it in action*, involves the existence of something more than brain and nerve—something that continues to be *the same Self* while the brain continually changes—something that is *conscious* of what the brain does;—something that makes us say “I” and “You.” Psychology proposes to prove the existence of this *Intelligent Something* by precisely the same evidence as the existence of the other motive forces of Nature are proved—by their action upon the molecular structure of the external world, molecular combination being the only form of the numberless combinations of atoms that is perceptible by our very limited senses.

We call this *something* “Soul” merely for lack of a term that would be at once intelligible to the Reader and yet free from the pre-judgment arising out of the vague notion that every person has more or less pre-formed as to the nature of Soul.

But it must be distinctly understood that all such fanciful conceptions must be discarded. Nothing is intended to be affirmed in this treatise as to what the structure of Soul is, or in what manner it is associated with the molecular mechanism. The *something* that for convenience we term “the Soul” (or Self) in this little treatise is to be understood as being merely a name given to *the thing* (whatever it be) that is “You” or “I,” and in this sense only is it to be here read.

The course of our argument has been, to trace the phenomena exhibited in the *abnormal* conditions of the

mechanism from the most frequent and familiar to the most rare and strange. Not that the most seeming marvellous and mysterious of the phenomena are in truth more wondrous or wrapt in mystery than those we continually contemplate without wonder or perplexity. In reality, all are equally marvellous and inexplicable, only some are familiar and some are rare. If, for instance, "the phenomena of Dream" were as rare as are those of Psychism, and if Psychic phenomena were as familiar to us as those of Dream, we should accept the Psychic facts without surprise or curiosity, and view the phenomena of Dream with wonder and with doubt; theasserter of them would be accused of "diluted insanity," and perhaps prosecuted as a rogue and a vagabond.

Some, accepting this conclusion from the proved facts, have expressed much doubt and difficulty in finding a rational explanation of the action of the Conscious Self (or Soul)—that is to say—through what non-molecular medium it is that, in the abnormal condition of partial severance from the mechanism of the body, it obtains its knowledge and exercises its powers.

There is no need to resort to the Supernatural for a solution of this problem. Recent Science has supplied a clue. Scientific discovery is advancing with a rapidity that threatens a revolution in our conception of the construction of the material (that is, the molecular) universe and the laws that govern it. Not merely have we learned that our notions of that structure are wrongly based—such for instance, as our conception of *solidity*, which does not exist—but that we are surrounded by forces and media of which we have been absolutely ignorant hitherto. Mr. NORMAN LOCKYER, F.R.S., has decomposed an "element." Mr. W. CROOKES, F.R.S., has demonstrated the existence of a "supra-gaseous," that is, a fourth and hitherto unrecognised condition of matter, so refined that light moves in it in curves instead of straight lines as in the infinitely coarser atmosphere. TYNDALL and others hold that there is an ether yet more rare, in which all molecular structure is floating. We know not



how many other forms of being may exist, constructed of other combinations of particles and therefore imperceptible to us. The mathematicians of Germany are proving mathematically that there is a fourth dimension of space beyond those of length, breadth, and depth, (which are alone conceivable by the human mind), but in which condition a whole Universe of mind and matter might exist and yet be wholly unrecognisable by the human senses or the human Intelligence. (a) Thus that which was merely conjecture and speculation when the earlier pages of this volume were printed have taken their places in science as proved facts, furnishing clear solutions of a multitude of problems, and explanations of hundreds of phenomena, psychological and physical, which before had been wrapped in impenetrable mystery.

They who have pursued the chain of facts and arguments in this sketch of the Human Mechanism, as it is seen in action, will understand my contention to be that the Machine is not merely an admirable automaton, constructed with marvellous ingenuity to perform a certain prescribed series of actions, under the impulse of a blind force, which merely imparts motion to the machinery but does not guide it, and on the ceasing of which the machine stops, dies and is dissipated, but that the Force moving the material mechanism is itself set in motion and directed by an *Intelligence*, that has a *Will*, whose commands, within the limit of its capacities, the mechanism obeys.

It is my contention, further, that this controlling Intelligence is not the visible material machine, nor the product of its structure; but that it is a distinct and definite entity, existing in it, probably permeating it,

---

(a) They assert that in this fourth condition of space, matter must possess quite other properties than such as are recognisable by our limited powers of conception and perception, as for instance, that a hollow sphere might be turned inside out without breach of continuity, and that a knot might be tied in an endless cord.

and intimately associated with it. This distinct and definite entity, whatever be its form, structure, or qualities, is the *thing* that, in these pages, is intended by the term—the SOUL. It is of secondary moment what that Soul is, its shape, its substance, its manner of being. The important fact *first* to be determined, by *evidence* supplied by a scientific examination of the Mechanism of Man, as seen in action, may be thus expressed :

Is the mechanism merely that material structure which is perceptible to the senses, growing, moving, decaying, dying, and dissolving ?

Or, is the mechanism compounded of *something* other than the material body, that is *not* perceptible to the senses and whose presence can be proved only by its action upon that which is perceptible ; a *something* that permeates and possesses the molecular structure, converting it from an automaton to an Intelligence, directing its motions, living with it in closest union, but not dying with it ; a *something* that is not dissipated with it, but continues to exist in some form, under some new conditions, after the molecular structure has been resolved into its elements ?

These questions are not new. They have been in controversy for ages. Lives have been devoted to their investigation. Libraries have groaned under the weight of the arguments they have provoked, and the dispute is still as far from settlement as ever. The cause of this is clear. The disputants have endeavoured to determine a question of *fact* by argument alone. Formerly, indeed, this was the favourite method for the treatment of all Science, which therefore made little progress. Long after the banishment of this philosophic folly from Physical Science and the substitution of *experiment* and observation for logic, of *facts* for argument, the same fallacious system was unfortunately preserved in the schools of Mental Philosophy and Psychology. In these Sciences alone the old folly has been retained, and even now it is but partially abandoned.



It is a just boast of the abused Phrenologists, that they were the first to revolt against the vicious principle of the Metaphysicians, and to assert that the Science of Mind must be pursued, like the Science of the Body, and like all the other Physical Sciences, by observation and experiment, by collection of facts, and by noting the manifestations of Mind in its normal, and still more in its abnormal, conditions. To the adoption of this principle we are indebted for the great progress made of late in Mental Physiology. (a)

The design of this treatise has been to apply the same fruitful principle of investigation to *Psychology*. Instead of *arguing* if man has or has not a Soul, it was my purpose to apply to the problem the principle that has proved so successful in other sciences. By observing phenomena and arranging them in something like orderly array, I hoped that it might be practicable to deduce from the *proved facts* some reasonable and probable conclusions as to the existence and nature of the forces that are found in actual operation in association with the Mechanism of Man. Although little was to be learned from the motions of that mechanism in its normal condition, when the machine is working smoothly, a great deal was obviously to be learned from it when observed in its abnormal conditions, when the hidden parts of the machinery are thrown out of gear. It was reasonably concluded that Forces, whose presence was imperceptible when working smoothly, would be exhibited when working irregularly, and thus that we should learn their uses by their failures, their power by their friction, and from their imperfect or misshapen products what are their proper functions. It was not anticipated that, upon examination, however careful, the thing that made the motion we call a force

---

(a) It is due to Mr. HERBERT SPENCER to acknowledge the great services he has rendered to Psychology by the adoption of this principle, and the foundation he has laid for it by a laborious collection of facts exhibiting human actions as indicating the mind that prompted them. Why does he not devote the like industry to observation of that mind in its abnormal conditions?

would become perceptible to any *sense*. But it was not unreasonable to hope that, if such a thing exists, though imperceptible to the senses, it would exhibit some action upon molecular structure that is perceptible, from which action we might reasonably infer its presence, and perhaps learn something of its nature. This manner of arriving at knowledge of the imperceptible is not new to Science nor peculiar to Psychology. It is recognised and adopted in practice by the Scientists in many departments of Physical Science. Electricians do not by any sense perceive *the thing* they call "Magnetism" or "Electricity." They cannot see, feel, nor hear these immaterial existences. But they are not the less assured of them. They do not refuse to treat them as verities because their senses are incompetent to perceive that which is of non-molecular structure. Their senses can and do, in fact, perceive the operations of the imperceptible and imponderable force upon molecular matter that is perceptible. They see the conditions of that matter manifestly changed by the operation of the unperceived agent. From the changes so observed they reasonably infer the existence of the agent, and are enabled to learn much, and are daily learning more, of its source, its nature, its qualities, its powers, and of the *conditions* under which it is manifested.

It is not true, as so many of our Physicists have affirmed, that we can know nothing of the imperceptible, and therefore that it is a vain and worthless study to inquire into Mind and Soul, of which our senses cannot take cognizance. The truth is that their existence and qualities can be discovered and investigated by precisely the same process, and with precisely the same confidence in the results, as are those of Magnetism and Electricity—by *study of their manifestations*.

And that is the purpose of this treatise. Few attempts have yet been made systematically to apply to Psychology the principle of investigation by observation of phenomena and collection of facts—employing the same method of treatment as is pursued in the study of any of the



Physical Sciences—that is to say—verifying and noting the *facts* and deducing reasonable conclusions from those facts. Therefore this endeavour is of necessity very imperfect. The phenomena reported, which are but one in a hundred of those collected, have been authenticated with the same precautions as would have been observed had they been submitted to a jury in a court of justice. The inferences from them are questions upon which opinions may fairly differ. I have stated what are the conclusions to which they have pointed in my own mind. The Reader will, I trust, clearly understand that I suggest those conclusions for his consideration merely. I do not advance them dogmatically, nor assert them as confirmed. I am myself only a student, not a master. I am learning and suggesting, in hope to stimulate inquiry and reflection. I am not dogmatising.

I will now briefly sum up the argument in a judicial spirit.

The working of the Mechanism of Man in a condition of health presents so few opportunities for insight into the interior of the machine and the manner of its movements that it has been treated of very briefly.

It is to the phenomena attendant upon *abnormal* conditions of the mechanism that we must look for revelations of the hidden machinery and the forces ruling it, and which we can learn only by their effects upon perceptible molecular structure; precisely as we learn the existence of electricity, which otherwise would be imperceptible, by its eliciting a spark from the molecules of the atmosphere with which it comes in contact when an obstruction is opposed to its passage.

I have arranged these abnormal conditions of the human mechanism in the order in which they appear to be associated, and I follow the links of a natural chain from the most familiar and frequent to the most strange and rare. Thus the Student of Psychology will be better enabled to pursue the inquiry, for he will see, probably with some surprise, how each phenomenon grows out of

the other and how one explains another. Beginning with mental conditions whose existence is undisputed, and of which we all know something (though not really so much as we think we know), such as *Sleep* and *Dream*, I proceed to *Delirium* and *Insanity*, unhappily too familiar to us, and thence to *Natural Somnambulism*, which also is an undisputed but more rare mental condition. As Somnambulism can be produced artificially, thus offering peculiar facilities for study of its manifestations, I have dwelt upon it at more length. The next in natural order was the cognate condition of *Trance*. Then the more complicated but still obviously allied condition of *Psychism*.

Before I trace briefly the links in the chain connecting these abnormal conditions, it will be necessary, although tedious, to repeat the *physiological* conditions under which their phenomena are presented. The explanation of them will be unintelligible without a clear conception of these preliminary facts.

Whether there be or be not a truth in the suggestion I have adventured, that the body is the product of a junction of two germs, there is no doubt that its structure is duplex. It is not *one whole*, as is a statue, but it is manifestly made of two halves joined together—precisely as if the sculptor had modelled and hewn his Venus in two separate parts, and then united and bound those parts together by wires, crossing from either part to the other. Thus it is that the two halves of the animal structure are joined, and the nerves that radiate from the nerve centres of each half of the body pass into the other half of it, and by this device half of the structure is supplied with vital force, not by its own nerve centre, but by the nerve centre of its ally. This important fact once questioned has completely been established by the experiments (described *ante*, p. 98) of Professor FERRIER. A distinct recognition of this structural scheme would be of incalculable importance to Science, for it would solve many perplexing problems in Physiology and explain much that has been hitherto inexplicable in Psychology.



Its value in the practice of medicine will be apparent at a glance.

And as it is with the nerves that feed the body with vital force, and carry to the muscles the command of the *Conscious Self*, so it is with the brain that directs the various actions of the body. That brain is also double. We have, in fact, *two brains*, as we have two arms and eyes. The brain is constructed of two distinct and perfect hemispheres joined together. As it is with the nerves of the body, so with the two brains, there is an exchange of function, the right hemisphere of the brain directing the motions of the left side of the body, and *vice versâ*. Consequently, all the functions of the brain are double. Professor FERRIER has demonstrated by positive experiment that the brain is not one organ, the whole of which is employed in every act of intelligence, but that various parts of it have distinct functions, even to the moving of particular muscles, and we may conclude, also, for the production of different emotions and acts of intelligence. Hence it is that all the brain organs are double, and that as we see with two eyes as two organs of vision, so we feel by two organs of emotion, and think by two organs of thought. Thus, as we can see with one eye, though not so perfectly, so we can feel or think, but likewise not so perfectly, with one organ of emotion or of thought.

The brain is the material organ by means of which the Mind or Soul—that is, whatever “I” am, or “you” are—communicates with the external molecular world. One part of this brain acts when we feel “hope;” another part when we feel “fear;” a third when we imagine, or sing, and so forth.

The student of Psychology must also steadfastly bear in mind that body and brain are *not solid*, as they appear to the eye, but constructed of molecules, themselves *probably* agglomerations of atoms in certain definite arrangements. *Molecules are the ultimate perceptible particles of MATTER*, although they are doubtless in magnitude as mountains to molehills compared with

the particles (for convenience called "atoms") that occupy all the non-molecular portion of creation; and which also (still for convenience only, and to distinguish it from "matter,") has been here called "spirit." These molecules, of which our bodies are builded *do not actually touch each other*. Atoms, and doubtless infinite varieties of atomic structure, can pass and permeate the whole mass of molecular structure as freely as the substantial body can pass through the yielding particles that compose the atmosphere.

So through this molecular structure of the Mechanism of Man can flow with equal freedom all the forces of Nature to which it is subjected, and by which it is moved, maintained, destroyed, and dispersed.

I repeat, that the scheme of this endeavour to make Psychology as interesting to the popular mind as it is profoundly instructive, by making its principles intelligible and describing in familiar language its scope and uses, has been to proceed from an examination of the most familiar and undisputed of the phenomena to such as are more rare and still more or less in dispute.

By the *psychological*, as distinguished from the *physiological*, phenomena of the Mechanism of Man, I intend such only as are associated with the intelligent forces by which the mechanism is moved and its molecules are directed and determined. These forces *physiology* fails to explain, because physiology can describe only structure and function. It opens the brain, and informs us that, by exciting certain parts of it certain effects are produced upon the body. It views the stomach and tell us, by observation of the changes that take place in the substances placed there, that its function is to digest food and then it proceeds to discover in what manner this function of digestion is performed. Here its work ends. It can manipulate molecular matter only, because that alone is perceptible to the senses. Physiology refuses even to inquire into the existence of anything not molecular, because it is incapable of being examined by its methods or by its instruments. Rightly it thus restricts



itself. If it were to look beyond *perceptible* structure, it would be trespassing out of its proper domain.

But the province of *Psychology* commences precisely where that of *Physiology* ends. It first asks, "Is there any existence of any kind not perceptible to our senses? Is there anything behind or beyond this molecular structure which our senses cannot perceive?"

The answer to this is instant and conclusive and will scarcely be questioned even by the most dogmatic materialist.

There is much that is *non-molecular*; in fact, the *molecular* part of creation is the least part of it.

The next question *Psychology* asks is, if this non-molecular, and, *to our senses*, "imperceptible" portion of creation is, and ever must remain, a closed book to us? Is our knowledge of Nature rigidly restricted to the intelligence our senses can convey? Or is there any process of investigation by which we may learn something of the non-molecular (and therefore imperceptible) portion of the Universe, and especially of as much of it as undoubtedly encompasses and underlies the molecular structure of this our world and our own structure also, everywhere permeating it and apparently giving to it that *vitality*, the sources of which *Physiologists* have sought in vain with their microscopes to find in the visible substance? They have been searching with commendable industry the grey matter and the fibre of the brain; but they have failed to discover *Mind* in it. They have dissected the eye with patience and skill, but they cannot find *vision*. They have resolved the whole body into its elements, and have looked in vain for *LIFE*.

And yet we know, though we cannot *perceive* them, that *MIND*, *SENSATION*, *INTELLIGENCE*, *LIFE*, are as absolute and certain realities as are brain, eye, and body.

Why, therefore, should the *Conscious Self* (or Soul), not be, merely because it is as imperceptible and as imponderable as *Mind*, *Sensation*, *Consciousness* and *Life*?

How do we acquire this knowledge? It is not shown to our senses. *Physiology* is powerless to prove it.

By MANIFESTATION.

We see perceptible molecular structure moved by *something* we cannot see. Thus we learn the existence and presence of that imperceptible *something*. We know that it is there as certainly as if we could see it, feel it, analyse it.

Then we note *how* this *imperceptible something* moves perceptible things. We carefully note the conditions under which it operates. We try *experiments* by changing the conditions and marking what changes are so wrought in results. Thus we learn step by step more or less of the nature and qualities of that imperceptible *something*.

Next comes the question, "Is this imperceptible something intelligent or unintelligent? Does it act with apparent *knowledge*, with a seeming WILL of its own? In this respect do the phenomena exhibited differ from those produced by other physical forces?"

If it be so found, we conclude with reason that, whatever that "imperceptible something" may be—however constructed, however operating—it has a *real* existence—as real as is the perceptible matter it moves and controls.

The investigation of all this is the province of *Psychology*, whose business it is to explore the non-molecular, and therefore imperceptible, forces, or things that exercise force, by which organic or molecular structure is endowed with Life and motion and controlled by *Will* and *Intelligence*. The scientific process by which that knowledge is obtained is by noting the manifestations of those imperceptible existences (whatever they be), as exhibited in their action upon the molecular structure which alone our senses are constructed to perceive.

If there be in Man anything other than molecular structure—anything united to it or associated with that structure—we should look for its manifestations in that part of his Mechanism which appears to be most immediately employed in the operations of Intelligence. We



should not expect to find them in the stomach, whose duty is digestion; nor in the heart, whose business is pumping. The brain is the molecular organ from which Intelligence proceeds. That is undisputed. It is disputed only if there be anything behind the brain, of which the brain is merely the outward and visible sign, something which thinks and feels according to the impression made upon the brain. Is the brain (and the nerve system of which the brain is a part) merely molecular, or is it Soul materialised so far as is necessary for communication with the molecular world in which its present existence is to be passed? *Can it be that the molecular structure we see is the Soul that is the Man* materialized at its points of junction with the molecular world? This is a conjecture merely, but it may be deemed worthy of thought.

The solution of this problem will certainly be difficult and may be impossible. But some advance can confidently be made, and we may discover enough to give us assurance that we are not wholly material—that we are something more than the molecular structure that is palpable to the senses. Although it may not be given to us to learn what that *Something* is, its past or its future, we may reasonably hope to prove that it exists, and to elicit very considerable knowledge of its character, its functions, and the manner of its association with the molecular structure. If such knowledge be attainable, it must obviously be sought for in the Mechanism of Man where Consciousness, Intelligence, and visible molecular structure are so blended that the keenest investigators are at issue whether the “Intelligent Force” proceeds from the one or the other, and are doubtful if two structures are concerned in producing the indisputable manifestations, or one only.

Accepting this as the true work of *Psychology*, I have invited the Student to survey with me the manifestations of that Conscious Intelligence to which we have given the name of *Mind*, intending by this term to express in one word all the various faculties possessed and exercised by

the brain, and by that which, if Mind is not automatic, must direct and possess the brain.

But when organic functions are healthily performed there is no consciousness of action. Only when the brain is disordered, or the relationship between the brain and its intelligent director is disturbed, when the mechanism is out of gear and works irregularly, are we enabled to trace the hidden processes by which the machinery is moved. Hence the almost exclusive attention here given to the abnormal conditions of the mental mechanism.

Of these the first considered, because the most familiar, were *Sleep* and *Dream*.

In *Sleep* there is a suspension of the control of the Will over the brain, and therefore over the body, whose voluntary motions are directed by the brain. The Will itself is not suspended, but only its power to command. As the consequence of this, the organs of the various mental faculties are subject to be wakened and stimulated to action by slight accidental excitement, produced by impressions feebly brought by the senses from without, or by action self-generated within. The whole brain is rarely at rest at once. For the most part some organs are inert, possibly slumbering, while others are awake and active. As the brain-organs of the mental faculties are duplex, it must often occur that one of the pair is at rest and the other at work. It is this partial exercise of the brain that produces the remarkable phenomena of *dream*—its incongruities, its impossibilities, which, although at the moment of dreaming we believe to be real incidents of our existence, yet cause in us no emotion of surprise. We are not conscious of absurdity in anything we dream that we do or see. Still more strangely, the mind not only invents a drama thronged with impossibilities, but it paints also the scenery, moulds all the actors, and places in their mouths dialogues appropriate to their various characters. Nevertheless, it is the dreamer's mind that plays every part and gives to each of its creations fit words and actions. This work of creative genius is executed nightly, not by the intelligent only,



but by the most stupid and illiterate, who, when awake, are poor in idea as in speech, but who, when asleep and in dream, construct a continuous story, invent divers characters and sustain them all, however numerous, by giving to each his appropriate expression. To understand the wonder of this, think what you would say of a ploughboy who suddenly, and without effort, should extemporise a story similar to one of his own dreams, and introduce various personages and distinctly describe them, giving to each a special character, and placing in all mouths dialogues apt to the character of each, embodiments more perfect than ever dramatist or novelist has painted? Would you not deem him to be an *inspired* ploughboy? Probably, a Spiritualist would declare him to be possessed by a Spirit, and acting under Spirit control. Yet is this seeming miracle almost nightly performed by every one of us.

But the *unwilled* action of the brain in sleep is not without *consciousness*, although without Will. The brain imparts its impressions to the *Self* (or Soul) in dream as when awake. We really have the idea and feel the emotion; we do not merely dream that we see and feel. The imagination presents the picture, and the picture so presented evokes the same mental emotions as if it had been real. If in dream we have in our minds *ideal* images of objects of love, fear, hate, we have *real* emotions of liking, dreading, or detesting. We may conclude from this that in dream the various mental faculties are capable of very much more powerful development than they habitually exhibit when awake. It is not yet ascertained what are the impediments to the action of the waking mind that prevent the exhibition by the several faculties of the same capacity and power as are displayed by the sleeping mind; but it may be surmised to be due to some change in the relationship between the *Self* and the body, by reason of which some restriction upon brain action exists in sleep which does not exist when we are awake. In sleep, the mind works, not only without the repressive control of the Will, but also with little interference by the body. In

dream, our lives are *thoughts*. Waking, our lives are *acts*. Thought flows with incalculable rapidity; but action is restricted to the capacity of muscular movement, which, from its structure, is necessarily more slow than thought. Awake, every mental impression, before it is expressed in a bodily act, has to pass through the process of impressing the *Self*, kindling the Will, stimulating the nerve centre, transmitting the nerve force through the nerve cords and contracting the muscles. In sleep, the mental organ produces the thought or emotion instantaneously, and this is at once accepted by the mind as completed, although, in fact, the waking process of completion has never been performed. This speciality of dream explains also the extraordinary difference in the measure of time as perceived by the sleeping and the waking mind. The dreaming mind is released from the obligation, imposed upon it in the waking state, of adapting itself to the capacity of the body. It is not clogged by corporeal conditions and can work as freely as if the bodily action followed instantaneously the Soul action. Something also is doubtless due to the concentration of the nerve force upon the lessened number of waking faculties, instead of its being diffused over the whole mass of the brain, as in the waking state it is.

This, sketched in outline merely, being the condition of the organism in Sleep and Dream, what difference is exhibited in *Delirium*?

Delirium is a continuous dream—more vivid and more *real* to the mind of the patient. The Will appears to exercise a feeble power over the mind, and consequently the dream is less confused, incongruous, and impossible than is healthy dream. Consciousness continues unimpaired—that is to say, the patient perceives his dream as in sleep, and usually the memory of it remains after health has returned, and often more vividly than of any natural dream or even than the impressions of his actual waking life. The condition is that of cerebral depression and not of cerebral excitement.

*Insanity* is a waking dream. It is a disease of the



brain, dependent for its character upon the parts of the brain that are disordered, and for its degree upon the extent of the injury. Hence monomania (or partial Insanity). Insanity of the whole Mind is of rare occurrence, save in the latter stages of softening of the brain at the base of the two hemispheres, where all the organs of the mental faculties meet and consequently all become more or less involved in the mischief. This is the *physiology* of Insanity broadly viewed. Its *psychology* may be thus described. There is *Consciousness*; there is *Will*. So far the condition resembles the waking state. But the disordered faculties act abnormally, either in excess, and then the Will wants sufficient power to control them, or feebly, and then they are incompetent to perform their proper functions in the combinations of faculties requisite to intellectual processes. So it is with the organs of the *emotions*. Disorder of any one of these is shown in excessive or defective action, in causeless passions or depressions. In Insanity, ideas are mistaken for realities, the visions of the brain for impressions brought by the senses; in this resembling Dream. Or the mental faculties are abnormally enfeebled; and then they are incompetent to the performance of their duties and all mental operations dependent upon proper action of the organs fail to be properly performed. The Insane believe their waking illusions, precisely as when *we* are dreaming *we* believe our sleeping illusions. But the madman *acts* the dream he believes; the dreamer does not act his dream, he only *believes* that he is acting it. Dreaming, *we* are mentally in the same condition as is the madman awake. The Insane are mad waking and sleeping. The sane awake are mad in sleep; but the madness of sleep passes away on the instant of waking—the madness of Insanity is permanent as is the disease of the disordered faculties.

*Somnambulism* is another undisputed abnormal condition. It resembles sleep in external aspect. But it is not Sleep and its psychological state differs much from that of dream. In Somnambulism, whether occurring

naturally or produced artificially, the Will is entirely powerless and consciousness is wholly suspended. In Dream, consciousness is preserved and the Will is often exercised, but its power to control the body has ceased. Here we again find proof of the existence of the *Self*, as distinct from the body. *Will* is the expression of the *Conscious Self* (or Soul) normally acting only through the molecular organ by which it controls and directs the body. In dream, we *Will* often—perhaps as often as when we are waking; but we *Will* in vain, because sleep has for the time paralysed the organ through which the Will controls the structure. From this fact we learn that the Will is not a function of the molecular organism, but is exercised by *Something* other than that organism,—that *Something* which is not the body but which here is termed the *Self* or SOUL. In this condition of suspended Will, it is manifest that some change occurs in the relationship of the Conscious Self to the molecular mechanism. There is at some point more or less of severance between them. The Self ceases to communicate with, or to receive communications from, the external world through the mechanism of the body. In this state it appears to act to some extent independently of the body—that is to say, it *obtains perceptions of the external world either directly or through some other medium than the customary one of the senses*. The patient perceives objects though the sense is sealed. He sees without sight, hears without ears, and feels without the sense of touch. I use these terms because they are familiar; but the process is *not* that of sight, hearing, and touch. *It is a perception by the Self, without the aid of the senses, of objects which, in the normal condition of the organism, are perceptible only through the medium of those senses*. How this perception is obtained, or what is its nature, we know not: we know only the *fact*—that it exists. It is one of the problems which it is the proper province of Psychology to solve by observation of and experiment upon the facts and phenomena presented by it.



The brain, thus dissevered from the controlling Will of the patient, appears to be subject to the control of any other Will coming into a certain relationship with it. What this relationship is, how it is established, or by what process it operates, is as yet unknown. It has been commonly attributed to some equally unknown and unproved "magnetic" influence, supposed to be passing from the active organism of the operator to the passive brain of the Somnambule and so setting that passive brain in action, in obedience to the Will that has been thus substituted for its own. This importation of a "Magnetism," whose very existence is unproved (and which is certainly *not* the force known to Science by that name), for the purpose of explaining the phenomenon of Mind influencing Mind, appears to be as facile and convenient a substitute for research into the physical cause, as is the introduction of Spirits of the dead to solve the problems presented by the phenomena of Psychism. Is it not more reasonable, when investigating rare and strange facts, first to exhaust Nature and see if Science can find a natural solution for them? May it not more probably be that, instead of an animal magnetism passing from the operator, the passive brain of the patient is set in motion by the process of "mental sympathy and communion" already described; that is to say, motion of the molecules of one brain setting up a like action in the molecules of the other brain, the motion being transmitted either by the atmosphere, or by the ether in which, according to Professor TYNDALL, the atmosphere is diffused, or more probably by means of the *supra-gaseous* fluid in which molecules float—for the discovery of which Science is indebted to Mr. CROOKES, F.R.S.

The brain being thus passive to its own controlling Will and subject to direction by another Will, it follows that those of its faculties only will be called into action which that Will wakens. The faculties thus excited exhibit themselves in vastly greater power than in the normal condition of waking existence, when the whole brain is being exercised, because the nerve force which,

in waking life, is diffused throughout the whole brain, in the passive condition of Somnambulism is concentrated upon the few faculties that are active, and which therefore express themselves with a *power* and *exaltation* proportioned to the excess of nerve energy thus imparted to them. This explains the extraordinary *mental exaltation* that usually characterises Somnambulism and is *always* seen in the allied condition of Trance.

*Trance*, again, differs from *Dream* in this. In *Dream*, some of the organs of the mental faculties are slumbering more or less, and the communication between the Will and the nerve system is interrupted. We know that in *Dream* the body does not obey the commands of the Will. In *Somnambulism*, the communication between the Will and the body is usually suspended, as in *Dream*, and the Will is paralysed. In *Dream* there is mental consciousness and consequent recollection of the dream; in *Somnambulism* there is no present consciousness and no recollection in the waking state. In *Dream*, the impressions of a waking mind cannot be impressed upon the sleeping mind, at least there is no sufficient proof of such a condition, although there are phenomena that might suggest such a conclusion in certain conditions of the sleeper. In *Somnambulism*, which is imperfect *Trance*, the impressions (or motions) of a waking mind can by mental sympathy be readily impressed upon the patient's mind. In complete *Trance*, there is entire unconsciousness at the moment and no recollection when awakened; but the Will is active and powerful. The patient dreams and acts his dream; he has a memory of that dream, but it can be recollected only when the condition of *Trance* recurs. In *Somnambulism* and *Trance* alike, though there is no *recollection*, when the patient wakes, of mental impressions received, or of any bodily action done, during the state of seeming slumber—it is certain that, when the condition recurs, the recollection of all that passed during all former like conditions returns also, but there is entire unconsciousness of all the memories of waking life. In *all* of these



abnormal conditions there is *memory*. But there is no *recollection*, unless the same conditions recur under which the impressions were made upon the memory.

What, then, are the *Psychological* conditions of these mental states, so nearly allied and yet presenting such different aspects?

In *Dream*, there is a *very partial* dislocation between the sleeping body and the *Intelligent Something* that governs it. The Will—which is the expression of that “*Something*” upon the organism—cannot in dream command the actions of the brain or of the body. Some link of communication between them, by which they work in concert in the normal condition of the mechanism, is suspended or severed.

In *Somnambulism*, there is yet a *further dislocation* between that “*Intelligent Something*” and the body. The Will is not only unable to command the mechanism—it is so far disconnected from the mechanism that it is itself suspended.

In *Trance*, this “*Intelligent Something*” exhibits what appears to be a *further dislocation* of alliance with the body, for in this condition the Intelligence possesses a conscious existence of its own, having its own memory and a manifest power of perception through some other medium than the senses. In complete Trance, the Will is awake, active, and controls *the body*; but the Mind receives no impressions, nor sensations, nor intelligence, through the body. Nevertheless, it has powers of perception extending far beyond the range of the bodily senses. The reasonable conclusion from these conditions of Trance is, that it is a state of the Mechanism of Man in which, by some as yet unexamined physical process, there is extensive dislocation of the normal relationship between the *Intelligent something* we call “*Soul*” and the body, by reason of which the “*Intelligent Something* that is not the body” is enabled to exercise some of its functions without the interposition of the body, which, in their normal relationship, is the only medium through which the *Conscious Self* can hold

communication with the external world. What that changed relationship is, how it is caused, how it works, and what are its consequences, are subjects of most profound interest for mankind, and will command the investigations of the Psychology of the future, devoted, as it must be, to observation and experience instead of abstractions.

But the phenomenon is of vast value, as supplying further cogent evidence that the Mechanism of Man is constructed of an *Intelligent Something* other than the body, and that *these are distinct entities*. It does not demonstrate, but it raises a strong probability, that this "Intelligent Something" is immortal, by the *proofs* it presents that, even in this life, that *Conscious Self* and body can, in certain conditions of the mechanism, be partially severed and preserve a more or less distinct existence.

*Psychic Force* we know only by its *manifestations*, precisely as we know *Magnetic Force* and the Force of *Gravitation*. Perhaps we can approach nearer to a knowledge of *Psychic Force* than of these physical forces, because we know that it proceeds from a living human body, and therefore we are enabled to give to it closer and more extensive study, and to question it by repeated experiment and test. Considering that *Psychic* (or *Soul*) Force has been recognised for only a few years, and that the other Forces have been known and investigated for centuries, extraordinary progress has certainly been made in knowledge of it. Great light has been thrown upon its source and upon the manner of its operation, through the *Psychic* conditions exhibited in the various abnormal states of the organism to which this volume has been devoted. It is, in fact, *Soul Force*. It may or may not be identical with *Vital Force*, or *Nerve Force*, if indeed these be not one force; but it is a force that comes from the *Conscious Self* (or *Soul*) because it is controlled and directed by the *Conscious Self*, which the nerve and vital forces are not. *Psychic Force*, as Psychology contends, is a force independent of the organism—the



producer and not the product of molecular structure, and, as I have ventured to suggest, moulding and making the molecular mechanism. But whether it be a force controlling structure, or a force produced by structure, and whether we call it *Psychic Force*, *Nerve Force*, or *Vital Force*, it cannot be seriously questioned by any Physiologist that such a Force exists. I have called it *Psychic Force*, as being a convenient name by which to signify a *something* as to whose existence there is substantial agreement, but about the origin, nature, and operations of which there is much disagreement. A vast amount of evidence has been already accumulated, proving the manifestations of *Psychic Force*. We see visible motions and hear audible sounds produced by some imperceptible force operating within a certain distance beyond the muscular action of a human being having a special constitution. We reasonably conclude, therefore, that the agent by which these effects are produced is something (as imperceptible to our senses as is the magnetic force) passing from the body of that person to the things so affected. It is not the only instance in nature of motion without contact and "action at a distance." The like phenomenon is familiar to us in the magnet, which has been investigated for many years, and still we are ignorant what is the *imperceptible something* passing between the steel and the magnet that causes the untouched thing to move; but we do not therefore question the existence of that "something." So, seeing things moved without contact, and "action at a distance" exhibited, in the neighbourhood of a person of a special physical constitution, we conclude the motion to be due to something connected with that person, and we further conclude that a force flows from him by which it is caused, in some such manner as the force that flows from the magnet. And it is almost equally obscure.

But in the case of the *Psychic Force* there is a fact that may help to throw some light upon the manner of its

action. We have seen above how, in those abnormal conditions of Dream, Somnambulism and Trance, there appears to be a progressive dislocation of the normal relationship between the body and the "Intelligent Something other than the body" that constitutes the individual Man. All the phenomena exhibited in each of these abnormal conditions are referrible to, and may be explained by, such a condition of the organism. There is in all of them a manifest disturbance of the normal relationship of the Conscious Self (or Soul) and the body. In *Dream*, the Self loses its command of the body. In *Somnambulism*, the Self loses consciousness of the doings of the body, and the control of the Will over the body is so paralysed that the brain can be subjected to the Will of a stranger. In *Trance*, the severance of the links between the Self and the body is so far extended, that the Self can, to a certain degree, act without the body, that is to say, it can obtain perceptions directly without the interposition of the bodily senses; it can live a perfect life of its own, having even a memory of its own which is not restored with the restoration of the normal condition of relationship to the body. But the Self must have some force of its own wherewith to control the body. That is the force intended to be designated by the term *Psychic Force*—that is to say, *the force which the Self (or Soul) possesses*—which, if there be a Conscious Self, it *must* possess—which, in the normal state of its alliance with the body, operates evenly and regularly upon the entire organism, through the medium of the nerve system, the proper channel for its expression. Hence that force is not perceptible save in the smooth, healthful, and harmonious action of the whole structure. But when a disturbance of the organism occurs, this *Psychic* (or Soul) *Force*, like all the other natural forces, exhibits itself in *irregular* action, in excess in some parts, in deficiency in other parts. By the disturbances thus caused in all molecular structure within its range, phenomena are presented that startle us by their strangeness and their apparent inconsistency with the



natural (by which we mean only the *customary* or *normal*) course of things. Moreover, when there is such a dissolution of the normal relationship between the Soul and the body, the *Psychic* (or Soul) *Force*, instead of flowing through its proper channels, passes out of its bounds and manifests itself in *direct* action upon the external world, without the intermediate mechanism of the nerves, and consequently without the restrictions imposed upon its action by the conditions of that molecular mechanism. This is precisely what we witness with the other natural forces. The electric force which, when disturbed on its way, can rend an oak, is the same that speeds through our structures every moment of our lives, not harmless merely, but maintaining us in health and vigour. So it is with the *Psychic Force*. In its usual passage through a healthy organism, it moves so equally that its presence is unperceived. But if disturbed by abnormal conditions of that organism, it may, and *does*, equally with the disturbed electric force, exhibit its presence with a power, in a direction and to an extent that appears to us anomalous and strange. May it not reasonably and probably be that it is this *Psychic Force* which, in the normal state of the organism, we do not notice because its action is familiar and equable, but which when its presence is manifested by the happening of those partial disturbances of the normal relationship between the Conscious Self and the body attending Dream, Somnambulism, Trance, and Psychism, exhibits itself in abnormal action? May not Psychics be persons in whom this dislocation of the normal relationship of the Self and body is not only more extensive but more readily induced? In Trance, the mind is proved by countless experiments to perceive without the medium of the bodily senses. In this condition, may not the Soul also possess power to direct the action of its own force, without that intervention of the body which is requisite to its action in the normal state—and may not *this* be the answer to the question, not unreasonably put to us, “*What* is your *Psychic*

Force? *How* can it move matter, and *how* is it directed by Intelligence?" The answer in such case would be: "*Psychic Force* is the Self (or Soul) force. The *Psychic* is a person in whom there is an abnormal capacity for dislocation of the normal relationship of the Self (or Soul) and the body. In such a condition, the *Psychic* (or Soul) Force ceasing to flow through its usual channels manifests itself without them, as do the physical forces, in disturbing effects upon molecular structure. *Psychic Force* is imponderable—that is to say, like the electric and magnetic forces, it is not subject to the law of gravitation;—it penetrates and permeates molecular matter and, being imponderable, it neutralises in molecular matter the force of gravity. It is directed by Intelligence—but that is the Intelligence of *the Self* from which the force flows. The Self (or Soul), in the normal state of its connection with the body, can direct its *Psychic* (or Soul) force only through the agency of the brain and body, and to the extent only of the capacities of *their* structure. But, in the abnormal state of dislocation of that relationship as occurring in Psychism, the Soul can direct its own force immediately, without the agency of the body. Hence the phenomena we witness; hence its exhibitions of intelligence; hence the necessity for a *Psychic*.

This explains why a *Psychic* is *developed* by practice. Exercise makes this dislocation between the Soul and the body more easy and probably more extensive. Practice also improves the control of the Intelligence over the force. So it is with mind and body in the normal state of their relationship. Practice facilitates the obedience of the body to the Mind and increases the range of action in both. Thus we learn also why it is that, in Trance, the phenomena of Psychism are so especially powerful. In Trance, as we have seen, the dislocation between the normal relationship of *the Self* and the body is much more extensive than in any other known condition, and consequently the *psychic* action of the Self is then more free and untrammelled and less subject to be



limited in power or capacity by the restrictive conditions imposed by the structure of the mechanism.

*Unconscious Cerebration* explains perfectly so many of the hitherto inexplicable psychical phenomena that too much attention cannot be given to it by the Student. It is chiefly, perhaps wholly, the consequence of the duplex structure of the brain. It is because we have, in fact, *two brains and two organs of each mental faculty*, one of which can work while the other is at rest, that the Mind so often acts without our consciousness. But for the full exposition of this phenomenon the reader is referred to the chapter devoted to it.

Assuming the phenomena of *Psychism* to be real—that there is an unknown force directed by some Intelligence, but that this force can be exhibited only when a person of some peculiar organisation is present—the Psychologist is compelled to a choice between the following conclusions. Either :

1. The Intelligence is that of the Psychic.
2. Or, it is that of one or more of the persons present.
3. Or, it is that of some other being imperceptible to us. And, if so, it must be :

- (1) The disembodied Soul of a dead human being ; or,
- (2) Some intelligent creature inhabiting or visiting this earth, imperceptible to our senses, and whose presence we can know only by inference from its actions ; or it is

- (3) The Soul (or Conscious Self) of the Psychic.

The Spiritualists solve the problem easily enough by attributing all the phenomena to Spirits of the dead.

The reasons for dissenting from this conclusion are set forth at length in a previous chapter (*ante*, p. 384.) There is no satisfactory *evidence* bearing out such a contention. There is an overwhelming weight of evidence to *negative* it.

The possibility that this world is inhabited by a race of beings, not perceptible to our senses, inferior to ourselves in intelligence, and of whose existence we are ignorant, save under certain rare conditions, cannot

of course be positively denied, and such an hypothesis would sufficiently explain all the phenomena. But the existence of such beings is a pure conjecture. There is no *proof* whatever of their presence, other than the phenomena they are invoked to explain. This hypothesis might be admitted to controversy if we were driven to conjecture, in the absence of any other apparent and obvious cause. But we are not in such stress. There is another to which all the facts directly point, namely :

The *Intelligence of the Psychic*, whose presence is the one thing absolutely essential to the production of the phenomena, all of whose manifestations are plainly stamped with the characteristics of *his* Intelligence.

It is not necessary to repeat them. They have been already described at length.

I now close this *summing up* of the argument, inviting the reader to form his own judgment upon it. I do not ask him to accept all the conclusions to which I have come, but only to keep his mind open to *evidence*, and to enter upon the investigation of the magnificent Science of Psychology without prejudice or prepossession, with resolve to strive after THE TRUTH, THE WHOLE TRUTH, AND NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH.

---



## CHAPTER II.

## CONCLUSIONS.

THE Reader who has followed attentively the series of mental phenomena described in this volume, beginning with *Dream*—as the most frequent and familiar of them—and advancing step by step to the most rare and remarkable, as exhibited in *Trance*, will have observed that all of them have a very marked relationship; that, in fact, they are continuous developments, under varied circumstances, of a peculiar relative condition of the parts of the human mechanism. All appear to be *dislocations*, more or less, of the normal relationship of Soul and body—or, if the name be preferred—Mind and body. In *Dream*, the Will is paralysed, or, at least, its control over the brain as the organ of the mind and over the nerves of motion is for the time suspended, although self-consciousness continues. In *Delirium* there is the state of *Dream*, with inability to shake it off and instantly to start into waking consciousness, as in health. *Insanity* is excitement of some of the material organs of the Mind beyond the power of the Will to restrain them, or their depression below capacity for performance of their functions and, as the consequence, brain-bred ideas are so vivid as to be mistaken for external realities or the emotions are excited beyond the power of control.

In *Somnambulism*, the temporary dislocation of the relationship between the mental machine and the controlling Intelligence is still further extended. Not only is the *Will* paralysed, but *consciousness* is lost. Not only is the communication between the Will and the body

suspended, as in Dream, where the brain continues to work while the Self is unable to regulate its working, but in Somnambulism the brain itself appears to be passive to all influences from within and to be moved only by some influence brought to bear upon it from without. In this condition of further dislocation between the Self and the body, the Self is not only unable to communicate with the molecular world and be communicated with through its usual medium, the mechanism of the body, but, so long as this dislocation and severance from the usual channel of communication continues, the Self (or Soul) is manifestly enabled to receive impressions from the external world and obtain perceptions of it by some process other than that by which its perceptions are procured in the normal conditions of the mechanism. *It has, in fact, power to perceive directly, without the interposition of the bodily senses.*

In *Trance*, the dislocation has advanced another stage, with very singular consequences. The communication between the Soul and the external world, by means of the bodily structure, is in *Trance* *wholly* suspended. Sensation ceases. Consciousness is lost. The brain dreams. The dream is *acted*. But the Soul—by which I mean the individual “Ego”—then not only obtains perceptions by some other process than through the medium of the senses, but it appears to be enabled to project its *Psychic* (or *Soul*) *Force* beyond the body, and to influence by it external matter to a limited but not yet defined extent, precisely as do the physical forces.

*Psychism* is another form of the same state under different circumstances. It is a further dislocation of the normal relationship between the Self and the body, in which condition the Self, partially released from the trammels of the molecular body, is enabled, first, to receive impressions from without *directly*, or at least through some other medium than the brain and the senses, and, secondly, to exercise its *Psychic* (or *Soul*) force upon molecular matter directly, without the interposition



of the apparatus of the nerves, through which alone, in a perfectly normal and healthy condition of the organism, it is able to express itself upon the external world. Thus probably the Psychic obtains impressions on his mind of impressions then existing in the minds of persons who come within the influence of his *Psychic* (or Soul) force. Thus it is that motion is caused in molecular substances to which his *Psychic* Force is applied; and thus it is that his Conscious Self (or Soul) directs the operations of the Force. He has no consciousness of what his mind is doing, because the condition of Psychism, like those of Somnambulism and Trance, is a condition in which consciousness is partially suspended, by reason of the dislocation between the molecular organs and the Self, which are acting with partial independence of one another, aided also by the process described as *Unconscious Cerebration*. Hence, with the cessation of the abnormal condition and the resumption of the normal relationship between the Conscious Self and its molecular organ, the brain, there is no recollection of what occurred during the abnormal condition. Hence, also, the *recollection* of the incidents of previous like states, when the same conditions are afterwards resumed.

That this may be somewhat more intelligible to the reader I resort to a rude illustration. A musical box makes music by means of the striking of tongues of metal by small points of steel fixed upon a revolving barrel. So long as the barrel continues to revolve in the same groove the same tongues are successively struck by the same points, and the same tune continues to be played. Shift the barrel but a little, the tongues remaining stationary, and there is silence where there should be sound and discord where harmony should be. Shifted to another groove, another series of points being presented, the tongues are smitten in a different order and another tune is played. Thus it may be with three, ten, twenty, or any number of tunes for which the instrument is constructed. Restore the barrel to its first groove, the former relationship between the tongues and the points being then restored,

the tune first played will be repeated precisely as before.

This will convey some rude notion of what I intend when I speak of the *dislocation* of the relationship between the Conscious Self and the body, as exhibited in the allied conditions of *Dream*, *Somnambulism*, *Trance*, and *Psychism*. In the normal state of the organism, the Self and its molecular organ, the brain, are so nicely adjusted that they perform their functions without any jarring. But if this relationship be disturbed, the action is inharmonious, the impressions are wrongly received or not received at all, the right note is not struck, and no sound, or a wrong sound, follows. When the normal action revives and the disturbed relationship of the Self with the body is restored, it is as when the barrel of the musical box is placed again in its proper groove and the same tune is reproduced as if its course had never been broken.

If Man is not merely a molecular structure; if there be in him an *Intelligent Something* that is not the body, (although held with it in intimate alliance and co-ordination) a definite and distinct entity, subject to such a dislocation of its normal relationship to the molecular mechanism that they can, in certain abnormal conditions conduct independent action (as appears to be established by the various phenomena we have been reviewing) the very strongest presumption is raised that this *Conscious* and *Intelligent Something*, which, though intimately allied with the body is *not* of the body, does not perish with the body, but *continues* its independent existence after the molecular body has been resolved into its elements.

If in those abnormal conditions of its relationship to the body, the entity we call *the Self* (or *Soul*) reveals powers and capacities far exceeding those it can display when its communications are limited by the capacity of the molecular mechanism through which alone it can act and be acted upon in the normal condition, we can conceive what those capacities may be when that condition is changed and the Self, parted from



the molecular structure, is consequently enabled to act and be acted upon without the interposition of a slow moving mechanism, made of molecules, whose most rapid motions, compared with the activity of *the Self*, is as that of the minute hand of the clock to the speed of the lightning's flash. We may form some dim notion what must be the powers and capacities of the *Self* when wholly disembodied. Whatever it *believes* that it can do when there is a partial severance in *Dream* and *Somnambulism*—whatever it shows itself to be actually *doing* in the greater dislocation of *Trance* and *Psychism*—that and infinitely more it will be enabled to do when the severance is complete.

To this conclusion we are brought by fair reasoning, based upon the evidence of a vast body of *facts* carefully noted by competent observers. It is a strictly scientific process of proof, alone permissible in a treatise designed to investigate what Psychology has already learned, as well as to indicate the directions in which knowledge is as yet scanty, in hope that inquiry may be directed thither. Authority has been purposely excluded. So also has evidence of the universal belief of the whole human race, from the earliest time, as shown by Mr. TYLER in the chapter on "Animism" in his admirable treatise on "Primitive Culture." At the close of a purely scientific investigation, it is, however, satisfactory to find that the results at which we have arrived are in entire accordance with the teachings of every religion and the firm beliefs of all climes and times. Indeed, in such substantial agreement are they that it has almost the character of an *instinct*, and experience shows that those untaught impressions and unmotivated actions we call *instincts* are *true*—that is to say, there is always an object, corresponding to the instinct, on which that instinct is designed to operate.

It may now, I trust, be taken as a *strong presumption* amounting almost to *proof*, that, "WE" are SOULS, of whom the body is the molecular mechanism for communication with the world of molecular structure in which the present stage of existence is passed, and that when

this machine falls to pieces the Soul survives—a living thing—constructed of some other combination of atoms than the molecular one.

But the question remains, the problem is still unsolved, does *the Self* (or Soul) preserve its individuality, its personality, its identity, when it is severed from the body? In its new stage of existence, has it a memory of the past, or, with the severance of the link that bound it to the molecular world, does it sever entirely its communication with that world?

The existence of *the Self* (or Soul) after the death of the body by no means implies that it should retain a memory of the past, or preserve its past sense of identity. The answer to this grave question will much depend upon what *memory* is. If memory be an action of the brain merely, the probability will be rather that memory and recollection die with the body. But if memory be an operation of the Conscious Self, the conclusion is almost inevitable that it survives with that Self. And if Memory survives, so must *identity* and *personality* attach to the disembodied Soul.

The reasons for holding *Memory* to be a faculty of the Self (or Soul), and not of the molecular brain merely, may be stated in few words.

If memory be a function of the brain, it is an action of the brain. All brain action is molecular motion. The mental condition we term “a thought” or “an emotion” is, in the normal state of the mechanism, attended by some motion of the molecules of a certain part of the brain. Memory is said by Physiologists to be merely a power possessed by the brain to reproduce certain motions of the molecules in the same order of succession in which they had been previously produced. When we see a book, for instance, the *physical* act of perception is produced by some molecules of the brain moving and placing themselves in a special relative position, which action of the brain impresses upon the mind the sensation we call “a book.” This sensation was preceded or followed by other impressions causing other sensations. When any one of these



associated sensations recurs, the renewal of that position by the molecules of the brain causes the renewal also in like succession of the motions and impressions formerly associated. This process of renewal of past molecular conditions is the physical (not the *Psychic*) process of Memory. But the voluntary act of such revival is by exercise of the faculty of *Recollection*, which is often confused with *Memory*. Many things are impressed upon the *memory* which nevertheless we are unable to *recal*. Whatever molecular condition at any time takes place in the brain is doubtless capable of being reproduced—in common speech, is “in the Memory.” But it depends upon the recurrence of some of the links of association when, or if ever, they shall be *recalled*.

This is the *physical* process of memory. The *psychic* process is more obscure. Probably it is effected thus. The Conscious Self takes cognizance of the action of the brain, and these molecular motions either excite or suggest ideas and emotions to the Conscious Self.

Now, seeing that the material structure of the brain is subject to continual change, not in the molecules only of which it is formed, but also by growth and development, and that no particle of the molecular substance of the brain of the child remains in the grown man, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to conceive how the countless millions of impressions made during a lifetime can be so preserved and marshalled upon this everchanging structure that all those infinite multitude of motions shall be capable of being reproduced by the new and wholly changed substance when the requisite associations are set up. This is more difficult to assert than even the doctrine of the Materialists, that the brain is the ultimate recipient of the impressions made upon it, and the sole *conscious* being to which those molecular motions are ideas and sentiments. The likening of Memory to a series of impossible mental pictures stored up in some impossible places in the skull, laid one over the other like so many photographs and from which Memory selects any one it wants at the moment, (which is the popular

notion of Memory) will be dissipated by very slight reflection upon the physical process. But, although it is so difficult to associate the existence of *Memory* and *Recollection* with any conceivable *physical* condition, the difficulty disappears if we import into the Mechanism of Man that which the phenomena we have been viewing appear almost to demonstrate—the existence of a non-molecular *Conscious Self* (or Soul), allied to the molecular body, which receives the impressions made upon the molecules of the brain, to which *Self* (or Soul) it is that the *sensations* belong, which possesses the *thoughts* and the *feelings*, which is the true seat of *Memory* and of that consciousness of *individuality* which is the consequence of Memory, and which employs the brain merely as the machine through which it receives its impressions. Such a mechanism explains also how it is that, when the brain is injured or enfeebled, the power of memory is destroyed or weakened and the capacity for recollection lost. The impressions, being received but imperfectly by the brain, are conveyed but imperfectly to the *Self* (or Soul). *Recollection*, which is a brain process, is revived but imperfectly through the agency of such a brain, because the power of association is enfeebled by the incapacity of that brain. But, released from the condition of receiving its impressions through the molecular brain and of recollecting through the brain-process of association, the *Self* (or Soul) would not only *perceive* all its memories at once, but the *recollection* of them would be regulated by some other process. Thus also would the conception of *time* by the *Self* (or Soul), now determined by the slow *succession* of brain impressions and recollections, be changed entirely in accordance with the infinitely greater rapidity of action, *insomuch that it might conceivably have no perception of time at all—the entire series of memories being present together.*

If *Memory* be something more than a condition of the molecular brain (and it is difficult not to conceive it to be something more) then we have further evidence of the existence of a *Conscious Self* (or Soul) ; and not of its



existence only, but of its capacity for a separate existence, and, above all, *proof*, almost amounting to demonstration, that if there be a Self (or Soul) and it survives the body, it preserves its *Individuality* because it possesses Memory.

But the Materialists ask, why we deem it to be necessary to plunge into Psychical Science, and hazard conjectures, and resort to difficult argument, to establish the future existence of the individual *Self* (or Soul) after the death of the body, when the fact, if it be a fact, could be proved by indisputable *evidence*, which ought to be forthcoming if there be truth in our assertion. "If," they say, "the Soul of one dead human being has ever appeared to any person, in any country, at any time, the existence of the *Self* (or Soul) after death will be conclusively established beyond all future controversy. Bring us a ghost, or conclusive proof of a ghost, or presumptive proof of fifty ghosts, and we confess ourselves conquered."

The issue thus raised is not unfair, nor unreasonable, and the decision of it ought not to be difficult. It is a question of *fact*, not a matter for argument. We may not waste time and toil in fruitless discussion whether ghosts can or cannot be. The single question permissible to Science is "*Are they?*" This is to be determined by *evidence* only—precisely as we should adjudicate on any other asserted fact.

The strange feature of this controversy is the combination of quantity with worthlessness in the *evidence* produced. There are few facts in Nature upon which there is such a universal concurrence of testimony. Ghost-seers and ghost believers are found among all peoples, of all ages and climes, equally among the civilised and the savage, the ancient and the modern. *Animism*, as Mr. TYLER so aptly terms this universal creed, has been an almost instinctive faith that preceded and produced, and did not, in his judgment, follow, the recognition of religion. There is no known religion, however rude or however advanced, which has not for its foremost article of faith, if not at its very foundation,

not merely the *existence* of Spirit, but the *reappearance* of the Spirits of the dead. It is not the Christian creed only, it is that of Buddhism and of Mahomedanism. All who believe the Bible must believe in ghosts, for it is full of them. Passing from peoples to individuals, the literature of every land teems with references to ghosts, which could not be made unless they appealed in some way to a popular belief. There is not a village that has not its ghost stories. There is not a family without some ghostly tradition. You cannot sit by a Christmas fire with half a dozen neighbours and moot the subject, without as many ghost stories being told and heard with half credulous, half doubting ears, by those who express disbelief. The most sceptical of us has in his inmost soul a lurking sense of semi-credulity which makes him, in spite of reason, feel not quite at ease in ghostly places; and many a man, who would face an army without flinching, would walk with unconquerable fear and shuddering through a lonely place reported to be haunted by a ghost. It was the remembrance of this unusual concurrence of opinion among all mankind that led Dr. Johnson to the often quoted assertion, that the evidence for the existence of ghosts is stronger than that for any event in history. Instead of a mental effort to *believe*, it demands the strongest exercise of the reason *not* to believe, and the instinctive creed often remains to influence the *feelings* long after the *judgment* is satisfied by argument that ghosts *are not* because they *cannot* be.

Still the reflection returns that upon this question depends a far more important one—the separate existence of *the Self* (or Soul) and its survival of the body. True, that the Self may exist and survive without the capacity to make itself visible to mortals. But if it can be demonstrated, by *positive* evidence, that *any one Soul of any one dead person* has at *any time* or *anywhere* presented itself to mortal eye, the whole controversy that has troubled preachers and philosophers, and upon which materialists and psychologists are contending, would be



settled at once and for ever. The being and future existence of the Soul would be *proved*.

Wherefore has this *not* been done? Why do not the disputants, dropping their worthless weapons and forgetting their endless arguments as to what *may* be or *may not* be, apply themselves, with the same perseverance as has been devoted to the investigation of other facts in Nature, to the settlement, *by evidence*, of the question, "Ghost or no ghost?" Is there such positive *proof* in any one case as would justify the assertion that a ghost *has been*, therefore that Soul *is*, and that Soul survives the body, preserving its individuality and identity?

For my own part I have sought in vain for an *authentic* ghost. I have searched books, I have examined living witnesses, but I can find no *unexceptionable* testimony. The evidence always breaks down somewhere. In the vast majority of the reported cases the alleged ghost was seen but by one person at the same instant of time, and, for the reasons already stated, such evidence is wholly worthless. Where two or more have testified to an appearance, there were discrepancies in description, and in no instance was there assurance that the necessary inquiry had been made at the moment of perception, so as to preclude the very probable solution of an exclamation by one suggesting the idea to the other. I have read with the greatest interest the two works by the Hon. DALE OWEN, (a) who has made so large a collection of "ghost" cases and taken so much pains to authenticate them, and yet I cannot place my finger upon one which in a court of justice would bear the scrutiny of judicial investigation. I have applied to living persons who are said to have seen a "ghost," but the greater portion of them, being pressed, confessed that the story came to them from some other person, and, we may be

---

(a) "*Footfalls on the Boundary of another World*," and "*The Debateable Land between this World and the Next*." London, Trübner and Co.

sure, lost nothing in the passage. The few who had personally seen broke down upon a few questions in the nature of cross-examination. Always there was something wanting to make authenticity perfect.

"Ghosts," therefore, must be deemed at present to be *problematical*.

And this difficulty in proof of but one of the reported thousands of cases goes far to confirm the argument here maintained, that, although, in experiments in Psychism, many of the acts are done and appearances presented which are reputed to attend supposed Spirits of the dead, the agents there seen are *not* Spirits of the dead, but some other agents by whom those very unspiritual performances are enacted.

In default of such *positive proof* as the re-appearance of one dead person would give us, and which alone would preclude all further controversy and determine for ever the question of a future existence for man *scientifically*, as it is declared theologically, Science must ask, what are the presumptions reasonably raised by the undisputed facts? Reviewing those collected in the preceding pages of this volume, and the multitude from which they are but a selected fragment, surely the most sceptical Materialist will not deny that there is cogent, if not conclusive, *evidence* that the Mechanism of Man is constructed of an exquisitely designed molecular machine, possessed and directed by an *Intelligence* that is something other than the Mechanism so controlled, and which "Intelligent Something" is here called *the Self* (or Soul);—that this Soul, in the normal conditions of relationship with the body, communicates and is communicated with only through the molecular mechanism of the body; that in certain abnormal conditions this Self (or Soul) is enabled to make and receive communications otherwise than through the medium of the bodily organs; that the Self (or Soul), being structured of material other than that of the body and capable of partial action without the body is not likely to perish with the body, because none of the causes of bodily decay attach to it; that if it survives



the body, having its faculties released from the restraints imposed upon them by the bodily conditions, the emancipated Self (or Soul) must enter upon a new existence with vastly extended capacities, necessarily consequent upon its non-molecular structure, that its progress from world-life to a larger life implies continual progress in accordance with the principle of evolution, and that life after death has an existence without an end, but through endless changes of being.

And an unending life is strictly in accordance with all the teachings of Science. The Materialists themselves proclaim it: "There is no death," they say; "nothing perishes. It is a change of form, not a change of being. The life departs from us. The organic laws lose their power over the structure they have builded. The chemical laws resume the power that had been for a time suspended by the greater power of the organic laws. The particles, which the organic force had attracted and moulded into shapes of flesh and bone, separate and seek other combinations, according to their affinities. We mingle thus with the earth and with the air. We pass into new shapes. We wave in the grass; we smile in the flower. We enter into other animal forms; we pour through new veins, quickening new hearts. Not one solitary atom of us perishes. We are eternal, in the sense that the material of which we are made is imperishable. We shall live again in *some* shape, in the course of the great cycles of the ages; but in the combination that constituted the being that you are or that I am—*never*."

To this Psychology answers, "You are right if 'you' and 'I' are merely the bodies we see. Our bodies *will* die, and be dissipated, and enter into the composition of minerals and gases, and be absorbed by vegetables, and assimilated by animals, and go to form the *bodies* of other men. If there be only body, your history of us is true. But if there be in Nature something that is not molecular matter, something of other than molecular structure that has *Intelligence*, the something we call *the Self* (or Soul), in *that* we shall find the Intelligence which undoubtedly

possesses and controls the body, and which is so difficult to conjecture as being the product of the body itself. When the body is dissipated, what becomes of this Self (or Soul)? If the body does not perish, it is still less likely that this Self should perish. But if it survives the body—where?—how? The question admits but of two solutions. Either the Self preserves its individuality,—and thus there is the future existence for which I am contending,—or it is absorbed in the great ocean of Soul—if the expression may be allowed—which in such case must be, and from which new shapes of Soul are for ever being individualised.” The phenomena described in this volume will doubtless be accepted by the reader as *strong presumptive evidence*, to say the least of it, that the condition of a continued individual existence for the Conscious Self (or Soul) is the most probable.

To pursue the Science of Psychology successfully, it is necessary, by a great effort, to make clear to the mind the conceptions of *Time* and *Space* as being only the conditions under which the mind, acting through a material brain, is compelled to think, and to conceive of *Soul Existence* as exempt from those conditions. Something of this may be seen in the phenomena of Dream, where the events of a month are crowded into a minute and thoughts pass from place to place without perception of intermediate distance. We are accustomed to speak of the Divinity as being omnipresent, as having no time and no space. Has the reader ever attempted to conceive such a condition? The ready answer will be that it is inconceivable. But it is not altogether so. A dim notion of it may be obtained by a grand conception put forth by an anonymous writer some time ago, then reported as the work of BABBAGE, (a) a brief sketch of which will

---

(a) *The Stars and the Earth; or Thoughts upon Space, Time, and Eternity*. Seventh Edition. London, Bailliere, 1862. It is, I believe, the production of M. Flammarion, the great French Astronomer.



worthily conclude this very imperfect endeavour to inform the Student of Psychology what a vast world of the most magnificent knowledge lies before him, the exploration of which will certainly reward him with an untold wealth of thought, with a new and enlarged interest in Man, in NATURE, and in GOD, and with a confidence, founded upon *evidence*, that for him there is no Death, but only a passing away from one life to another.

Light travels 213,000 miles in a second of time. We do not see the Moon for a second and a quarter, nor the Sun for eight minutes after it has actually risen. The ray from Jupiter comes to us in fifty-two minutes; from Uranus in two hours. The light of the nearest fixed star travels for three years before it reaches our eyes. The light from Vega, in the Lyre, has a journey of twelve years. The ray we see from a star of the second magnitude has taken twenty years to reach us; from a star of the third magnitude, thirty years; from a star of the fifth magnitude, sixty-six years; from a star of the sixth magnitude, ninety-six years; from a star of the seventh magnitude, one hundred and eighty years; and from a star of the twelfth magnitude, the smallest visible through a powerful telescope, four thousand years. Hence, we see the stars, not as they are, but as they *were* at the time when the rays that at this moment strike our eyes first quitted them. Consequently, a star may have been extinct for a period longer than the Christian era and yet be visible to us now.

As we see a certain star, say Vega, as it was nine years and a quarter ago, an observer on Vega would see our earth as it appeared *then*. An observer from a star of the twelfth magnitude would, at this moment, see our earth, not as it is now, but as it *was* four thousand years ago, when Memphis was founded and Abraham was wandering upon its surface.

A clear conception of these facts will enable us to form some conception of that which to most minds is merely a vague expression, without anything like a definite

notion attached to the words OMNIPRESENCE and OMNISCIENCE.

Imagine a Being possessed only of superior human powers, that is to say, with a sense of sight infinitely extended. Let him be situated at some point in space, at which the reflected light from the earth is arriving. He would see what was passing upon the earth at the time when that ray left its surface. If at the Sun, he would see the events that occurred here eight minutes before. If at Vega, the events of twelve years before. If at the star of the sixth magnitude, what occurred ninety-six years ago ; and, if at a star of the twelfth magnitude, the occurrences of four thousand years before.

Inasmuch as space is boundless, the rays transmitted to it move on for ever. Hence, there is no incident, however trifling, that ever has been, that does not exist at some point in space, and an Intelligence located at that point would see it as a thing present, although it actually occurred thousands,—nay, millions,—of years before.

A Being omnipresent in space must therefore be *Omniscient*. He must perceive all that has been and all the past must be present to him.

*Omnipresence* and *Omniscience* are identical.

And inasmuch as that which has occurred in this earth, or in any other of the worlds, is always visible somewhere in space—as, for instance, an event here is visible at the sun in eight minutes, at Vega in nine years, at a star of the twelfth magnitude in four thousand years, and so forth, it is obvious that *events contiguous in Time are also adjacent in Space*.

Hence to the Divinity *Time and Space are identical*.

Are they not also identical *in fact* ?

Suppose a man to be transported to different points in space, with a knowledge of all distances, and provided with a telescope that would make all objects visible at any distance.

Such an observer would be *Omniscient*.

For instance—Does he desire to see the historic scene



of Luther before the Council of Worms. He must go to some fixed star, where the light of the earth arrives in three hundred years, or as the case may be, and he will then view that drama in action. From another fixed star he would see the Saviour on the cross. From another, the building of the Great Pyramid, and so forth.

Thus the Universe contains an indestructible and incorruptible record of all the events of the past. They have been projected into the ether, and are carried forward into space by the wings of light, actually existing in form and colour. The most secret deed that is done lives through eternity. There is no act of virtue and no crime that is not projected into the heaven, painted upon space, and retained there for ever!

Now let us imagine our observer placed on a star of the twelfth magnitude. He would see what was occurring on our earth four thousand years ago. Let him advance towards our earth, say, until he has reached the Sun. In his flight he would have seen all the events that have occurred from the time of Abraham to the present day. He would meet them coming.

Suppose him further to have made this flight in a year. Then in one year he has lived the events of four thousand years. But, suppose his transit to have been accomplished in a moment, as Spirits can. Then he will have lived four thousand years in a single moment, because he will have lived the events of four thousand years.

He has been in fact *Omniscient* and *Omnipresent*.

We can thus be made to some extent to conceive of Omniscience and Omnipresence. We are enabled to understand the meaning of the text, "One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day:" (2 Pet. c. 3, v. 8.)

It is thus also demonstrated how that, in truth, *Time and Space are merely human inventions*.

In further proof of this, suppose everything to be simultaneously reduced in time by one-half—the year to six months, the day to twelve hours, man's life from

eighty years to forty years. We should be wholly unconscious of the change. Every act would be done with double speed, and all about us being equally affected, we should be cognisant of no change, as we are not cognisant of the motion of the earth because all about us moves with us.

So likewise, if everything were to be reduced in *magnitude* by one-half, we should not be conscious of it. So also it would be if *Time* were diminished indefinitely, or size indefinitely contracted.

Thus it is proved that *Time is a human fiction*. It exists in our conceptions only, not in reality. Our idea of it is the consequence of the molecular structure of the brain, which can work only by successive actions and under conditions that make action comparatively slow. Released from that structure the Soul must necessarily have quite other conceptions of *Time*, and perceive and think and feel under conditions altogether different.

The same argument applies to the conception of *Space*.

If all measurements were to be reduced simultaneously by one half, we should be wholly unconscious of the change, and this process of reduction might proceed infinitely and still we should be unconscious of it. Take the Magic Lantern as an illustration. A picture traced on glass in transparent colours is painted upon the screen. How? The rays from that picture upon the glass pass through the lens and are there converged to a point whence they are again diverged and are transmitted in a wider circle. But the large picture on the screen, like the picture on the glass, was all contained in colour and in form in a mere point at the focus, the whole being infinitely condensed and yet absolutely perfect.

Or better still is the illustration of the eyes. We stand on a mountain top, and spread before the eyes are hills, valleys, rivers, lakes, towns, villages—a stretch of country of a hundred miles. All within the range of vision, with all its infinite forms and colours, is precisely painted upon the retina of the eye, in a space which the head of a large pin would cover. What the Mind actually sees is



this infinitely minute picture upon the retina, not the scene itself. This *speck* it is that to our minds conveys the notion of huge mountains and the countless slopes and shapes and hues of miles of landscape. The Universe might thus be condensed to an infinitesimal point, and yet appear to the spectator of any magnitude.

*Space is thus shown to be a human conception only.* It is a mere idea of space only that we have. We *imagine* the vast expanse; what really we *see* is only a pin's point.

May it not well be, then, that the Universe itself does not exist in the expanded form or even in the shape we think we see, for are not these also dependent upon our human mode of perception!

Consequently, a point of view is conceivable from which the Universe might exist without the expansion of Time and Space.

This is but a glimpse of the new and vast world of knowledge which must be ours "when we have shuffled off this mortal coil," if (as I presume to hope in this little treatise I have made some approach to *proving*) *we have Souls*, or as I have ventured to suggest—**WE ARE SOULS.**

Thus we are enabled to arrive at *some* definite conception of that which the Materialists reject as being inconceivable—an IMMORTAL SOUL—an OMNISCIENT and OMNIPRESENT GOD.

---

## APPENDIX.

---

SINCE the printing of this volume, Science, abandoning *à priori* argument and adopting experimental research, has fully confirmed all the phenomena of Artificial Somnambulism described in these pages, but hitherto angrily denied by the Scientists. The following report is taken from the *Times* of the 23rd January, 1879. A similar report has been supplied to the *Standard* by its Paris Correspondent.

### DEMONSTRATIONS OF SOME ABNORMAL NERVOUS STATES.

FOR some years past Dr. Charcot, an eminent medical professor has been giving, at the Asylum of La Salpêtrière, Paris, extra-official courses of clinical lectures on the nervous maladies with which his work is so largely concerned. These weekly lectures have been highly popular, and special interest has been excited this year, as the professor has taken up questions connected with somnambulism and animal magnetism, a class of phenomena which have, perhaps, been too much in the hands of charlatans hitherto, and the truth about which has been largely mixed with error and absurdity. Reporting the professor's experiments to *La Nature*, Dr. Cartaz considers he has given positive demonstration that somnambulism, catalepsy, &c., are among the numerous forms of hysteria. Dr. Charcot showed that certain hysteric persons could be easily thrown, under certain conditions, into such states. Thus a patient is placed before an intense light—e.g., the electric—and requested to look at it. In a few seconds or minutes she become motionless in a state of catalepsy. The eyes are fixed: the limbs are supple, and will keep any position given them. In this state the physiognomy seems to reflect to some extent the expressions of the gestures; if the limbs be put in a threatening attitude, the face darkens; if the fingers be joined on the lips as if to wave a kiss, the face becomes smiling and open; but beyond such modifications from attitude



the patient remains impassive, fixed, and insensible to the outer world. If the luminous beam be now interrupted with gives a screen or by closing the eyelids, the catalepsy suddenly place to a state of lethargy or somnambulism. The patient falls on her back, her neck being stretched, her breathing loud (accompanied by slight hiccup), the eyes convulsed, with all the symptoms of the beginning of a hystero-epileptic attack. On being called loudly, she will rise and come to the person calling, will perform at request various combined movements, as writing, sewing, &c., and sometimes answer questions, all the time being in complete anæsthesia. Other agencies besides light will bring on those crises—*e.g.*, they may be produced by sound; and to illustrate this Dr. Charcot produced a gigantic tuning fork, giving a very deep note, and sounded it when one of the patients was seated on the resonance-case; she soon fell into catalepsy. The somnambulist state is easily dissipated—*e.g.*, by blowing in the face. One notable experiment of Dr. Charcot proved that the two states—catalepsy and lethargy—could exist simultaneously in one person. The patient being put into the former state is made lethargic on one side by closing the eye of that side or shutting off the luminous ray from it with a screen; this side (say the left) has then no longer the property which the right has of maintaining any given attitude in the limbs. A peculiar muscular hyperexcitability (as Dr. Charcot further shows) appears with the lethargy. By gently pressing or rubbing a muscle it can be made to contract immediately; and on pressing the trunk of a nerve, the muscle to which it passes will contract. In this way may be produced those various facial changes which Dr. Duchenne, of Boulogne, has obtained with electricity. The nature of the nervous disorders in question is far from being adequately known as yet, and Dr. Charcot does not offer any scientific explanations. It is important that exact observations should be accumulated, and the precise conditions of the phenomena, their modifications under such and such causes, &c., fully determined.

FINIS.

# INDEX.

ABERCROMBIE, DR.:	<i>page</i>	CARPENTER, DR.:	<i>page</i>
cases reported by .....	261	theory of unconscious cere-	
ACTION AT A DISTANCE:		bration.....	15
cases of .....	223	on prepossession and domi-	
AGASSIZ, PROFESSOR:		nant idea.....	45
experiments in hypnotism ...	187	objections by .....	362
ARGUMENT, THE:		answers to .....	365
Summing up .....	504	CATALEPSY:	
The Conclusions.....	533	phenomena of .....	196
AUTOMATIC MOTION:		CEREBRATION, UNCON-	
experiments in .....	347	SCIOUS:	
theory of .....	421	See "Unconscious Cerebra-	
BEECHER, MISS:		tion."	
communication by .....	485	CLAIRVOYANCE:	
BELIEF:		See "Perception, Supersen-	
definition of.....	69	suous."	
BODY, THE:		COBBE, MISS:	
healthy condition of .....	28	on Unconscious Cerebration	12
BRAID, DR.:		COMMUNICATIONS:	
on hypnotism .....	187	character of.....	400
BRAIN, THE:		CONCLUSIONS:	
structure of.....	94	the .....	533
Dr. Ferrier's experiments on	97	CONSCIOUSNESS, DOUBLE:	
mechanism of .....	99	phenomena of ....	218
how set in motion .....	103	CONVICTION:	
action of the double brain... 106		definition of.....	60
BROUGHAM, LORD:		CROOKES, MR., F.R.S.:	
supersensuous perception by	268	experiments of .....	353
		report by .....	355
		experiments with .....	444, 446



- |                                |             |                              |             |
|--------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------|-------------|
| <b>DELIRIUM:</b>               | <i>page</i> | <b>ELECTRO-BIOLOGY:</b>      | <i>page</i> |
| what it is.....                | 146         | theory of .....              | 202         |
| description of .....           | 147         | cases of .....               | 203         |
| a continuous dream .....       | 149         |                              |             |
| <b>DELUSION:</b>               |             | <b>EVIDENCE:</b>             |             |
| fallacy of.....                | 316         | cautions in taking .....     | 48          |
| Dialectical Society, report on | 341         | scientific, what it is ..... | 63          |
|                                |             | witnesses, worth of .....    | 327         |
| <b>DIALECTICAL SOCIETY:</b>    |             | <b>EXPERIMENTS:</b>          |             |
| experiments of.....            | 340         | research by.....             | 48          |
| report of .....                | 343         | of Dialectical Society.....  | 346         |
| further experiments by ...     | 346         | No. 1 of automatic motion    | 347         |
| No. 1 automatic motion ...     | 347         | No. 2     ditto .....        | 348         |
| No. 2     ditto .....          | 348         | No. 3     ditto .....        | 349         |
| No. 3     ditto .....          | 349         | No. 4     ditto .....        | 349         |
| No. 4     ditto .....          | 349         | conclusions from.....        | 350         |
| conclusions from.....          | 350         | No. 5 automatic motion...    | 352         |
| <b>DOMINANT IDEA:</b>          |             | No. 6 measurement of the     |             |
| influence of .....             | 52          | force.....                   | 353         |
| objection of.....              | 362         | No. 7.....                   | 438         |
| answer to.....                 | 365         | No. 8.....                   | 439         |
|                                |             | No. 9.....                   | 439         |
| <b>DREAM:</b>                  |             | No. 10.....                  | 440         |
| state of .....                 | 91          | No. 11.....                  | 444         |
| material mechanism of .....    | 94          | No. 12.....                  | 446         |
| action of the brain in .....   | 104         | No. 13.....                  | 450         |
| action of the mind in.....     | 105         | No. 14.....                  | 454         |
| the double brain.....          | 106         | No. 15.....                  | 456         |
| psychology of .....            | 109         | other communicated experi-   |             |
| phenomena of .....             | 116         | ments.....                   | 480 to 489  |
| invention in.....              | 117         |                              |             |
| exaltation of the faculties... | 119         | <b>FACTS:</b>                |             |
| consciousness in .....         | 123         | immortality of.....          | 48          |
| no sense of incongruity.....   | 124         |                              |             |
| causes of .....                | 126         | <b>FAITH:</b>                |             |
| effect of the duplex brain ... | 127         | definition of .....          | 69          |
| nightmare, cause of .....      | 129         |                              |             |
| artificial production of ..... | 130         | <b>FANCHER, MISS:</b>        |             |
| perceptive dream .....         | 131         | case of.....                 | 459         |
| cases of .....                 | 132         |                              |             |
| prophetic power in.....        | 134         | <b>FERRIER, DR.:</b>         |             |
| the Soul in dream .....        | 136         | experiments of .....         | 98          |
| sympathetic dreams .....       | 137         |                              |             |
| influence of other minds ...   | 138         | <b>FOSTER, MR. C.:</b>       |             |
| external suggestion .....      | 138         | experiment with.....         | 440         |
| composition of music in.....   | 139         |                              |             |
| philosophy of .....            | 149         | <b>FRAUD:</b>                |             |
| the Will in .....              | 142         | liability to .....           | 322         |
| Conclusions.....               | 143         |                              |             |
| Soul proved by .....           | 144         | <b>GHOSTS:</b>               |             |
|                                |             | no decisive proof of .....   | 541         |

<b>GORDON, MR. PERCY :</b>	<i>page</i>	<b>MEMORY :</b>	<i>page</i>
case reported by.....	265	physical process of.....	538
<b>HEALTH :</b>		<b>MENTAL EXALTATION :</b>	
relationship of mind, soul, and body in.....	28	phenomena of .....	224
<b>HOME, MR. :</b>		<b>MENTAL SYMPATHY AND COMMUNION :</b>	
experiments with.....	353, 439	Thought-reading .....	22
obligations of the author to	452	proofs of .....	24
experiments of Lord Broug- ham with.....	452	theory of.....	26
<b>HYPNOTISM :</b>		<b>METALS :</b>	
See "Somnambulism Arti- ficial."		influence of, on somnam- bules .....	205
<b>ILLUSION :</b>		<b>MIND, THE :</b>	
fallacy of.....	316	relationship to the body ...	28
Dialectical Society's report on.....	341	<b>MOSES, REV. S. :</b>	
<b>IMMORTALITY :</b>		case reported by.....	266
in accord with Science .....	545	<b>NIGHTMARE :</b>	
<b>INSANITY :</b>		cause of .....	129
definition of.....	152	<b>NORMAL ACTION OF THE MECHANISM .....</b>	<b>1</b>
monomania .....	153	<b>OMNIPRESENCE :</b>	
physiology of .....	154	illustrative conception of ...	547
phenomena of.....	155	<b>PEPPER, PROFESSOR :</b>	
<b>INTELLIGENCE, THE :</b>		experiment with.....	389
whence and what .....	384	<b>PERCEPTION, SUPERSEN- SUOUS :</b>	
theory of .....	409	cases of .....	207
<b>KNOWLEDGE :</b>		theory and explanation of...	244
how we know .....	58	introduction to .....	256
definition of .....	69	phenomena of.....	259
<b>LOUISE, LITTLE :</b>		physiology of .....	276
supersensuous perception by.....	270	psychology of .....	280
explanation of.....	272	cases of .....	261
<b>MAHAN, REV. A. :</b>		case of Miss Fancher .....	459
theory of .....	411	<b>PHRENOLOGY :</b>	
<b>MATERIALISM :</b>		phenomena of, in hypnotism	212
answer to.....	539	cases of .....	214
<b>MECHANISM OF MAN :</b>		explanation of.....	243
normal action of .....	1	<b>PHYSIOLOGY :</b>	
action of, in health.....	4	of somnambulism .....	232
abnormal action of.....	31	of supersensuous perception	276



PHYSIOLOGY—continued :	page
of trance .....	299
of psychic force .....	374
of Psychism.....	492

# PSYCHIC, THE :

definition of.....	359
who is .....	360
list of psychics .....	361
very numerous .....	362
how discovered .....	364
imposture by .....	366
objections of Dr. Carpenter .....	363
answer to.....	365
the directing Intelligence ...	384
development of .....	402

# PSYCHIC FORCE :

definition of.....	309
discovery of.....	329
proofs of .....	331
directed by intelligence.....	332
method of investigation.....	336
phenomena of.....	340
report of Dialectical Society .....	343
unconscious muscular ac-	
tion .....	342
experiments on .....	347
measurement of .....	353
physiology of .....	374
the directing intelligence ...	384
summary.....	396
theory of.....	409

# PSYCHISM :

definition of.....	309
objections and objectors.....	315
witnesses of.....	326
psychic force .....	329
proofs of .....	331
directed by intelligence.....	332
investigation of .....	336
phenomena .....	340
experiments of Dialectical	
Society.....	340
illusion or delusion.....	341
unconscious muscular ac-	
tion .....	342
report of the Society .....	343
experiments of, reported ...	347

PSYCHISM—continued :	page
automatic motion—four ex-	
periments.....	347
measurement of the force... ..	353
experiments of Mr. Crookes .....	353
report of .....	355
psychic, the .....	359
who is .....	360
physiology of .....	374
directing Intelligence, the... ..	384
summary .....	396
theory of .....	409
automatic motion, theory of .....	421
more phenomena of .....	429
automatic writing .....	431
other phenomena .....	437
Miss Fancher's case .....	459
communicated phenomena... ..	476
physiology of .....	492
psychology of .....	495
The argument.....	504
The summing up .....	504

# PSYCHOLOGY :

of the future .....	31
how to be pursued .....	35
objections and objectors ...	39
precautions in research.....	43
of somnambulism .....	235
of supersensuous percep-	
tion .....	276
of trance .....	279
of psychism.....	494
the argument .....	504
the summing up.....	504
the conclusion .....	533

# PREPOSSESSION :

influence of .....	53
objection of.....	362
answer to.....	365

# RECOLLECTION :

process of .....	539
------------------	-----

# RESEARCH :

precautions in.....	43
plan to be pursued in .....	77

# SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE :

what it is .....	63
------------------	----

<b>SENSATION :</b>	<i>page</i>	<b>SOMNAMBULISM, ARTIFI-</b>	
community of, in hypnotism	200	<b>CIAL—continued :</b>	<i>page</i>
physiology of	201	scientific view of	229
<b>SENSES :</b>		physiology of	232
fallacies of the	59	psychology of	235
<b>SLEEP :</b>		<b>SOMNAMBULISM, NATU-</b>	
what it is	79	<b>RAL :</b>	
physiology of	81	introduction	158
mental condition	84	is not sleep	161
seat of	87	diagnosis of	161
<b>SOMNAMBULISM, ARTI-</b>		natural somnambulism	164
<b>FICIAL :</b>		aspect of the somnambule	165
definition of	180	difference between, and sleep	166
to be termed hypnotism	181	phenomena of	168
phenomena of	182	cases of	170
the hypnotic state	182	physiology of	232
the somnambule	183	psychology of	235
bearing of, on psychology	185	rigidity in	247
Mesmer and mesmerism	186	clairvoyance	245
Dr. Braid	187	double life	252
experiences of Agassiz	187	case of Miss Fancher	459
how produced	190	<b>SOUL, THE :</b>	
experiments in	193	relation to the body in health	28
<i>rationale</i> of	194	not insane	156
cataleptic phenomena	196	capacities of	536
subjection of the will	199	conclusions as to existence	
cases of	200	of	533
community of sensation	200	<b>SPACE :</b>	
physiology of	201	realisation of our concep-	
electro-biology	201	tions of	546
theory of	202	<b>SUMMING UP, THE :</b>	
cases of	203	the argument	504
metals, influence of	205	<b>SUPERSENSUOUS PER-</b>	
super-sensuous perception	206	<b>CEPTION :</b>	
cases of	207	<i>See</i> "Perception, Supersens-	
phrenological phenomena	212	uous."	
cases of	214	<b>TESTS :</b>	
double consciousness	218	employment of	49
mental travelling	219	<b>THOUGHT-READING :</b>	
cases of	220	is mental sympathy	22
theory of	221	proofs of	24
action at a distance	223	theory of	26
mental exaltation	224	<b>TIME :</b>	
how awakened	225	illustration of	546
Dr. Gregory on	226		
medical uses	227		
theory of	228		



TOWNSHEND, REV. C. H. :	<i>page</i>	UNCONSCIOUS CEREBRA-	<i>page</i>
case reported by.....	267	TION .....	10
TRANCE;		Cobbe, Miss, theory of .....	12
definition of .....	283	phenomena of .....	14
phenomena of.....	287	Dr. Carpenter on .....	15
physiology and psychology			
of .....	299	VITAL FORCE :	
TRAVELLING, MENTAL :		definition of .....	309
phenomena of .....	219	WILL, THE :	
cases of .....	220	paralysis of, in hypnotism...	199
theory of.....	221	subjection to another will...	200
TRUTH :		WRITING :	
how attained to .....	60	automatic .....	431
scientific, what is .....	63		

Lately published, by LONGMAN AND CO., price 10s. 6d.,

THE  
**MECHANISM OF MAN:**

A Popular Introduction to Mental Physiology and Psychology.

AN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION "WHAT AM I?"

By EDWARD W. COX, Serjeant-at-Law

*President of the Psychological Society of Great Britain.*

**VOL. I.—THE MECHANISM.**

Vol. II. will treat of "The Mechanism in Action."

**CONTENTS OF VOL. I.**

**PART I.—INTRODUCTION.**

Cap. I. What am I?

II. The Science of Man.

III. The Province of Psychology.

IV. The Method of Study.

V. Scientific Proof.

Cap. VI. Matter and Spirit.

VII. Of Force.

VIII. Of Solidity—Size—Space—Time.

IX. The Natural and the Supernatural.

**PART II.—THE MECHANISM OF MAN.**

Cap. I. Introductory.

II. The Germ.

III. Of Heredity.

IV. How we Grow.

Cap. V. How we Live.

VI. Health.

VII. How we Sicken.

VIII. How we Die.

**PART III.—THE FORCES THAT MOVE THE MECHANISM.**

**INTRODUCTORY.**

**BOOK I.—LIFE.**

Cap. I. What Life is.

II. The Beginning of Life.

III. The Cessation of Life.

**BOOK II.—MIND.**

Cap. I. Introductory.

II. The Mechanism of the Mind.

III. Of the Brain.

IV. The Duality of the Mind.

V. The Nerve Force.

VI. Of the Senses.

VII. Of the Sense of Sight.

VIII. Of the Sense of Hearing.

IX. Of the Senses of Taste and Smell.

X. Of the Sense of Touch.

XI. Of the Evidence of the Senses.

XII. The Structure of the Mind.

XIII. Classification of the Mental Powers.

XIV. The Propensities.

XV. The Sentiments Common to Man with the Lower Animals.

XVI. The Sentiments proper to Man.

XVII. The Intellectual Faculties.

XVIII. The Faculties that perceive the relationship of External Objects.

XIX. The Intellectual Faculties.

XX. Of Memory and Recollection.

XXI. How the Machinery of the Mind Works.

XXII. Of the Will.

XXIII. Of the Freedom of the Will.

XXIV. Of Instinct.

(Continued on next page.)



## THE MECHANISM OF MAN (*continued*).

### BOOK III.—SOUL.

#### Cap. I. Introductory.

- II. Soul—Spirit—Psyche—Anima.
- III. Is Soul possible and probable.
- IV. Consciousness.
- V. Presumptive proofs of Psychic being.
- VI. What the Soul is.
- VII. The Dwelling place of the Soul.
- VIII. The Form of the Soul.
- IX. The Soul after Death.

- X. The Outlook of the Soul.
- XI. Of Soul (or Psychic) Force.
- XII. The Pre-existence of the Soul.
- XIII. The Whereabouts of the Soul after Death.
- XIV. The Condition of the Disembodied Soul.
- XV. The Mystery.
- XVI. Speculations.
- XVII. Conclusions.
- General Index.

### OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

We have said enough to show that "The Mechanism of Man" is a work of sustained interest and ingenious theories.—*Westminster Review*.

We can promise all a vast fund of information in these pages.—*Hampshire Telegraph*.

That Mr. Cox is not only an earnest advocate of the principle of truth as he conceives it, an elevated thinker, an intelligent teacher of the science he loves, but also an enthusiast, may be inferred from these few words, with which we may aptly conclude our necessarily brief review of his book. "Psychology will thus be seen to be a science as liberal as it is large. There is none so calculated to expand and elevate the mind, for its contemplations are of the past, the present, and the future of man; its issues are annihilation or immortality."—*Lloyd's Newspaper*.

This is a powerful manifesto against the doctrine of materialism, and it is made by exactly the sort of person whom one would like to hear on this question—a hard-headed practical lawyer; one accustomed to weigh evidence, and not likely to be led astray by high-flown language or visionary ideas. The author is the well-known Recorder of Portsmouth, Chairman of the Middlesex Sessions, and the writer of law treatises, one of which is in the seventh and another in the eleventh edition. . . . A most able and interesting work.—*Brighton Guardian*.

We think Serjeant Cox has succeeded in establishing his proposition (the existence of Soul as an entity distinct from the body) on unimpeachable grounds of reason, and that his work will have a most useful effect on the many whose faith has been disturbed.—*Sheffield Independent*.

The reader will be struck with the popular way in which the subject is treated, and with the amount of independent thought which is manifested throughout the volume. They are topics of intensely human interest, and they are handled by Serjt. Cox with a power of statement and illustration which will be appreciated wherever the book is introduced.—*Bristol Mercury*.

We recommend the volume to the careful study of every thoughtful man, and with an almost impatient anticipation look for the appearance of further treatises on kindred subjects by the same hand.—*Somerset County Gazette*.

This volume opens up a very wide and deeply interesting study—interesting from innumerable points; and to all honest students of nature and science, full of invaluable thoughts and suggestions. Mr. Cox takes nothing for granted; he begs no part of the great and abstruse questions which he sets out to examine, but he goes carefully and patiently into a searching investigation of the most minute details and branches of his subject.—*Birmingham Daily Gazette*.

Mr. Serjeant Cox is a gentleman whose whole being concentrates on his subject. So perfectly is he at home in it that an uncommon ease and pleasant garb adorn all his chapters. . . . It is a felicity to all thinking men to see a high member of the Bar devoting to such topics those energies which many a man may possess but has not the will to exert.—*Leicester Daily Post*.

To those who care to wander in the obscure border land that lies between the material and the spiritual, there is alike in its facts and fancies material for most interesting thought and speculation.—*Ayr Advertiser*.

#### Notices of the Last Edition.

Few books more remarkable than this have been issued of late.—*Eastern Daily Post*.

The entire work is of absorbing interest.—*Civilian*.

The legal mind of the author displays itself here in a very characteristic manner, for all through there breathes the spirit of one who will be content to take nothing for granted—nothing, in short, that is not proved.—*Somerset Gazette*.

All lovers of physics will find much to delight them in the earlier pages of the work, where the author discusses the nature and condition of our animal structure.—*Standard*.

Thoughtful, and calculated to make its readers think.—*Graphic*.

A most useful and charming work.—*Standard*.

(Continued on next page.)

## OPINIONS OF THE PRESS (Continued).

Revelations full of interest.—*Leicester Daily Post*.

There is in this, and through the volume generally, much to challenge the attention of reflective readers.—*Bristol Mercury*.

A thoughtful and remarkable book, full of original and suggestive ideas.—*Builder*.

The work will be found of the greatest value, not only to the scientific scholar, but to every reader who is desirous of knowing himself.—*Irish Daily Telegraph*.

A difficult task, but one which the writer has shown his ability to deal with.—*Brighton Times*.

A work that may be very profitably read, and deserves much careful thought.—*Figaro*.

The spirit throughout is that of a man who seeks truth only, and who desires to promote its search by others.—*Edinburgh Daily Review*.

Mr. Serjeant Cox's book is full of thought, and well worth reading.—*Morning Post*.

He has a way of seizing the central *nodus* of a difficulty with a swift and sudden grasp that one can't help admiring.—*Literary Churchman*.

The result of deep investigation, careful and laborious research, and extensive reading —  
*Chester Courant*.

LONDON: LONGMAN AND CO.

Recently Published, Price 7s. 6d.

THE

# PRINCIPLES OF PUNISHMENT

AS APPLIED IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE CRIMINAL LAW  
BY JUDGES AND MAGISTRATES.

BY MR. SERJEANT COX,

*Chairman of the Second Court of Middlesex; Recorder of Portsmouth.*

## CONTENTS.

### CHAPTER.

Preface.

I.—The Purpose of Punishment.

II.—Crimes and Criminals.

III.—The Principle of Punishment.

IV.—Legal Classification of Crimes.

V.—The Province of the Judge.

VI.—Classification of Criminals.

VII.—1. Crimes of Wantonness.

VIII.—2. Occasional Crimes.

IX.—3. Crimes involving Breach of Trust.

X.—4. Crimes of Fraud.

XI.—5. Crimes of Passion.

XII.—6. Crimes of Violence.

### CHAPTER.

XIII.—7. Crimes of Cruelty and Brutality.

XIV.—8. Prevalent Crimes.

XV.—The Character of the Criminal.

XVI.—Circumstances of Aggravation.

XVII.—Mitigation of Punishment

XVIII.—Abuses of the Criminal Law.

XIX.—Costs—Compensation—Restitution.

XX.—Juries and Verdicts.

XXI.—Summary Convictions.

XXII.—Payment of Penalties and Costs—  
Rewards—Bail.

XXIII.—General Remarks on the Administration of Criminal Justice.

It is very seldom that a book so thoroughly satisfactory to the lay as well as to the legal mind has been given to the world. We can only wish that passing an examination based upon it were made a *sine quâ non* in all judicial and magisterial appointments.—*Morning Advertiser*.

The learned Serjeant has succeeded in laying down many broad rules for the guidance of magistrates.—*Lloyd's News*.

No better book has in these later days been produced for the young county magistrate.—*Globe*.

The work will be of great assistance to the magistrate and judge.—*Court Journal*.

LONDON: "THE LAW TIMES" OFFICE, 10, WELLINGTON-STREET.

[TURN OVER.]



MESSRS. LONGMAN & Co.  
HAVE PUBLISHED ALSO THE FOLLOWING WORKS BY  
MR. SERJEANT COX:

---

THE PROVINCE OF PSYCHOLOGY.  
INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

*Price One Shilling.*

---

THE SECOND SESSIONAL ADDRESS.

*Price Sixpence.*

---

THE  
PROGRESS and PROSPECTS of PSYCHOLOGY.

Being the Third Sessional Address.

*Price Sixpence.*

---

SOME PHENOMENA of SLEEP and DREAM.

*Price Sixpence.*

---

THE  
PSYCHOLOGY of MEMORY and RECOLLECTION.

*Price Sixpence.*

---

MATTER and SPIRIT: a DEFINITION.

*Price Sixpence.*

# THE CLAIMS OF PSYCHOLOGY TO ADMISSION INTO THE CIRCLE OF THE SCIENCES.

Being the Fifth Sessional Address.

*Price Sixpence.*

---

## HAS MAN A SOUL?

ANSWER TO PROFESSOR TYNDALL.

Being the Fourth Sessional Address to the Society.

*Price Sixpence.*

---

## SOME MORE PHENOMENA OF SLEEP AND DREAM.

*Price Sixpence.*

---

## HEREDITY AND HYBRIDISM:

A SUGGESTED SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM.

*Price 3s. 6d.*

---

*Just Published, Price 3s. 6d.*

## A MONOGRAPH ON SLEEP AND DREAM; THEIR PHYSIOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY.

BY MR. SERJEANT COX,

*President of the Psychological Society of Great Britain.*

---

LONGMAN AND CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.

---

*N.B.—Any of the above sent to any address on receipt of a Post-Office Order or Postage Stamps for the amount addressed to Mr. Poole, Secretary, at the Offices of "The Psychological Society of Great Britain, 11, Chandos-street, Cavendish-square, London."*



Now ready, price 7s. 6d., the THIRD EDITION (and Fifth Thousand), revised, of

# THE ARTS OF WRITING, READING, AND SPEAKING. LETTERS TO A LAW STUDENT.

BY EDWARD W. COX,

Serjeant-at-Law, Recorder of Portsmouth.

*N.B.—A New Chapter treats of the CAUSES and CURE of STUTTERING.*

## CONTENTS.

### LETTER. INTRODUCTION.

- I.—Introductory.
- II.—The Objects, Uses, and Advantages of the Art of Speaking.
- III.—The Foundations of the Art of Speaking and Writing.

### ART OF WRITING.

- IV.—First Lessons in the Art of Writing.
- V.—Reading and Thinking.
- VI.—Style.
- VII.—Language.
- VIII.—Words—Sentences—Rhythm.
- IX.—The Art of Writing.

### ART OF READING.

- X.—The Art of Reading.
- XI.—What to avoid—Articulation.
- XII.—Pronunciation—Expression.
- XIII.—The Art of the Actor and the Reader.
- XIV.—The Management of the Voice—Tone.
- XV.—Emphasis.
- XVI.—Pause—Punctuation—Management of the Breath—Inflection.
- XVII.—Attitude—Influence of the Mental over the Physical Powers.
- XVIII.—Illustrations.
- XIX.—Illustrations of Tone, Emphasis, and Pause.
- XX.—Illustrations (continued).
- XXI.—Illustrations (continued).
- XXII.—How to read Poetry.

### LETTER.

- XXIII.—Reading of Narrative, Argument, and Sentiment.
- XXIV.—Special Readings—The Bible.
- XXV.—Dramatic Reading.
- XXVI.—The Reading of Wit and Humour.
- XXVII.—The Uses of Reading.
- XXVIII.—Public Readings.

### ART OF SPEAKING.

- XXIX.—The Art of Speaking.
- XXX.—Foundations of the Art of Speaking.
- XXXI.—What to Say—Composition.
- XXXII.—How to Begin—Cautions.
- XXXIII.—Writing a Speech.
- XXXIV.—First Lessons.
- XXXV.—Public Speaking.
- XXXVI.—Delivery.
- XXXVII.—Action.
- XXXVIII.—The Construction of a Speech.
- XXXIX.—The Oratory of the Pulpit.
- XL.—The Oratory of the Senate.
- XLI.—The Oratory of the Bar.
- XLII.—The Oratory of the Bar (continued).
- XLIII.—The Oratory of the Bar (concluded).
- XLIV.—The Oratory of the Platform.
- XLV.—The Oratory of the Platform (continued).
- XLVI.—The Oratory of the Platform (continued).
- XLVII.—The Oratory of the Platform (concluded).
- XLVIII.—Socia Oratory.
- XLIX.—Stuttering—Its Causes and Cure.
- L.—Penny Readings.

*Liverpool Mercury*: "A text-book for all whose avocations render accuracy of speech and elegance of composition a necessity of comfortable existence. The precepts, founded on experience, are unexceptionable."

*Sheffield Independent*: "We should recommend the budding orator to patiently sit down and study the wise and necessary counsels which long experience and careful and extensive observation have enabled the writer to put into what he modestly calls this 'little treatise.'"

*Hampshire Advertiser*: "It teaches how to avoid a bad style, and at the same time points out how to attain a good one."

The *Athenæum* says: "Herr Mendel has asked and obtained from the Author permission to translate this book into German for educational uses in that country."

NOTE.—A copy sent by post to any person inclosing a Post-office Order for the price.

LONDON :

"LAW TIMES" OFFICE, 10, WELLINGTON-STREET, STRAND, W.C.