

The Open Court.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Devoted to the Work of Conciliating Religion with Science.

No. 180. (VOL. IV.—50)

CHICAGO, FEBRUARY 5, 1891.

{ Two Dollars per Year.
{ Single Copies, 5 Cts.

HALLUCINATIONS AND ALIENATION OF PERSONALITY.*

BY TH. RIBOT.

Hallucinations form a natural transition from perceptions to ideas, and the part played by them is of great interest. At the outset let us recall to mind a few general points regarding the hallucinatory state. Four hypotheses have been advanced to explain it †: 1. The peripheric or sensorial theory, which places the seat of hallucination in the organ of the senses. 2. The psychic theory which localizes it in the centre of ideation. 3. The mixed or psycho-sensorial theory. 4. The theory which attributes hallucination to the perceptive centres of the cortical layer.

Observation teaches us that hallucinations sometimes affect one sense only, and sometimes several senses; that most frequently they extend to both sides of the body, but occasionally to one side only (right or left, indifferently); still more rarely, they are bilateral, yet presenting a different character on each side; thus, whilst one ear is assailed by threats, injuries, evil counsels; the other is comforted by kind and soothing words; one eye perceives only sad and repugnant objects, the other beholds gardens rich in flowers. These latter cases, being at the same time bilateral and opposite by nature, are to us the most interesting.

Happily, in this immense domain, we have only to explore a very small area. Let us carefully limit our subject. In the normal state the feeling and thinking individual is entirely adapted to his surroundings. Between the group of states and of internal relations which constitute the mind, and the group of states and of external relations which constitute the external world, there is a correspondence, as Spencer has minutely shown. In the case of the hallucinator this correspondence has been destroyed. Hence, false judgments, absurd acts, that is, incongruous and unfitting acts. Still, all this constitutes a disease of reason and not of personality. Undoubtedly the ego is dethroned; but so long as the consensus which constitutes it has not disappeared, is not split in two, or has not alienated a

part of itself, (as we shall see again) so long will there not be any disease of personality in a proper sense; the derangements will be but secondary and superficial. Consequently, the immense majority of cases of hallucination are withdrawn from our consideration.

Nor have we, moreover, either to occupy ourselves with that numerous category of patients, who misjudge the personality of others, and who take the physicians and attendants of the asylum for their own relatives, or their relatives for some imaginary persons in some connection with their delusions.*

Having made these eliminations, the cases to be studied become sufficiently circumscribed, since they are reduced to changes of personality the basis of which is hallucination. There is here almost always an *alienation* (in the etymological sense) of certain states of consciousness, which the ego does not consider as its own, but makes objective and places outside of itself, and to which, ultimately, it attributes a distinct existence yet independent of its own.

As regards the sense of hearing, the history of religious mania furnishes numerous examples. I shall quote the most ordinary cases; namely, those in which at first the hallucinatory state acts alone. A woman was persecuted by an internal voice, "which she heard only within her ear," and which would rebel against whatever she wished. The voice always incited evil when the patient wished for good. Without being heard externally, the voice would call to her: "Take a knife and kill yourself." Another hysterical patient originally had thoughts, and would utter words she had no intention of saying, and soon would express them in a voice that differed from her own. This voice at first only made indifferent or rational remarks; afterwards it assumed a negative character. "At the present time, after thirteen years the voice simply verifies what the patient has just said, or comments upon her words, criticizes them, turns them into ridicule. The tone of this voice, when the mind speaks, always differs a little, and sometimes entirely from the ordinary voice of the patient, and this is the reason why the latter be-

* Translated from the French (*Diseases of Personality* Chap. III. 11.) by 776

† For a complete exposition of the question, see the important articles of M. Binet. *Revue philosophique*, April and May, 1884.

* To some patients, the same individual is, by turns, transformed into an imaginary person and maintained in his real personality. A woman at times recognized her husband, and at times took him for an intruder. She had him arrested, and he had great difficulty in establishing his identity (*Magnan Clinique de Sainte-Anne*, Feb. 11, 1877.)

lieves in the reality of this mind. I, myself, have frequently observed these same facts.”*

As regards sight, alienations of this kind are less frequent. “A very intelligent man,” says Wigan (p. 126) “had the power of putting his *double* before himself. He used to laugh loudly at this double, which would also laugh in return. For a long time this was a subject of amusement to the man; but the final result proved lamentable. By degrees he became convinced that he was being haunted by himself. This other ego taunted him, worried and mortified him incessantly. In order to put an end to this sad existence he arranged his private affairs, and, being loath to begin a new year, on Dec. 31, at midnight, he shot himself in the mouth.”

Finally Dr. Ball in *L'Encéphale* (1882, II.) reports the case of an American, who, through simultaneous hallucinations of hearing and sight, possessed in all its features an imaginary double. “Prostrated by a sunstroke, he remained unconscious for a month. Shortly after recovering his senses, he heard a distinctly articulated human voice, which said: ‘How are you?’ The patient answered, and a short conversation was begun. On the following day the same question was repeated. The patient looked around but saw no one. ‘Who are you?’ said he. ‘I am Mr. Gabbage,’ answered the voice. A few days later the patient got a glimpse of his interlocutor, who from that time presented himself with the same features and in the same dress; he would always appear in front, showing only his bust. He had the appearance of a vigorous and well built man of about thirty-six years, with a strong beard, dark-brown complexion, large black eyes, strongly penciled eye-brows, and was always dressed in hunting costume. The patient would fain have known the profession and habits of his questioner and where he lived; but the man would never consent to give any other information than simply his name.” At last Mr. Gabbage grew more and more tyrannical: ordering the patient to throw his newspaper, watch and chain into the fire, to take care of a young woman and her child whom he had poisoned, and eventually to throw himself through the window of a third floor, whence he fell and was killed upon the pavement below.

These facts show us a beginning of *dissolution of personality*. In another article we shall cite cases not having hallucination for their basis, which will enable us to better understand those already referred to. That more or less perfect co-ordination which in the normal state constitutes the ego, is here to a certain extent broken. Within the group of states of consciousness which we feel as our own, because produced or experienced by ourselves, there exists one,

which, although having its source in the organism, still does not enter into the consensus, but remains apart and appears separate from it. In the order of thought this is the analogue of irresistible impulses; in the order of action, a partial incoördination.*

These voices and visions emanate from the patient himself; why then does he not regard them as his own? This is a very obscure question, but I shall attempt to answer it. There must exist here anatomical and physiological causes, unfortunately at present unknown, the discovery of which would solve the problem. Being ignorant of these causes, we are restricted to the consideration of the surface, the symptoms, and the states of consciousness with the signs that reveal them. Let us, accordingly, suppose a state of consciousness (with its organic conditions) having the characteristic of being local, that is of having in its physical and psychic organization the weakest possible radiation. In order to make myself understood by way of antithesis, let us suppose any violent, sudden emotion; it resounds through the whole system, shakes completely the physical and mental life; it is complete in its diffusion. Our case is exactly the reverse of this. Organically and psychically it has only rare and precarious connections with the rest of the individual; it remains apart, like a foreign body, lodged within the organism, but having no share in its life. It does not enter that great woof of *conesthesia* which sustains and unifies everything. It is a cerebral phenomenon almost without support, analogous to the ideas that are imposed by way of suggestion in hypnotism. This attempt at an explanation is corroborated by the fact that any morbid state—if it be not arrested by nature itself or by medical treatment—has a fatal tendency to increase and expand at the expense of the primitive personality, which, attacked by this parasite, diminishes. Still, in this case it preserves its original mark, and does not constitute a duplication but an alienation of personality.

I only offer this attempt at an explanation as an hypothesis, being perfectly convinced that our present lack of knowledge of the organic conditions of the phenomenon precludes the possibility of a satisfactory diagnosis. In submitting this explanation I have been compelled to anticipate what will be said in a subsequent article with reference to ideas, and which, perhaps, will furnish us with new arguments in favor of that hypothesis.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

THE CHEMISTRY OF PLEASURE.

BY J. C. F. GRUMBINE.

It is hardly possible that the use of the word chemistry in the sense in which it will be used will deviate very widely from the scientific application of it.

* Griesinger, *Maladies Mentales*. French Trans., p. 285-286; Baillarger reports an analogous case, *Annales Médico-psych.*; 1st series, Vol. VI, p. 151.

* Concerning irresistible impulses considered as a phenomenon of partial incoördination, see my *Maladies de la Volonté*, p. 71 and following.

It is true that chemistry does not usually deal with such evanescent and indivisible subjects as pleasure, for it may be argued and rightly that pleasure is not a substance, and hence it cannot properly be catalogued among the things which chemistry analyzes and defines. Pleasure, however, is that which is so closely associated and bound up with so-called material things—it is an effect produced so far as we know altogether within the sphere of sensuous life and in the domain of natural causation that an understanding of its nature and object may well be worth our attention. And when it is known that it is not only an end of life as the Epicureans and even the Stoics maintained—is, indeed, the one quality or effect of life which makes existence bearable as Christianity, and all ethnic religions allowed, but it is the flower of all toil and that which underlies the entire fabric of human culture and civilization, it becomes a theme of very great importance.

Pleasure is sensational, intellectual, psychical. It is an effect of conduct. It is differentiated in quality only as one kind of conduct varies from another kind. It is the product of the use of the functions of life.

Pleasure is not always a safe guide to right action. Like arsenic, which is sweet, and, indeed, a most admirable tonic to the nervous system, especially in combinations with other and similar drugs, it has a danger point, for as neither the sweet taste of arsenic nor its restorative or exhilarating qualities are all that there is to it, so the delicious sensation is not all there is to pleasure. It has a mission which not only its name suggests but which is educative. Like the sunlight it belongs to no special class of people and like gravity, it is inseparable from life itself. It comes to the poor in the hovel and to the rich in the palace. It follows the vagabond in his journey and goes with the prodigal to the habitation of the swine. It is man's friend when even his father and mother prove an enemy. It goes with the exile into Siberia and flies with the criminal to foreign lands. The fact is, it belongs to every plane or grade or state of being. It is sensational in that it is the result of the use of the senses as comprehended in the physical organism. It is intellectual in that it is the result of the use of the intellect as defined in intellectual pursuits. It is psychical in that it is the result of a rational or moral use of life in every possible direction.

Pleasure has been defined as that which is produced primarily in the sphere of the senses while happiness, joy, peace, comfort, felicity are synonyms for that which is produced in the intellectual and moral sphere of being. Both pleasure and happiness are mental because they are only known or realized in consciousness.

The right use of the senses may, all other things

being equal, insure man health, and thus he may have a sound mind in a sound body. A perverted or wrong use of the senses will lead to an unsound mind in an unsound body. Mark Hopkins, a deceased president of Williams College, maintained in his Mental Philosophy that the mind and body are related to each other as the conditional and the conditioned. The right use of the latter, conditions the healthy activity and normal state of the other, so that a man who is intemperate in any sense of the word effects the value and use of the mind. For it is reasonable to suppose that although there are functions in the body which are not altogether governed by the human will, yet the mind is or should be the guide to all action. It should dictate or decide whether ice water and ice cream, new vegetables or gross meats are healthy, and it, instructed by the experience of man in all ages, should be the arbiter in the choice of all food and drink. Hence one of the dangers associated with the physical life is the attempt of man to get pleasure in excess, and license in indulgence and in dissipation, without regard to inevitable consequences, and many to-day, therefore are reaping a whirlwind, the powerful motion of which was spun far back in the lives of their ancestry. Hence there are those whose minds are harassed with acute pain or give way and become insane because of the abuse of the physical organism.

Further, a valuable equation in the conduct of man may be noted. *His pleasure is to life what his conduct is to the law of his being.* It matters not whether a man, like a barbarian, lives on the lowest plane of life or not, the method for obtaining pleasure is the same. If he desire permanent and aggressive pleasure and the greatest amount of it he must use life rightly. For abuse means not only a wrong use but an over-taxing of the function of life, as for example, the perversion of the sense of sight and the eye by staring at the sun. Pain is the monitor which warns us against abuse.

Now, the object of pleasure is to please or make happy, as the object of pain is to afflict and make miserable, yet the two are so closely associated that there is, in the last analysis, little if any difference between them. For the one is often imperceptibly blended into the other, as tears are with smiles. The object of the one is the object of the other.

Pleasure is represented by Heine, the great German poet, as Lorelei, and the figure is borrowed from the Greeks who looked upon pleasure to some extent, as a siren that leads a man to destruction by a lovely face, a beautiful form or a ravishing song. For a man is apt to become enamoured of pleasure only, as Venus was with her beauty and to forget the truth of the adage that there is a way which seems right, but the end is the way of pain. He may become so in love with it that he may ignore the very law for keeping it,

and like Belshazar, the Persian king, at his feast he may allow himself to become enslaved by it, and while powerless to help himself, see his empire slip out of his hands forever.

The apology of Eve for sin cannot be made man's apology for it to-day. Were mankind without knowledge or experience he might well condemn the alleged cruel order of the universe in which he lives. For in this age a thousand angels come to him to teach him the way of life and to lead him into Paradise. He thus becomes in a measure his own enemy if, having access to knowledge and experience, he refuses both for egotism. Science, not pseudo-science, maintains that the chances of man in this world for obtaining pleasure are greater than for pain so it can be said that *man's pleasure is to pain what two is to one*. This may be taken as the fixed law of the universe, and why should it not be if as religion affirms, the nature of God is love?

If a man uses his body well he will escape much pain, and be qualified to receive the difference of pleasure. For it stands to reason that as a man decreases the possibility for getting pain he increases the possibility of obtaining pleasure. Righteousness is the law which should guide us in all we do. It is easily and clearly seen that, given a certain plane of life, a man's hope of future happiness depends not upon his getting all the pleasure he can out of his conduct while on that plane, but of availing himself of the wisest and right use of his life there, as that use is related to his life on another and higher plane—in short, to build in his early years with granite durability, the right kind of a foundation upon which to place the life which will rise upon it, as the building not made with hands eternal in the heavens. For as Michael Angelo, or Raphael, or Turner or Murillo became artists by the same process through which all who have talent in art must go, in learning to draw and color, if they aspire to eminence, so through a like method of training we must go to become that for which we by virtue of our being have been intended. And as man shirks or shrinks from the performance of duty now, or the doing of a work which will make him great or successful in that which he would accomplish, as for instance a boy at school allows a companion to work out for him a problem in geometry or algebra, just in that measure his life will be a disappointment and he will receive the minimum of pleasure. As the poet wrote—*Sic gloria transit mundi!*

The design of the universe, so far as human destiny is concerned, is to afford man the maximum of pleasure with the minimum of pain. When separated from the theological idea of life, that which is called history, experience and civilization, means so much pleasure or pain. When measured by wisdom, human

achievements count only as they yield man the greatest amount of pleasure. The allegory of life is the same whether it is Alexander seeking to win Paradise by piling conquered worlds upon each other, or a mere child finding its joy in marshalling tin soldiers for battle. One pathway leads through the history and conduct of life. Like the needle on the compass, the nature of things decides its unchangeable direction. Whether man's aim in life is to obtain holiness or that which holiness gives, the way to both is the same. Whether our lot is to pass through poverty and folly, or through riches and knowledge, the end of conduct is the same.

It is possible that what are called the irreconcilable facts of life are nothing more or less than the inevitable which defines and qualifies our joy. For it is often found that a man's early history, even though one of hardship and struggle, proves to be the direct cause for his future success; as perhaps Abram Lincoln's experience in the woods of Illinois, and Garfield's conduct along the tow-path of the Miami canal paved the way for or led to the building of the character and life necessary for the positions which they filled in the government of this country. The work and conduct of Paul, the apologist and the tent-maker, and of Jesus, the teacher and the carpenter, are so closely associated individually that that of the latter, however much it may have diverged from that of the former, had in it the element or force which molded and unfolded all the glory and the power of their lives. Indeed what are usually called the irreconcilable facts of human life are after all but a *false generalization*. For take the three facts which, as Tolstoi remarked, stand pre-eminently and boldly forth as seemingly unnecessary evils, viz., pain, poverty, and fear, and are they not in reality as much a part of life itself as their opposites and would the world be what it is without them?

The question is not whether man wishes life without pain but whether he wants to possess life as it is or not possess it at all. If a man covets the sea he must not complain of its storms and icebergs and sharks. If he desires riches he must be content with all that it places at his door. If he is poor he must struggle through or out of his poverty, if he dislikes it, into a more congenial state, or if he cannot do this, he must study how to get the most of joy out of it. And herein man is apt to err in his estimate of the plane of life upon which his fellowmen should be, and at this point the dreams of the social-reformers and political economists disappear as the "baseless fabric of a vision"—for the creed of egotism is not the divine standard for measuring human joy. Because ten men love wealth or leisure, or books, or travel and find in these possessions that which makes life dear

to them is by no means either a proof or an argument that ten other men who possessed them not, ought and should have them to obtain their joy. Imagine all men as having leisure, as reading books, as traveling, as possessing riches—how very uninteresting life would be, yet such is the idea of heaven, which dominates much of the thinking of the Christian Church. It must be said in criticism of this erratic position that the soul will never be satisfied with any addition to its splendor such as is here implied and that any method of furnishing it pleasure other than the one, which prevails in society to-day, will prove to be a permanent blessing to mankind.

THE CONVENTION OF THE ANIMALS.

A FABLE.

BY * * *

A LONG, long time ago, the animals convoked a general congress. Their idea was to get together at some convenient place and to determine, in parliamentary conference, which was the greatest, best, and noblest creature of the animal kingdom. If a decision could be arrived at on this point, it was plain that it would be the easiest thing in the world to set up an ideal which all animals could strive to realize. They would then know how a model animal really looked and acted.

So the animals assembled. Amid the enormous multitude attending, were to be seen, the Lion, the Tiger, the Elephant, the Fox, the Badger, the Eagle, the Bat, the Crocodile, and also Man and the Monkey. These, so to speak, were the aristocracy; but of course there were countless hosts of other and lesser creatures present.

The Convention was called to order by a trumpet-blast from the Elephant. The Giraffe, who towered high above all the other animals, was chosen president of the assembly by acclamation. Immediately the Fox jumped to his feet, to take exception to this proceeding. Said he:

“Gentlemen! If we elect the Giraffe president of this Convention, we shall, in so doing, irrevocably commit ourselves to the position, that height and size of body are the decisive factors in the great question we have here convened to settle. Did we assemble here to decide which was the tallest, or which was the greatest animal? No. We came to decide which was deserving to be called the *best*. And I move you, therefore, Gentlemen, that, in accordance with parliamentary usage, the Giraffe as chairman pro tem. be instructed to proceed immediately to the election of a permanent president.”

Tremendous applause was the reward of the speaker. Whereupon the Giraffe took the floor, and declared that he made no pretensions whatsoever to

precedence on account of his great stature alone; his claim was founded upon the beauty of his dappled skin and the gentleness of his character. Majesty, Beauty, and Goodness were the true pearls of perfection. Whether he was what he claimed to be—that he was willing to leave to the high body before him assembled, and he would, therefore, proceed, he said, in conformity with the wish of the Convention, to the nomination of candidates.

A dreadful hubbub ensued. The animals shrieked and clamored. They feared their deepest and most cherished wishes were not to be realized.

“Petitio Principii!” screamed the Parrot, who had learned a great deal in his life-time, but was far from profiting by it. What he meant to say was, that the very question which it was the purpose of the convention to settle had been taken for granted at the start.

“Quack! Quack!” screamed the duck. “It’s a piece of senseless folly. Quack.”

The Lamb would fain have said something, too. His private opinion was, that Goodness alone should be decisive. If it were not so, why in the name of sense do people call Goodness good! Beauty and Grandeur are dangerous appendages. But the Lamb was weak and stupid; so he said nothing except “Bah! Bah! Bah!”

The strong and powerful animals as yet had not interfered. The Lion and the Tiger glared fiercely into the crowd, and kept busily a-thinking. But the hubbub grew so great that finally the Elephant lost all patience; he sprang up and dashing into the crowd, that the earth quaked beneath his feet, wound his trumpet so loudly, that he drowned the noise of everything about him.

When quiet had been restored, he declared that the President did not have to be the best animal at all. That was just the point the Convention had to decide. They ought not to elect such a feeble animal as the Giraffe president, which belonged to the same family as the sheep, but a person that could keep good order.

“Preside, yourself! Preside, yourself!” piped the Plover. The Plover was a well-intentioned, but nevertheless a very fickle fellow and easily impressed.

“Excellent,” grunted the Hog. The Hog was proud of the fact that a pachyderm should thus be honored. He looked upon the Elephant as his cousin.

The Elephant took the chair, and order was indeed restored.

The new president declared that the violent scenes but just enacted had taught the Convention one important lesson—namely, What was the first course necessary to be taken. For, before anything else was done, some irrefragable, incontrovertible principle must be discovered and established in accordance

with which the decision of what was GOOD should be determined. Not until that had been accomplished, could they hope to decide which deserved to be regarded the best and the most excellent animal.

Speaker after speaker arose. Each lauded the wisdom of the Elephant and declared that surely the President must agree with the position each, guided solely by reason, took. Each believed that his idea of Good bore upon its face an incontestible guaranty of its truth.

Said the Lion: "The greatest virtue is strength. The ideal of perfection is power. The weak perish, the strong survive. Strong teeth, stout sinews, firm muscles, solid bones—such are the criteria that should form the basis of judgment."

Next came the Flea. But unfortunately he spoke so low that he could not be heard throughout the entire assembly. He quoted the very first sentence from a famous work on psychology, saying: "'The lowest animal and the highest animal present no contrast more striking than that between the small self-mobility of the one and the great self-mobility of the other.' Locomotive power accordingly in comparison with size is the factor that determines excellence. Given that and the victory of fleahood is ensured. So far as I myself am concerned, I have kept and always intend to keep on the top in the struggle for existence, come what may."

The Monkey followed the Flea. He agreed with the Flea in so far as the latter appealed to the philosopher cited. "But," said he, "the gentleman that preceded me seems to forget that according to the authority on which he relies complexity of motion is also a factor in determining excellence. One must possess organs that enable one to perform complicated movements. Every one knows how useful the hand is to Man. Nay, the hand makes the Man. Which signifies, that the more hands an animal has, the higher will be his position in the scale of life. The possession of four hands is the cherished ideal of all living creatures, and that ideal is far transcended when in addition to hands there is a developed a fifth organ of prehension—namely, a TAIL.

Hereupon the monkeys all yelled "Hurrah!" and the other animals remained gloomily silent.

The Fox, in his turn, dexterously set forth, how slyness was the condition of all success. What was the use of mobility and activity, if they were not employed to good account in the protection and advancement of Self. The Farmer, he added, labors for my benefit. He raises and cares for his poultry, and I partake of his property in the measure that the wants of life require.

The Eagle came forward and demonstrated, that foxes labored under one enormous disadvantage. They

could not fly. Many a poor Reynard had he seen die of hunger because of his inability to get at the doves in a tree-top. Flying is the power we must possess. If Man could fly, he would be master of us all. That is why he is now trying to learn it. What man is unable to do, *that* birds can do. Among birds therefore is the ideal of living creatures to be sought.

The Sparrow concurred in what the previous speaker had said, in so far as it was certain that a bird must be the ideal animal. But added he, the chief aim of life must not be left out of consideration. We have not only to live, but also to enjoy life. If not, what benefit have we from existence! He himself had always been a merry fellow. He had seen, it was true, hard times. Last winter hundreds of his friends and relatives had perished of hunger and cold. He himself owed his preservation to the fact that he had found a wretched, though warm shelter in the chimney of a school-house. The children there had fed him to his heart's content. "They were hard times," he concluded, "but one must view life philosophically. I have abundant opportunity to observe other animals, and am often surprised at their want of insight. The silliest animal of all animals is without question Man. Man thinks ever of the future, and seldom enjoys the present. His whole life long doth he labor and worry, instead of employing the present moment, and being of good cheer and ever in buoyant spirits."

The Bat was of opinion, that everything should be examined and the best retained. There was no doubt of it, he continued, that, as the Eagle said, the Mammals, with Man at their head, would be the highest animals if they could only fly. The substance of all perfection, accordingly, could only be possessed by those animals that united both qualities. Mammals that could fly, must it be; and noble mammals, whose breasts lay over their hearts!

Man had also sent up his name to the Speaker; but there were so many animals on the list ahead of him, that he would have had to wait several days before his turn came. Having various matters of importance to attend to, however, he concluded that it was not worth his while to await the issue of the Convention, and departed. He wrote a report of what happened up to the time of his departure. What was the outcome of the affair we do not know.

* * *

There is a rumor afloat among the other animals that man had left the convention from pure vanity. He had hoped that he would be proclaimed the ideal animal, but during the discussion he had found out that he was lacking in all the virtues which were regarded as constituting the standard of excellence. There was no chance left for him.

And certainly man was not the tallest creature, not

the strongest in muscular power, not the cunningest in sly shrewdness; his locomotive powers were not extraordinary; he did not possess the most complicated organs, he was not the merriest in the enjoyment of life; even in the highest virtue of the sheep's good-naturedness he was extremely lacking. Yet he went to work and joined hand with his brother-man. With common wants, they spoke a common language. Their struggle for existence was severest among all creatures, but they comprehended the causes of their troubles one by one, and learned from their hardships. The very evils of life taught them to progress; they fought their way against odds, and took possession of the earth.

Man became powerful as a disciple of nature, by adapting himself to the course of natural events. And now he, in his turn, humanizes nature, not by rendering nature unnatural, but by consecrating nature to the wants of humanity. Humanity, we must know, is the most purely natural part of nature, her highest efflorescence and the incarnation of her divinity.

Man, by humanizing nature, appears as the most egotistic animal; yet man's egotism is not mere selfishness. Man's soul is more than his self. Obedient to the laws of existence, man's soul became an image of the laws of nature. Representing in his mind the divine order of the world and regulating his action accordingly, he became the incarnation of nature's divinity. In this way his dominion over the creation of all the other animals has been firmly established.

Man is not the master of nature, but her first born son. He is potent by submission, and he rules by obedience.

THE SPACIAL SENSE.

The simplest explanation of the origin of the spacial sense, it seems to me, is to regard it as a specified and automatically operating interpretation of motion-experiences. These motion-experiences are mainly due to the activity of the muscles of the eye. In addition to this, it must be remarked that investigations of Wilhelm Wundt and of Ernst Mach prove that the perspective and the distribution of light and shade are essential elements in our perception of the third dimension in space. Our eyes have become accustomed, by the information received through other channels, especially the sense of touch, to interpret perspective in combination with certain shadings as corporeal forms.

The origin of the spacial sense was formerly interpreted as caused by the convergence of the two lines of vision. This, however, is disproved by the fact that one-eyed persons have the same corporeal vision as two-eyed persons; and if the convergence of the lines of vision were really the only or at least the main factor in the creation of the spacial sense, how could we experience artistic delight in the contemplation of pictures—into which we read, as it were, the corporeality of the third dimension. Our eyes do not converge differently on the different points of the picture more or less distant according to the rules of perspective.

It will be noticed that the relief in a picture appears more perfect, if a frame set it off from the wall, and the best frames are those which have a high elevation at the outer margin and slope

down to the canvas of the picture. A good frame helps to intensify the illusion, and may be compared to looking out through a window upon a landscape beyond.

Perspective in combination with light and shade will naturally be interpreted as the third dimension. Thus in looking at a picture with one eye only, excluding the rest of the field of vision, (which is generally effected by using a tube) the illusion is more perfect than if we used both eyes. One eye cannot help but interpret a correct perspective combined with a faultless distribution of light and shade in the way acquired by heredity and experience, that is as an indication of the third dimension. The assistance of the second eye reveals many minute details which to a great extent destroys this illusion; and so does a comparison with the surroundings of a picture. Accordingly if these two sources of information are removed the relief in a picture will naturally appear more perfect.

Mr. Wake in his article "The Third Dimension in Monocular Vision" in the last number of *The Open Court* uses the expression *latent* perspective and maintains that if Mach's view is correct, it will not be necessary to have recourse to the psychological explanation of M. Binet. The term "latent perspective" does not appear to me an appropriate expression, for it can too easily be mistaken for some mystical quality objectively present in picture. If the term "latent perspective" is simply taken in the sense of *chiaroscuro*, we see no reason for the statement that there is a conflict between the explanation of Wundt and Mach on the one hand, and of M. Binet on the other. For the former is just as much "psychological" as the latter, which no more than the former denies the existence of a "physical basis in the picture itself." p.c.

BOOK REVIEWS.

FREETHINKING AND FREE INQUIRY. By *Agnosco*. London: W. Stuart & Co.

This little book (64 pages) is the "first part of a series of manuals to be devoted to sketching in outline a system of Rationalistic philosophy." The basis of the work, however, is the philosophy of Agnosticism, which the author regards as the demonstrated resultant truth of science; so that the reader must not expect to find a critically constructed body of principles, but a theory of things as viewed from the position assumed to be correct, of so-called Agnosticism.

It is one beauty of Agnosticism, when merely theoretically professed by competent and earnest investigators, that despite their belief in its truth and inefficacy, it can, by virtue of its own inherent, impotency never vitiate the results they arrive at. It is a pre-eminently useless and unnecessary adjunct to such work—the surplussage of philosophy; and were it not for its ethical tendency and disintegrative influence, might be entirely neglected. Thus, for instance, of what use is "that deepest, widest, and most certain of all facts, that the Power which the universe manifests to us is inscrutable," to "Agnosco," in his solution of the religious problem? He recognises that the religion of the future is to be a religion of science; he says it will "consist . . . in discovering the true action and import of nature's laws and understanding how best we may conform thereto"; and he recognizes that nature is the totality of all phenomena, and that it is regulated by unalterable laws the investigation of which is the object of science. If this is a *fact*, *not dependent on the existence of an external power known or unknown*, why should we concern ourselves or bother about a power that is not a power and that has no "power" to interfere in any way with its own creations, or "manifestations," but is *ex hypothesi*, by the irrefragibility of its own laws, placed *hors de combat* so far as regards any damage it can do? Its effect in the equations of practice and of thought is thus admittedly zero, and why should we not eliminate it? Instead of saying that this

Power is "unknowable," why not say unhesitatingly that it does not exist? The author has himself supplied the material and developed the logic to this conclusion.

And if this is true in the case of religion, how much more is it so in the case of metaphysics and physics. Except that here it is far from harmless. For, when we can say that force and matter are the dynamical and statical *differentiation* of one existence, "caused by some unknown and perhaps unknowable power," it is indeed conceivable that we should be able to hold that "phenomena are produced by the interaction of two *causes*—matter and force"; or that there is an "absolute truth," "as near as possible" to which it is the office of criticism "to lead us."

Aside from *fundamental* objections of this and a similar character, we find much to commend in "Agnosco's" little book—its style, its aptness of illustration, and its copious and well-put citations of scientific facts. Of the practical aspect of freethought, as currently conceived, it is representative. ицрк.

HERMETIC PHILOSOPHY. Including Lessons, General Discourses, and Explanations of "Fragments" from the schools of Egypt, Chaldea, Greece, Italy, Scandinavia, etc. Designed for Students of the Hermetic, Pythagorean, and Platonic Sciences, and Western Occultism. By an *Acolyte of the "H. B. of L."* Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.

This is the first of a series of volumes on "pure, mental, occult science." The series proposes to "lay" the system of Old Egypt, Chaldea, Greece, and other countries before students. The present volume deals with "Things That Are." Here are some of the 'things that are,' put in the form of maxims; viz.—"*Not every body is dissolvable*"; "*Some bodies are dissolvable*"; "*Not every body is sick, but every body that is sick is dissolvable*"; "*That which abides always is unchangeable*." The author justly says, à propos of these things, that "the course of reasoning and line of thought in this study and school require the exercise of a higher range of faculties than those which are directed exclusively to a contemplation of material and physical manifestations." We believe him; and are glad, when we contemplate the state of mind necessary to comprehend things of this sort, that we do not possess these faculties.

The "Hermetic Philosophy" is compiled of sentiments and excerpts from ancient and oriental authors of celebrity and authority. But they are compiled without *critique*, and to the ordinary mind, in most of their applications, appear silly—just as the doctrine of the Conservation of Energy, in all its truth, would appear silly if similarly put and similarly employed. ицрк.

THE FIVE REDEEMERS. By *M. J. Barnett.* Boston: H. A. Carter & Company, 1890.

The five redeemers or rather classes of redeemers of this work are mothers, teachers, employers, artists and priests. The title is not an unhappy one, for the condition of society largely depends on the way in which the persons standing in those relations towards their fellows perform the duties their positions impose on them. They are placed in the order in which their influence is felt by those subjected to it, and it is significant that while the first redeemer is the mother the last is the priest, the former being concerned with the beginning of life and the latter with its end, if his services are called into requisition at all. The book is episodically pervaded with notions of the science of "spiritual healing," "the science of metaphysics," and other sciences that are not sciences.

BOOK NOTICES.

"The Fruits of Culture," a comedy in four acts, by Count Leo Tolstói, translated by George Schumm, has recently been published by Benj. R. Tucker, Boston, Mass. The rendering is

fair: one of the characters is Tania, a young girl who in moments of powerful joyous excitement, "squeals."

"Teutscher Radikalismus in Amerika; ausgewählte Abhandlungen, Kritiken und Aphorismen aus den Jahren 1854-1879," by Karl Heinzen. Edited and arranged by Karl Schmemann. This paper-covered book, of 371 pages, is the first of a new series of volumes, to be three in number, which shall contain the chief and most valuable of Heinzen's journalistic performances as published between the years mentioned in the *Pioneer*, a German newspaper which he edited. Their importance from an ethical and historical point of view cannot be overestimated. Heinzen was in the truest sense of the word a man of his convictions. But his convictions were supplemented by a critical and cultured mind which supplied his steadfastness with the element that in this type of character is most commonly lacking. His writings will be read especially by the Germans of our country, who deserve so much of him: but they possess in point of acumen and verity, an independent value and applicability in the sphere of opinion generally, and might more than profitably be studied by us Americans who profess so much freedom and act so much despotism. (The Freidenker Pub. Co., Milwaukee.) L. G.

NOTES.

We learn with deep regret of the recent death of Mr. Josiah P. Mendum, proprietor and manager of the *Boston Investigator*. In the capacity of general director of the last-named liberal journal, Mr. Mendum labored in the interests of freethought for more than half a century. His activity has been almost wholly in the practical sphere. But his unselfish and persistent efforts have supplied a foundation on which others will be able to build, and his life-work has been, therefore, one of inestimable value to the ideas he espoused.

JUST PUBLISHED.

THE LOST MANUSCRIPT. A NOVEL. By GUSTAV FREYTAG. Authorised translation. In two volumes. Bound and Elegantly Bound. Price, \$4.00. The Open Court Pub. Co., Chicago.

THE OPEN COURT.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY BY

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO.

TERMS THROUGHOUT THE POSTAL UNION:

\$2.00 PER YEAR.

\$1.00 FOR SIX MONTHS.

AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND, AND TASMANIA, \$2.50 PER YEAR.

All communications should be addressed to

THE OPEN COURT,

(Nixon Building, 175 La Salle Street.)

P. O. DRAWER F.

CHICAGO, ILL.

CONTENTS OF NO. 180.

HALLUCINATIONS AND ALIENATION OF PERSONALITY. TH. RIBOT.....	2691
THE CHEMISTRY OF PLEASURE. J. C. F. GRUMBINE.....	2692
THE CONVENTION OF THE ANIMALS. A Fable.....	2695
THE SPECIAL SENSE. EDITOR.....	2697
BOOK REVIEWS.....	2697
BOOK NOTICES.....	2698
NOTES.....	2698