

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

EDITED BY THE HONORARY SECRETARY.

VOL. V.



LONDON :

(Published for the Institute)

ROBERT HARDWICKE, 192, PICCADILLY.

1871.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

ORDINARY MEETING, 18TH APRIL, 1870.

JAMES REDDIE, ESQ., HONORARY SECRETARY, IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read and confirmed.

The following election was announced :—

ASSOCIATE, 2ND CLASS.—Rev. B. W. Savile, M.A., of Exeter.

Also, the following presentation of books for the Library :—

“Astronomical Geology.” By R. G. M. Browne, Esq.

“Cause and Effect ; or, the Globe we Inhabit.” By the same.

From the Author.

The CHAIRMAN.—In calling upon Mr. Aubrey to read Dr. Hitchman's paper, I must say I am sorry that the author is not here to read it himself, because it is one of a somewhat peculiar character, and the subject matter has been made his especial study. Perhaps we made a mistake in having a meeting on Easter Monday, still the attendance is a little better than I expected. I have to add that Dr. Hitchman intended to be here, but, owing to the illness of his daughter, we are deprived of his presence ; and this being the case, must do the best we can in his absence.

The Secretary then read the following Paper :—

ON TRUE ANTHROPOLOGY ; OR, THE SPIRITUAL, MENTAL, AND PHYSICAL CONSTITUTION OF MAN. By W. HITCHMAN, ESQ., M.D., HON. LOCAL SEC. V.I., *Liverpool.*

Νοῦς ὁρᾷ καὶ νοῦς ἀκούει, τὰλλα κωφὰ καὶ τυφλά.

1. **B**Y True Anthropology, I understand, not only scientific researches into the Natural History of our Species, but the spiritual, mental, and physical Constitution of Man *fairly represented*. Humanity proper is not Animal Organization—it is the Neshamah of Lives. As ordinarily interpreted by Anthropological Societies, it means only the *historical* study of Man, mentally and physically. But surely there is no measureless distance between נִשְׁמַת אַנְשָׁה Anima sed humana tantum, and רִיחַ, Spiritus revertetur ad Deum.

In Science, the History of Animals is the History of Man. It would, I think, be an insuperably difficult task to frame a set of articles of belief, requiring a larger measure of unqualified credulity, than the scientific creed of modern Anthropology, or External Man. It runs thus: Spirit is an imaginary substance created by priests. I believe in Law, but no Law-giver; in the life-giving power of Force and Substance, Intelligence from Non-Intelligence, without conscious Author, and that Metaphysics and Theology deserve contempt. I believe in the natural cohesive magnetic formation of the Earth on which I dwell, and the origin of Man from Beast, as Efficient Cause of Permanent Human Types, the never-ending development of species, in animated nature generally, first by Spontaneous Generation, afterwards Natural Selection—sheer material strength, and consequent destruction of the weak, the sole guiding Power, visible reality the only reality. I believe in the eternity of matter, which sets itself in motion, and governs all worlds, and I look for the oldest *Homo Sapiens* in pliocene, or miocene strata, and that his fossilized bones will be found, on examination, to be either an Ape more anthropoid, or a man more pithecoïd, than any yet known, Neanderthal or Engis Cranium notwithstanding, the sure mortality of the Human Soul, which is but an attribute of Brain-Protoplasm, and the regular order of the whole Universe, from the inherent harmony of Cosmic periodicity, arising from Molecular Machinery, diversity of *origin*, and diversity of *kind*, in Man, together with the evolution of all living beings, one from another, Naturally. Fundamental Inequality reigns, but no God, apart from Matter.

2. NATURE, in Man and Animals, like everything *in* us and *about* us, is a Chaos, without Method. The very word, in Greek, is itself suggestive of progressive transition from one step to another; it necessarily implies a principle of unity with progression. The Supreme Light of Living Knowledge, as Coleridge has well remarked, is conceivable only as “*the relation of Law,*” absolutely perfect alone in God, who is *ἐν πάντι* and *πρὸ τῶν πάντων* also. Professor Huxley, like Dr. Carl Vogt, sneers at the idea either of spirit, or vitality, yet is ready enough to admit the existence of a “*subtle influence*” even in the essential operations of Protoplasm considered as the Physical Basis of Life and Mind in animated Nature. Vital actions, however, are peculiar to living beings, and cannot be *imitated* scientifically. Yet Nature, in Man and Animals, we are everywhere assured, both at home and abroad, is “*exclusively*” compounded of the ordinary chemical and physical forces of the Universe, the same in origin, progress,

and destiny; death itself, in point of fact, a relative, not an absolute condition. The thing men call dead is periplastic only, a few degrees less alive. All the Laws of our Spiritual, Mental, and Physical Nature, and the truths of the Science of Anthropology, must surely be in the facts or phenomena of each department respectively, before they are either discovered or conceived by the Philosopher.

3. MENTAL VARIETIES ARE GREATER THAN THE BODILY VARIETIES OF MAN.—Yet Professor Huxley is teaching the British people—both orally and oracularly—and that, too, with an earnestness and a zeal worthy of a *better* cause, that a particle of jelly is capable of “*guiding*” physical forces into exquisite—and mathematically arranged structures, *i.e.* the highest faculties are but modifications of the lowest functions, from the Oceanic Hydrozoa through every classification of Animal Organization, from the lowest Mind to the highest Soul—Man included, and that the doctrine in Teleology is utterly “*absurd*,” which supposes that the organ of vision, for example, such as we find it in the human eye, or that of the Anthropoid Ape, was created, or made for the purpose of enabling the being possessing it, to *see*! Such structures exhibit nothing more than the passing outcome of natural development from the accidentally exposed “*nerve*” of some primeval creature, during countless æons of geological ages. Physicists want millions of years for the *natural* manufacture of Men, from Animals, yet, in all three of the primary groups, Mollusca, Annulosa, and Vertebrata, there are species with beautifully developed organs of vision, involving the three great questions of anthropological inquiry; *viz.*, Faith, Science, and Philosophy,—science of the natural world, and its physical laws, faith in the existence of a future Life for Man, and the philosophy of eternal principles, involved in finite and infinite being, phenomenal forms of motion and mutation, manifesting the laws and forces which originate and govern various natures, through all the mighty commonwealth of things, anterior to sovereign Man, even in the Silurian period; so that these splendid eyes in a vast chain of animal structure and function dispersed over the globe, must have existed *anteriorly* to the Solar System, *i.e.* without any light at all, if we are to credit this sort of scientific teaching, which rules by force of lawless Law.

4. The origin of Protoplasm is, itself, *extra-scientific*, in my opinion, a physical basis of Life without adequate cause within the range of Physical Induction—certainly, whenever Britain, as the British people, gives up the truths of Man’s Spiritual Nature, the seal of its Humanity will be broken, and the

“mark of the beast” will be upon it, both now and for ever. Yes, the soul of Man—though repudiated by Anthropologists—is the only deathless element of his nature and constitution, and will find no lasting rest in all its philosophical experiments and best scientific observations, until it returns from such *exclusive* physical researches, and learns to behold itself in God, and God in all things. The relations of Man to the Lower Animals form the prime objects, on the present occasion, as *materials* of method; and the proper contemplation of those relations is the indispensable condition of discussing them methodically. The following method is, I think, the leading thought, as an act of the Mind, which shall unite, and make many things—*one*; Man, himself, in the science of True Anthropology, the key-note of the harmonies of Physical Science, in relation to the higher sentiments of the genus Homo, no matter whether his skin be red, white, black, or yellow, or his geographical distribution denominated Caucasian, Mongolian, American, Ethiopian, Malay, or any of its subdivisions. All those departments of the Science of Man which deal with the *material* elements of Animal Organization, can only be adequately investigated, or successfully prosecuted by the scientific methods belonging to the Philosophy of Matter. The Psychological departments of Organic Nature, or Brain Protoplasm, can, in like manner, only be satisfactorily investigated by the method belonging to the Science of Mind. Equally *true* is it that the Moral and Religious elements, which belong to Man, and to Man only, of all created beings known to this sphere, not only indicate, by their very existence, a method of inquiry, and a kind of evidence distinct altogether from those on which we base our scientific knowledge of Physical and Psychical phenomena in animals; but, also, involve in their essential character, absolutely, that *immediate* relation which they enjoy to the Great Father of All, who, in his wisdom, rules all; not as the mere Pantheistic Spirit of the Universe, but as the Lord and giver of our world of Humanity, who is not only the God of Nature, but the Moral Governor of the Human Soul. Man, I say, stands *alone* in the History of the Earth and animated Nature, co-ordinated by specific endowments with the materiality of this planet, apart, entirely, from every other organic being; no vertebrate type *equals* him, either morphologically or teleologically. The specific character, as well as specific structure, physiological economy, and final purpose of an animal, however much resembling Man, either in mind or body, external or internal conformation, are, in my opinion, conditioned *fundamentally* in its exclusively immutable psychical principle, in

short, an animal, however anthropoid, is an organism, restricted to the manifestation of psychological and physical phenomena, the same in kind, though differing in degree, from generation to generation; there is no true mental progression in any known species.

5. The movement-spring of Anthropology is man's tendency to rise and fall. It is a vast Ethnical beat, or periodicity, from Civilization to Barbarism, and from barbarism to civilization once more—in the minutest acts of our minds is the same secret, logical, physical, metaphysical, as in the entire universe. Consciousness is the Science of Reason, and therefore the Science of Man, the very end of human existence, I think, is this—that in *each* Life, Mankind may, but will not, order all their relations—spiritual, mental, or physical—with Freedom, according to Reason. Man is an animal; but he is something more than Protoplasm; begotten of Spontaneous Generation and Natural Selection. From Soul to Spirit is a leap too great for Nature to accomplish. This fact of itself points out irrefragable considerations against the absolute reality of the "identical" structural gradation of the Human Race from Apes, according to mere exterior or interior resemblance, "Ὅμοιος is not Idem, either in Science or Religion. Teleology is not a prudent virgin that weds Heaven, and consequently produces nothing for the World. In the present Gulstonian Lectures on "Body and Mind," Metaphysicians seem classed as of the same order of philosophers as religious ascetics and maniacs! At least, Professor Maudsley says,—We shall make no progress towards a mental science if we begin by *depreciating* the body, not by *disdaining* it, as Metaphysicians, religious ascetics, and maniacs have done; still it may well be, as De Quincey surmised, the opening of the book at the Day of Judgment shall be the unfolding of the everlasting scroll of human memory (*Lancet*, Report). Obviously, therefore, the learned College-Professor does not himself choose to put off that which he cannot now make fit into the materialistic side of consciousness and organization. He carries us up his anatomical ladder, from gradation to gradation, aided mainly by Flourens' Pigeon, higher and higher up to Man,—“the misinterpretation of whose mind constitutes what has *hitherto* (but, of course, no longer) claimed to be Mental Philosophy;” and having truly declared that Science cannot touch this question, he descends metaphysically, after all, from that physical review of Comparative Psychology. The distinctive character of Man, however pithecoïd, consists, as a *starting-point*, in the moral faculty of subordinating that same mental and physical organism to his exclusively human

spiritual principle; and to this same spiritual principle man owes, not alone the faculty of speech, but that *self-conscious* intelligence of right and wrong, in an ethical point of view, on which depends, not alone the genius of Intellectuality, whether in highest cultivation or lowest debasement, but his sense of responsibility to God—bestowed upon him for his eternal welfare here and hereafter—and that too in obedience to the fulfilment of a Divine purpose. This is Man's true place in Nature, and his *only* relations to the lower animals. The formation of a crystal, a plant, an animal, or a man, is, in their eyes as Anthropologists, an exclusively *mechanical* problem—degenerated anatomical characters of crania, in the different races of Men; *e.g.* dolichocephalic, prognathous, brachycephalic, orthognathous, round-headed, oval-headed, oblong-headed, micro-cephalic or *headless*, from the ethnological antipodes, differ in the same way only as do the skulls of lower mammals—as though the tender, the sweet, and the lovely, in the physical world, were bequeathed to us as a legacy of mere temporary and sensual delight, that had *no* anterior or superior truth, beauty, and purity, in the spiritual and eternal Nature of our Heavenly Father, which cause our hearts and minds to vibrate—yea, our very souls to tremble and yearn for closer intercourse with Him from Whom all science springs!

6. No crystal, plant, or animal yet known to Natural History, however complex or wonderful the mechanism, can enter the spiritual domain set forth in the words, *I think, I feel, I speak*. Self-consciousness alone infuses itself into *that* problem. However rough the human casket, the jewel is there. Show the soul, the grand distinguishing prerogative of Man, cultivate the mind, soften the heart, Christianize Humanity, and the *religiosity* of the beast-child, the boy-wolf, or, like Ignatius Sancho and Gustavus Vasa, born in a slave-ship, wakens them up into the refined citizens of London or Paris, and the literary as well as philosophical ornaments of modern Europe.

7. Bishop Hurd said of Lord Bolingbroke, that he was of that sect which, to avoid a more *odious* name, chose to distinguish itself by that of Naturalist. Yes, a Naturalist, two hundred years ago, was a persistent denier of *all* spiritual Truth, an exclusive believer in natural phenomena, an investigator of Nature and its Laws; and the word remains true to its etymology at this moment, the mode of origin of the different species of men, historically or pre-historically considered, and their development from mammiferous quadrupeds are identical in all respects with those of the apes. The human ovum tells the same story as that of any other vertebrate

animal,—lizard, snake, frog, or dog—and that, too, in every essential particular; nay, more, the science of Anthropology is but the physical history of animal vicissitudes in which Accident is the only design!

8. About the year 1670, *mental* action, both in Man and animals, was generally regarded as a mere function of the brain. The cerebral organ was then looked upon as a sort of gland, by which thoughts were secreted. The expression adopted by Professor Carl Vogt at the German Congress in 1869, viz. Thought is a secretion of Brain-Protoplasm, had its certain prototype in the ancient days, when ideas were physically estimated as things entirely “of the earth, earthy”—material substances, in fact, closely allied to the bile—the saliva, and the gastric juice. Free-will was but a kind of subtle matter, identical with the nervous framework of the human organism. It seems not to have occurred to these scientific materialists, that function implies an act in which material changes can be weighed, or measured; an act, moreover, in which Mind in Man and animals, is *in no wise* concerned. The clay design of the sceptic in 1670 is the very prototype of the statue afterwards executed in marble, A.D. 1870.

9. In every part of our being—beyond the limits of humanity physical—there dwells Divinity above disputing. Mind everlasting *precedes* the Life of things material. Anthropologists have a strong love and deep conviction of the truth of beauty, but they are not guiltless of a partial abandonment of justice in denying the whole beauty of Truth. The science of Man, as it is commonly understood, represents, or rather aspires to represent, only the physical and mental aspects of Human Nature, that is to say—*one set of interests, exclusively*. Such Anthropologists aim to be the modern apostles of Naturalism, or Materialistic Philosophy. Man, like the Universe itself, arises out of modifications of matter, which are self-existent and self-directed; they repudiate the existence of Soul *utterly*, and regard the functions of Life, Sensation, and Thought as pertaining only to the domain of Natural History—on the contrary, I am of opinion, that True Anthropology cannot recognize special phenomena of one class only, but the whole history of the human constitution in its integrity—any other representation of the Science of Man is not *just* to eternal Truth; it is, in fact, neither more nor less than a retrogressive movement, repugnant, I hope, to the spirit of our age and nation. Such scientific principles, we know, abounded at the period of the French Revolution, and continued to agitate England for years—the religiosity of Man

was seared, as with burning steel,—“our fathers worshipped stocks and stones,” but our brethren worship flints and bones!

10. About that time, 1668, Dr. Cudworth published his principal work—“The true Intellectual System of the Universe,” as a philosophical refutation of the atheistical tenets then, as now, widely prevalent all over England; then, as now, too, science of the exclusive and bigoted physical sort, was to effect the complete “*restoration*” of mankind—morally and permanently—there being *no* existence except the fleeting present; natural knowledge was almost universally held to be the All in All—the “one thing needful,” for Mind and Body—from dust to dust was man’s only pilgrimage in 1670—his nature and constitution “*identical*” with those of animals, in origin, progress, and destiny—and from Protoplasm to Protoplasm is the highest and best march of science in 1870, the spiritual nobility of Manhood is gone, in substance and in structure, in organ or in function; he is *one* with the brute—their common parents—Spontaneous Generation and Natural Selection: in other words, “Her Wound is incurable, for it is come unto Judah.” Flint and Bone teaching has resulted in the pretended discovery of a body “without a soul”—spiritual being has no *locus standi* in the modern science of Man, past, present, or future; heroism requited with misery, religiosity without heart or hope, vice adorned with coronets, the nobility of virtue in chains, want, disease, violence, bloodshed, meet us everywhere; the arm of science, withal, impotent and helpless to succour or to save—our creed—rationalism, the ape for an ancestor, man greater than his Maker, an earth without a Heaven, and a world without a God. Vanity of vanities is *this* science of sciences; the aim of Anthropology was, and is, the *exclusive* aggrandisement of flesh and blood—its sure end is the grave, and its true epitaph, Ichabod, for where *is* the glory if it be not in shame? Such scientific investigations are one-sided, and *ex-parte* men search for the *ego* when its habitation is desolate; meanwhile, the *ego*, having escaped, they deny its existence! “What man is there of you, whom, if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone?” Anthropology in London, Paris, Vienna, and Madrid, has disdained to draw upon any department of true spiritual knowledge, which *could* throw more light on the subjects which it investigates. Although Jews, Greeks, Germans, Indians, were never wholly destitute of spiritual culture, Science deals in the swinish husks of physical phenomena alone, on which the soul of Man must *starve* and perish, for we shall never fly by feeding on birds, neither will worms ever speak by feeding on us—no possible amount of human brains will enable the grass on our

graves to *reason*. It is in passing from the region of scientific facts, to that of laws which govern the Human Mind, that Man can ever take his true position, either in the scale of Nature, or that of Spiritual Beings. Men of Science would have us believe nothing whatever in the philosophy of Mind, whether belonging to what they call the different *species* of men-mammalia, birds, reptiles, fishes, and so forth, beyond the *material* cause and effect—the physiological function of an anatomical organ. Hemispherical ganglia are now held to be the sole identical representatives of $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$, as well in the science of Anthropology as in that of Zoology; in fact, Anthropology is *Neo-Biology*, and would seem to imply little else than a knowledge of the science of animal Life, and the outward *forms* of Mankind; it explored the lowest depths of Superstition, and treats largely of idol-worship, as though Religion were but a *terrestrial Fungus—fetid and poisonous!*

11. Whatever the classification, in the midst of past or present organic remains, mind, according to some British and Foreign Anthropologists, is the attribute of Brain-Protoplasm only; in a word, their Science is *materialistic* in essence. Recent singular facts and coincidences appear to favour existing doctrines respecting the localization of the human intellectual faculties; but others, probably still more remarkable, are utterly opposed to them. It is quite certain that, in many of the lowest animals, no relation whatever can be discovered between astounding mental faculties and the physical conformation of their nervous systems, calculated, in any scientific way, to explain such psychical phenomena as wholly depend upon anatomical structure; indeed, were such material relations traced to particular parts in the Vertebrata, which has not yet been done, the same exegesis would by no means apply to the Invertebrate kingdom, even more singularly endowed with instinctive and rational faculties, and in which the central organs of the nervous system are represented, not by Brain-Protoplasm, but by slender cords, or ganglionic chains, which, as we advance in the scale of animals, become double, and traverse the body as ganglions; still Life and Mind do not seem to require even the aid of *this* nervous arrangement in some of the lower Zoophytes. Again, what *sort* of Man does Anthropology represent? Black women have white daughters, and white women have black sons; some are six-fingered, others are six-toed, with long ears, which they move like mules. Some have an excess of teeth, breasts, ears, together with other differences, internal as well as external. In addition to being born deaf, dumb, and blind, from age to age, endless varieties of formation are transmitted

and *perpetuated* for hundreds of years; madness, even to the nightly howling and barking, like dogs; hare-lip, &c.; squinting; "horns" and "tails," with spotted skins, covered from head to foot with long silky hairs, like those of *Pithecius Satyrus*, and of a reddish-brown colour, too; club-foot, hunchback, and the gift of second sight; physical and moral diversities, moreover, surpassing in extent those founded by the great families of ancient Rome; some men have skins like the bark of a tree, whilst the common integument of others resembles the pachydermatous covering of the elephant, or rhinoceros, looking and rustling like the bristles of a hedgehog or the quills of a porcupine. Some are giants, whilst others are dwarfs. Many girls, not Welsh, fast for fifty days; many boys sleep for a yet longer period. Some anthropological specimens live in the hollow of a stone, and subsist mostly upon dirt. Must we, therefore, deem it unequivocally true, that millions of years ago primeval man walked on all fours, and arrived at perfection by eating pipeclay?

12. Animals exist without any central organ of the nervous system that can be either scientifically or truthfully called Brain, and yet are endowed with unequivocal mental phenomena. To such an extent is this the fact, that bodies may be divided into several distinct and independent portions, still each separate and detached part is capable of manifesting special will, special faculties, and special desires, even when the mental principle, which is certainly not of an exclusively material nature, has been divided and subdivided over and over again. Brain, ganglions, or nervous cords; and what is more, even nervous matter diffused among the granulated bodies which form animal structure in some gelatinous zoophytes, afford no adequate solution of the scientific difficulty in which the advocates of an exclusive physical basis of Life and Mind find themselves, on *this* and many *other* occasions. Seeing these things are so, as a matter of incontestable fact, derived from philosophical experiments, after removing the cerebral hemispheres, and scientific observations upon animals yet lower in the scale of animated nature, how fare the statements of Professor Tyndall and others, so industriously circulated all over the kingdom, that Mind is known to Man "*only*" as dependent upon the Physics of the Brain, and that with this fact before him the infidel is secure in his position against all attacks? Sensori-motor functions prove conclusively that Mind has *not* its only seat of action in the Brain itself; the mental principle is assuredly divisible in Planaria, Polypi, and Annelida; and, moreover, the Naïdes and Nereides propagate their species by *spontaneous* division. The truth

is, Mind, in these lower animals, is divisible, whether it be or be not *identical* with their vital principle :—

“ On Earth there is nothing great but Man,
 In Man there is nothing great but Mind.”

13. The Spirit of Man is a special creation, capable of union either with God or the Devil. The Anthropologists, of these our days, found societies in London, Paris, Madrid, and Vienna, for the maintenance and propagation only of their own exclusive Physical History of The Human Species. It is held to be no part of True Anthropology to admit the existence of a Religious and Moral Nature in the souls of Mankind at large, the world over, upon any *kind* of testimony, however irrefragable, whether it be called Spiritual, Mental, or Physical. In *their* science of Man, Religion, itself, is mere systematic idolatry and sordid priestcraft. Mythology, and Tradition, Hindu or Christian, the Rig-Veda Sanhita is as truly spiritual or heavenly as the Hebrew Scriptures, and O-Kee-Pa, as an “inspired” ceremony of the Mandans, equal in value to either of the sacraments of the Church of England. Idolatrous worship in India may be taught and illustrated in Essays, Papers, and Lectures of singular “beauty” and profound importance, but the fairest Advocates of demonstrative Religiosity, true in sentiment and fact, in principle or practice, in proving the spiritual realities of the Universal Heart and Consciousness in every variety of the Human Race, are held only to “assume” the real in Man, historically and pre-historically. These *necessary* truths, as I conceive them to be, are held not to partake of the Absolute; the inscription of Aristotle, *τὰ μετὰ τὰ φυσικά*, is altogether untrue. Surely there *is* some distinction to be drawn between Israel purified and Israel disgraced; equally certain is it, in my judgment, that there exists as wide a gulf between true and false Religion as there is between light and darkness, or good and evil. The Science of Man, to be worthy of its high and noble calling, must include Human Nature, as we find it, in every geographical distribution of the genus Homo; whether found in the drawing-room of an Emperor’s palace or in the natural caverns of Bruniquel, during the Rein-deer period; the wild pithecoïd races of North-Western Europe, spoken of by Latin writers, or the members of the Victoria Institute. Absolute inequality of Neshamah is not demonstrable by Physical characteristics. “To do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God,” is *no* part of the modern Science of Man; but the utter prostitution of our Spiritual Nature, originating in,

and perpetuated by, the direst superstition, IS officially recognized and duly approved, as an essential ingredient of the best quality, if not the highest form of True Anthropology, "fables false as Hell yet deemed oracular."* Why is the Religion of the *Heart* ignored, as a duty to God, whether we speak of the Greek, Hindu, Jewish, Christian, or Mohammedan *Faith*?

14. Is such the rational Logic of Intellectual Philosophy? At all events, I am of opinion, as I have ever been, that the Science of Man, in the broad and catholic sense of that comprehensive and generic term, *must* include every department of Human Nature, whether regarded as pure or impure, mental or physical, moral or spiritual, or, whatever the "*science*" may consist of, there will not be much true knowledge of Man. The superstitious part of recent Anthropology was assuredly known to Ezekiel; and was he not the son of Buzi, and descendant of Aaron, when, carried away captive to Babylon 2,467 years before they were so *gratefully* appreciated, either by the British Association for the Advancement of Science or the German Congress of Physicians and Natural Philosophers? Yes, and were witheringly denounced by him as a morbid perversion of that which is holy and good, sublime, beautiful, and true in the nature and constitution of the human soul; he "caused Jerusalem to know her abominations," and that, too, in language of such bold, vehement, and tragic dignity, in a gorgeous and majestic style of rich oriental splendour, as will never be equalled by all the Anthropologists of Christendom, Jew or Gentile, to the end of time. Such is the protoplasm of Spirit! This is the true life in Man; it cannot be *seen*, but it can be *felt*. Life springs from Life in the spiritual as much as in the mental and physical world, and no scientific or philosophical experiments have yet proved that germinal Matter, which has never lived, has still been *seen* passing into vitality. The Human Soul is real, though alike invisible and intangible. The Crania of the *ancient Races* of Men were the same as those of A.D. 1870. The objects we have to deal with when we are reflecting on or studying the science of Mind, and, therefore, the science of Man, are in absolute *contrast* with those we are investigating when we are scientifically observing visible and tangible things, or experimenting amid Brains and Bones. The former are, from their very spiritual nature and divine

* Existing savages, in my opinion, are the degenerate offshoots of more civilized races, at least we have no adequate proofs that different communities *have* raised themselves, unaided, from the lowest to the highest forms of civilization. The Bushmen of Papua do not evolve Humboldts, Shaksperes, or St. Augustines.

constitution, wholly unextended, and have *no* temporal solidity, either for our hands to grasp or retain, as æriform bodies, in space. The latter are solid and useful occupants of places in *time*.

15. The issue is this. All true Anthropology has not only a moral origin, but a moral tendency, and I submit, with becoming deference, that no Anthropologist, in the present state of Science, is justified in being so dogmatically *exclusive*. However much he may be "distinguished" for his knowledge of strange peculiarities, observed by religious Moscovites, called Scoptsi, or the physical characteristics of ancient organic remains—force and matter—the plurality of the Human Race—the mythological tales of savage Africa—of the Esquimaux of Greenland, or the lacustrine habitations of "primeval" Man—anti-missionary labours—pre-historic hut-circles—shell-mounds—tumuli—the phenomena of hybridity in the genus *Homo*—the Negro's place in Jamaica, or elsewhere—"religious" faiths, embodied in ancient names—*artificial* deformities of crania, heredity—inequality—cerebral physiology, or materialism—in short, he may know thoroughly well the whole anthropology of primitive peoples, however scientifically distinguished in all this one-sided lore, I repeat, he is acquainted only with Man in his physical and mental aspects. Wisdom abideth not in *them*; he cannot thus ascertain his true place in Nature, or his true relations to inferior forms of Life and Mind. No amount of patient investigation, careful induction, or encouragement of scientific researches, will ever establish a *de facto* knowledge of Man—that is, Man as he is—the world over, in every geographical distribution and variety. And why? Because the Anthropologist in question has gratuitously and erroneously adopted a vicious, mutilated, and completely *deformed* method. The soul of Man speaks all Languages, and in all nations; but its nature or constitution is purely spiritual. In physical history man is closely allied to animals, both in flesh and blood; and with them he enjoys, somewhat in common, both mental and bodily phenomena. Every tissue and function of his structural organization may not only be strictly homologous, but likewise compounded of the chemical and physical forces of the Universe. Still, the being who is the subject or object of all these inquiries in natural history is at the end thereof discovered to be an organism "without a soul." An organic being, therefore, "without a soul" is *less* than Man—he is a beast; and his science is Zoology, and not Anthropology at all.

16. Viewed in the exclusive light of Physical Science,

the distinctions between Plant, Animal, and Man almost merge into perfect *identity*; for example, the Amœba is a shapeless mass of irritable Protoplasm apparently devoid of all organs; yet it is an animal creature, eating without a stomach, moving without muscles and without limbs, feeling without nerves, breathing without lungs, and nourished without blood. There are also creatures, equally shapeless, composed of structureless protoplasm, alike irritable by virtue of their power to feel and move. Dr. Kühne, of Leipsic, has already built them up into *vegetable* muscles, and can make them lift a weight, as though in grateful acknowledgment of their sensibility in feeling a galvanic shock; so that Plants, like Animals, move and feel; and in both the cycle of Life comes round to a small dot in the ovule of the one, as in the ovum of the other. Still the life-story of the green-pond scum is *not* that of the grain of wheat; neither is the heart of a fungus that of a man. Spirit, Mind, and Matter are not all identical; for if in the world of materiality the human body, like other bodies, is built up of protoplasm, there is yet a world of Intellect, where all is mind to mind, as there is just as certainly a kingdom of spirits, where all is spirit to spirit. Identification of the human skull with the spinal vertebræ of Apes does not account for Pure Reason: Thought and Religiosity in the soul of the former, and their significant absence in the brains of the latter. Protoplasm may, in short, be even "the moving creature that hath life;" but it was not for that *physical* basis of Man that Christianity was actually founded upon the grave of the risen Saviour. His spiritual kingdom "is not of this world," and is wholly independent of all the Races and Nations—both now and for ever. Surely the *quid est* of spirit, whatever can be predicated thereof, as either descriptively or historically true, belongs properly to Spiritual Philosophy. The *quid est* of Mind belongs to Mental Science, just in the same way as the *quid est*, or what it is, of matter belongs to Physical Science. These sciences are wholly distinct from each other, yet have their respective *truthful* foundations in the nature and constitution of Man himself. No wonder, therefore, that the exclusive Materialist, in such one-sided circumstances, should discover only a *beast* origin for Man, and that vital and mental phenomena are but physical and chemical phenomena, and that all living organic beings, Man himself included, are comprised in one word—Protoplasm.

17. Sometimes we meet with Professors of Science who are highly original in their suggestions, but singularly loose in verifying them. Metaphysicians are said to "*assume*" the truth of everything, and to prove nothing; yet Materialists might

themselves have the benefit of this compliment. We are now told fortnightly, with an *extra* review on Saturdays, that Memory exists in every organic element of the human body, and that Nature leaves scars on our fingers, for example, in "*remembrance*" of the injuries she has sustained, and vindictively refuses to deposit normal tissue! "*We*" may forget external or internal disease, but "*it*" will not forget "*us*"! Possibly, therefore, every other organic structure has its book of remembrances; if so, what will betide the bald-pated Philosophers? Organic registrations must be countless. It is not easy to admit these "arguments" to be incontrovertible reasons. Who or what, *inter alia*, is the "*it*" which will not forget "*us*"?—(Vide *Lancet*, March 26th, 1870, "On the Relations of Body and Mind," by Professor Maudsley.) It is the old, old story, that Life and Thought in Mankind at large are but mechanical products of molecular machinery. It results from the Professor's considerations, that there is no special faculty of memory; *ergo*, almost every possible act of the human mind, according to this sort of logic, is neither more nor less than memory. No idea is ever lost, it is reduced to equilibrium, and when latent is rendered active by Association. The anatomy of Man, we are further assured, under the heading of "*academical*" Science and Philosophy, is like a steam-engine with the fire out, and nothing in the boiler; but the body of living Man is a beautifully-formed machine, made up of those molecular properties, which, it is no less certain, once lay with the world itself, potentially, in cosmic vapour! In other words, vital movements are mechanical movements, and mechanical movements are vital movements.

18. The Science of Anthropology, as now taught, is neither more nor less than unmitigated Materialism—our most spiritual states are "*but*" physical and chemical processes. Every fact of human consciousness, whether in the domain of Thought, Sensation, or Emotion, is "*but*" the corresponding result of a certain definite "*molecular*" condition of the cerebral organ; *i.e.*, given the molecular state of the brain, the corresponding thought may be scientifically inferred. The growth of the animal body is "*mechanical*," says Professor Tyndall, and Thought, as exercised by man, has its correlative in the physics of Brain, and the materialist will be able *finally* to maintain this scientific position against all attacks! By the modification of pithecoïd form, Man has probably become what he is, says Professor Huxley. The "*most*" ancient Races of Men, we are assured, fashioned flint axes, and flint knives, and bone skewers of the same pattern as those fabricated by the "*lowest*" savages at the present day, and the

habits and modes of living of men have remained the "same" from the time of the Mammoth and the tichorhin Rhinoceros "till now"! The scientific crown, therefore, awaits the Anthropologist, who shall yet have the good fortune to discover, in still older strata, the fossilized bones of an Ape more anthropoid or a Man more pithecoïd, with the possible epitaph, Here lie the mortal remains of the Intermediate Vertebrates! Physical conditions do *not* account for organized intellectual *differences* from the *same* cell. In a recent course of "Lectures on Man," I have taught that there exist the strongest reasons for establishing a close anatomical and physiological similitude of structure and function between *Homo Sapiens* and the Anthropoid Mammalia, *e.g.*, as with no other vertebrates, the optic nerves open directly in the cerebral hemispheres; hence man and ape perceive their sensations alike, but there is no *identity* in Nature; *i.e.*, I acknowledge an Ideal Series between Types, but not a Lineal Series physically.

19. Nations rise and fall, yet there are Races which certainly were never Savages. Whatever may be said about the past physical History of Mankind, in regard to skulls, worked stones, tumuli, caverns, flints, and bones, Race-Legislation, mythology, superstitions, idolatrous worship, or comparison of man with the lower animals, as being the *essentials* of modern Anthropology, which, by the way, is defined by *la Soc. d'Anthropologie*, Paris, as "the scientific study of the Races of Men," Religion *must* be duly considered in every true Science of Man, and not superstition merely. Religion, in my opinion, cannot be scientifically ignored by any Anthropological Society, British or Foreign, *unless Man himself be excluded*. Religiosity is the anthropological character; even the psychological characters of the different races cannot be adequately investigated without discovering the inexorable influence of monotheism, or polytheism, upon them. That Man is diverse in *origin*, and diverse in *kind*, and derived naturally from lower animals, is, like the statement that Brain originates Mind and Thought, a *molecular* phenomenon, an hypothesis in each case as old as Philosophy itself. These theories have their day, are forgotten, as in 1670, and revived in 1870. Their authors are usually men of large intellects but small hearts. Did time permit, I could demonstrate almost every *recent* theory, now so assiduously propagated as "Science of Man," in the *ancient* speculations of former Materialists throughout the History of Philosophy, from the Ape origin of Man to primordial utericle, molecular machinery included, or with the conditions reversed, withal the scientific infidel stands but very insecurely, on a broken leg, and sandy foundation; for, supposing it "*proved*,"

which has not yet been done, that every living being had its physical basis in the same cell or the same nucleus, protoplasm, the all-in-all, Experiments in Physics are inconclusive, because new consequents demand new antecedents, spiritual Philosophy enables its faithful and devoted Alumni to look and smile on the raging tempests of modern science, with all its fussy and evanescent Eurekas, well knowing as they *do* that the true *cause* of the variety of Classes, Families, Genera, and Species of Man, Animal, or Plant, resides NOT in the physical and chemical phenomena of the germ, or Life-matter, but in the Divine Idea, or Nature, "after their kind," implanted in each, when *conditioned* fundamentally, that is "In beginning," at its special creation by God, בְּרֵאשִׁית who is "the same, yesterday, to-day, and for ever." Natural Science *must* be considered philosophically. Man is endowed with a spiritual nature, or moral faculty, wholly independent of the material Life which he has in common with the rest of creation.

20. Recent writers on the physiology of Matter are entirely mistaken, I submit, in viewing the brain, spinal cord, or sensory ganglia, as exclusive agents in all intellectual and mental processes, of whatever kind. I do not believe that impressions or ideas are absolutely dependent upon the physics or chemistry of nervous centres. The simple operation of Will is certainly exempt, in numerous animals, from any such fettered connexion with material processes, and as regards the immediate dependence of the human soul upon the organized structure of Brain-Protoplasm, it is independently active, rather than physically acted upon; its association with ganglionic nuclei of the senses is often both circumscribed and partial; in fact, the anatomical basis of Thought is but a temporary instrument subserving spiritual functions. The nature of mind no physical science is competent to interpret or explain. Time after time the light of speculation at the College of Physicians has left one landscape to shine briefly upon another, always darkened by deepest shadows, like giant forms of vanities on their way to hopeless ruin—*Edipo conjectore opus est*. The proper study of mankind, by which I understand its synonymic expression, True Anthropology, implies an adequate knowledge of the spiritual, mental, and physical history of the whole human race, whether sacred or profane. *Homo sapiens* I interpret to signify a deathless spirit, clad in organization, and, therefore, adapted divinely to the materiality of this planet, "to replenish the earth and subdue it." Man is the incarnation

of Thought, and the protoplasm of the elementary tissues of his temporary physical organization, ganglionic, sensory, or motor, is no more the *man himself* than were these stones, when in the quarry, the building in which we are now assembled. The history of humanity is an involution of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen, together with something more struck into spirit! Every organ and function of *T. Gorilla* may be strictly homologous with those of *Homo sapiens*—still Man is not *of* the brute scientifically. I resist the conclusions of modern Anthropologists as utterly undemonstrable—that the natural history of the human race, and that of Anthropoid Mammalia, is alike in Protoplasm, and therefore “*identical*” in faculty of Nature. Neither Tyndall nor Darwin—with Huxley and Maudsley to boot—whether molecularists or naturalists, are able even now, in the year 1870, to level up the difference between Organic and Inorganic, or between genera and genera, species and species; scientific differences yet *persist*; a natural growth from the moss to the monkey, excludes Man, the deathless, from its involution, for he is, as I have said, the incarnation of Thought, founded in the Divine Idea, and therefore independent of Natural Selection—terrestrially, morphologically, or teleologically—yes, Spirituality is the essential *gage* in true Anthropometry, and is not the exclusive offspring of chemical force or material substance. Religiosity is the ultimate fact of Human, as contradistinguished from Animal Organism, dependent upon no *ex-parte* physical basis, but as the bright gem in the crown of Human Life it scatters the dark and gloomy perplexities that cloud our earthly horizon, by whose native splendour, wrapt in a glory all its own, we are enabled to read that the writing of God, in the Book of Revelation, holds the same language of Truth as the writing, not less His, in the Book of Nature, for it shines on “the path of the just as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.” Physico-Zoic, or Pneumatico-Zoic,—these things, in all Race-Amalgamation, are Cause and Effect; therefore we have spiritual phenomena no less certain than those of Physics:—

“I argue not

Against Heaven's hand or will, nor bate a jot
Of heart or hope, but still bear up, and steer
Right onwards.”

21. Lastly, Justice to Truth constrains me to recapitulate—True Anthropology is the *synonymic* of Physical Researches into the history of our species, and the Spirit-

tual, Mental, and Material Constitution of Man, *fairly represented*. The I feel, I think, I speak, is not only the chief gateway into the Temple of Science, but is the entire intellectual basis of Physical and Metaphysical, Moral and Religious Knowledge. Were all the Orangas and the Gibbons, the Chimpanzees and Gorillas, collected together, and put into *one* being, they can neither constitute Humanity proper, nor the Neshamah of lives, for the true root of Animated Nature is in the Supersensible and Divine—past, present, and to come. The conclusions of necessary and demonstrated Truths are not mere optional scientific *opinions*, to be embraced or not, as Anthropologists please; they are insuperable necessities of Thinking, to understand and appreciate which is to assent to them. They appeal not to the feelings of men, but exclusively to their catholic Reason. If Anthropology is to include *Man*, it must not exclude the history of his *Spiritual* Constitution. Whilst acknowledging that there is a period of development, when the entire organism of every living thing consists of a particle of jelly, throughout each classification of the Animal and Vegetable Kingdoms,—of one molecule of clear, transparent, structureless matter,—whether destined to be Plant, Mammal, or Man, a centre of force capable of moving in all directions, which undergoes Division and Sub-division as it grows; and while in all these material things most wonderful chemical and physical living changes occur, let us never forget that there are altogether other astounding actions which constitute the matchless *difference* in nature or kind—actions as essential as they are peculiar to each *different* Life and Mind, quite of an immaterial eventuation, and capable of overcoming, by the Will of God, in the Constitution of Man all such physical and chemical attractions of Force or Matter; this—the spirituality of each one's real innermost being is the touchstone of Humanity, and is neither deprived of its being nor its active reality by the death of Protoplasm. In short, Truths—Spiritual, Mental, and Physical—are each and all exhibited to our view by the light of their own evidence, even as “one star differeth from another star in glory.”

The CHAIRMAN.—I have now to propose a vote of thanks to the author of the paper which has just been read, and I have no doubt that you will all cordially concur in this proposition. (Hear.) It is very much to be regretted that he is not able to be present, because, as I have already said, the paper is one of a somewhat peculiar character, and although I do not anticipate that there will be any difference of opinion amongst us with respect to the author's conclusions, yet I think it not unlikely that there may be some pas-

sages as to the precise meaning of which many of us may require a little enlightenment. I shall be glad to hear any remarks from those present, not only the members of the Institute, but also the strangers who have been invited here. The paper certainly opens up a wide field, but I do not suppose any one in this society will assert that the spiritual nature of man ought to be excluded from true anthropology, nor have I heard that the anthropologists of London, or, so far as I am acquainted with them, of Paris, deny this.

Rev. C. A. Row.—I wish you would interpret some portions of the paper which I find very great difficulty in understanding.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think it ought to be for you to state where the difficulties lie, and we shall be able to see what they are.

Dr. DENDY.—As you have invited those who are here as visitors as well as members of the society to join in the discussion, and as time is valuable, I rise in order to break silence and in the hope that I may induce some one else to follow. I believe that the reason discussion has been a little suspended is because the paper is so comprehensive that it is almost impossible to take hold of one single sentence among so many. If I understand the author aright—for with all due praise for the beauty of his paper I must confess that it is almost impossible to understand whether he is a true anthropologist or a false one—his idea is that there is an endowment superadded to structure, an endowment which he calls spirit, or soul, which is manifested to our senses, communicated through one individual to another, and without the intermediate matter of which the brain is composed. Now this appears to me to be an utter impossibility, unless we are to say that all human intellect is inspiration—special inspiration from the Deity,—and that, I think, neither you, Sir, nor the false anthropologists who are alluded to by the author of the paper, would agree to. That the brain is the organ of the mind there cannot, in my opinion, be the slightest question. Then we must ask whether the mind is an immortal spirit, whether the soul is mind unfettered by matter, and the mind soul combined with matter? There is the great question. Now, if you ask me whether mind can be manifested without matter I should decidedly say, “no.” What do we see in the senses? Probably this is a little material, for I am about to refer to the organ of vision. The eye does not see: it is not the eye itself that sees. The truth is that a ray of light passes through the cornea to the retina, where it is inverted, but we know that if we divide the optic nerve just behind the retina, and all the rays of light in the world were to be concentrated upon the retina, there would be no sensation such as we call vision; and therefore it is not the organ of vision—it is not the eye—that sees, but it is something else. Well, what is that something else? Here is an impression of the object upon the retina, and that impression is carried into the brain by the nerve which performs that function, and then we have the sensation of sight. Now, I believe that the sensation of sight, the faculty of vision, is one of the elements of the mind, and therefore we can scarcely admit that any immortal spirit is concerned in producing the impression. In my opinion there is an endowment,

—my opinion is made up upon that point; but that that endowment is in an inert condition unless through the manifestation of matter. Of course we must not venture to allude to the state of the immortal spirit after death: that is quite another question; but during life, as regards the manifestation of all our faculties, there is no question about what organization is concerned in that manifestation. We know that certain impressions made upon the mind will produce sickness. The receipt of unfortunate news, the witnessing of an operation—in the case of a person unaccustomed to such sights—will produce instant nausea and vomiting; but that is sympathy, and has nothing to do with the original impression made upon the mind—it is the sympathy of one organ with another. I think it will be right both for anthropologists and the philosophers of the Victoria Institute to try and come to some determination with regard to definitions, for I am quite sure that the great reason why we all differ so much from Professors Huxley and Owen, and Carl Vogt, is to some extent to be explained thus. If we were to come to a true definition of what we mean, so that we could say “If you mean so and so I agree with you, but if you do not I do not agree with you,” we should get on much better. I think that the want of proper definitions is a great stumbling-block to our understanding each other. I have ventured to make these few observations hoping that they may promote discussion, and I have only to add that I would be much happier to be a listener than a speaker.

The CHAIRMAN.—I am sure we are much obliged to you for having spoken; but perhaps it may be desirable to supplement what you have said, so as to put it more definitely. I do not think the author of this paper would deny that the spirit is connected with the physical nature of man, whether it be the brain or any other part: the question he argues more particularly is as against those anthropologists who deny the spirit altogether. Your contention is, that the immaterial is concerned with the physical.

Dr. DENDY.—I confess my perfect belief in an endowment, but then I ask how is that endowment carried on with regard to its communication from one mind to another? This is the great question. Is it carried on spiritually as an immaterial substance, or is it carried on to the brain of another, an impression being made upon that brain, the one introducing its own spirit and not influenced by the spirit of the other? That is, I think, the great question which we have to consider, and I think that its solution would determine the matter at once.

The CHAIRMAN.—There is no doubt that your remarks are conveyed to my mind, not physically in any way, but entirely as a mental operation, except that you express your meaning by means of the body: you create a sound in the air which affects my mind—affects the immaterial, as far as I understand the subject. At least I should be inclined to argue that it is so.

Dr. DENDY.—My sentiments are introduced into your mind as follows. My words or syllables undulate the air, and that air so undulated acts upon the ear, through which you are enabled to understand what I mean. The

sounds are conveyed to the brain, but is the brain acted upon by the inspiration of the soul?—for I grant there is an endowment,—or is it enabled to look at material things itself being a spiritual element?

Dr. HAUGHTON.—If the author of the paper were here, I would be glad to ask him whether he speaks his own sentiments or endeavours to convey to us those of the anthropologists whom he condemns? In the second section I find this sentence: “Nature, in man and animals, like everything in us and about us, is a chaos, without method.” That certainly surprises me very much, if it be intended as a statement of the author’s own views.

The CHAIRMAN.—That is not intended for the author’s own opinion. In fact throughout the first two sections he alludes to the opinions of others.

Dr. HAUGHTON.—But there is a scientific question which bears somewhat on the actual opinions held by Dr. Hitchman, upon which I have a word to say. If you look at the second section again, you will find that he says: “Professor Huxley, like Dr. Carl Vogt, sneers at the idea of spirit or vitality, yet is ready enough to admit the existence of a ‘subtle influence,’ even in the essential operations of protoplasm considered as the physical basis of life and mind in animated nature.” Now, you will notice that here he makes the words “spirit” and “vitality” interchangeable synonyms, and at the tenth section you will see it stated—“Even when the mental principle, which is certainly not of an exclusively material nature, has been divided and subdivided over and over again”; and then in another passage,—“The truth is, mind in these lower animals is divisible, whether it be or be not identical with their vital principle.” Now, here you have spirit and vitality made synonymous in the second section, while in the tenth you have the mental principle, which I presume is in the lower animals the only spirit they can possibly possess, declared to be divisible over and over again. It is certainly a new thing to me that any kind of spirit is capable of being divided and subdivided; that is not my idea as regards spirit. I can understand matter being divisible, but I cannot understand this as being the case with spirit. The only way in which such a condition can be connected with mind is by supposing that the mind itself is the manifestation of material organization. If he takes that view—(A VOICE.—“That is his view apparently; mind and spirit with him appear to be different things.”) Well, he takes the view that the mind can be divided over and over again. That I must repeat is a thing which I cannot conceive. I can understand that the mental operations in the lower animals may be supposed to be dependent upon the physical organization, and that if the physical organization is divided, such mental operations as they may be supposed to have may be manifested in two or three different ways; but how the mental can be “divided,”—how spirit can be divided,—is a thing which I confess I cannot imagine. Nor do I admit that “spirit” is a word that should be used as synonymous with “vitality.” I think that the idea in the author’s mind is the old notion of what was called the “vital principle,” by which everything going on in the body

which was otherwise incomprehensible used to be explained. Whenever the statement was made that there was a vital principle, that was supposed to be a sufficient explanation of anything complicated or abstruse which happened to be going on in the body; but I think I may say on the part of most of those who have made physiology their study, that they have given up this kind of argument altogether, and that they now consider it rather a hindrance to science to speak of the vital principle as explaining everything which goes on in the body, and as being the immediate cause of any forces or operations in its physical structure. In fact this notion is now regarded as being as great a hindrance to the progress of physiology as in another case was the old idea of the abhorrence of a vacuum as explaining the pressure of the atmosphere. The old notion of physical science was, that "nature abhors a vacuum": therefore, water rises in the pump; therefore when you use an air-pump the tendency is to fill up a vacuum." But the phrase was one that conveyed no true idea: it explained nothing. Whatever views people may have, they ought, when discussing scientific questions, to use fixed and determinative phrases, and not to put forward mere words as though they were satisfactory explanations of scientific phenomena. I trust that the few remarks I have made will lead others to express their opinions *pro* or *con.*, as to the different points raised by the learned Doctor.

Rev. Sir W. TILSON MARSH.—I should like to make one or two observations on this paper, which has evidently been written by a man of large information, but who has not given himself time enough to clearly explain his meaning in certain passages. I think that what we shall all agree with him upon is, that there is in the first instance ground upon which we can stand with the materialists,—and it is always well at the outset to ascertain the point or points on which we are agreed with our opponents.—We can stand upon this ground with the materialists, that we all agree that there is such a thing as matter. Our bodies are specimens of matter; but then we go on to a further question whether the materialists do not follow us; namely, that there is in man something beside and superior to matter. Now, I confess that in considering this question, when listening to my friend Professor Tyndall, whose intellect I hold in great admiration, and to others advocating his views, I never can get beyond the astute philosophical reasoning of Descartes when he said, "Cogito, ergo sum." I think that those who will examine this short enthymeme will agree that it contains pretty nearly all that can be assumed, independently of divine revelation:—"I think, therefore I am." This is the characteristic of man which distinguishes him from all other material creation. Man alone can say, "Cogito, ergo sum." He is a distinct and isolated being, altogether apart from the matter upon which the "I" acts. Granting that there is something within the material which is distinct in itself—and who can deny this?—will any well-read philosopher deny it? I certainly think I never could bring Professor Tyndall to any other conclusion than to agree with me upon the point "Cogito, ergo sum." Granting this, is there anything more in man than that, which distinguishes him from the rest of the material creation? Here I think we must apply ourselves

to the divine revelation. We must take that as our groundwork and see whether it is consistent with the facts which we see around us. In divine revelation we find that man is defined as a triple creature, a triple being, a trinity in himself; and I think if we look at the facts around us we shall see that they are consistent with this definition. The trinity referred to is composed of the *σῶμα*, or body, upon which we are all agreed; and the *ψυχή*, or soul, which man has in common with all the rational animals; and added to this there is the *πνεῦμα*, or the immortal part, which distinguishes man from all other rational animals. I think that if the writer of this able paper had taken into consideration this definition, it would have tended to resolve the difficulties which seem to have oppressed him; for obviously there are certain things which cannot be accounted for by the *πνεῦμα* without the *ψυχή*, and there are certain facts which cannot be accounted for by the *ψυχή* without the *πνεῦμα*. It has pleased the Divine Being to create man thus as a trinity, the *πνεῦμα* being peculiar to man in this material state. His body has been created for this very purpose, and it is described as *σῶμα ψυχικόν*, that is to say, a body of a soul character, and when it passes as renewed into the state beyond the grave it becomes *σῶμα πνευματικόν*, or a body spiritual. If we look upon man as composed simply of body and soul, there are very great difficulties indeed in understanding the facts which we see around us; but assuming for the moment the truth of the divine revelation (because we are not supposed to reason upon that alone), assuming that man is a triple being, a trinity, then I confess it seems to me that all the facts I have heard alleged by every class of philosophers will be met and accounted for. The *σῶμα*, or the material being, is one most intimately connected in the present world with the *πνεῦμα*, or spiritual portion, and I believe that that spiritual connection is combined through the *ψυχή*, but that at his death possibly the *ψυχή* disappears, and the *πνεῦμα* passes into a state in which the *ψυχή* perhaps will be re-created when the *σῶμα* is brought out in its perfection in the eternal world; but it is the passing away of the *ψυχή* which dissolves the connection between the *πνεῦμα*, or the spiritual portion, and the *σῶμα*, or material portion. Now, all the characteristics we have in common with the animal world will be explained by the existence of the *ψυχή*, or the intermediate portion of man. Our affections, our passions, all the lower feelings of our nature which we have in common with the dog and other animals, are all explicable in this way. We are apt to use the word soul rather unphilosophically; it is not the true word that should be used to signify what it is usually employed to express: "spirit" is the word we ought to use to express the immortal part, which part is not exhibited in any other material being in the whole known visible world except in man himself. Our thoughts—the "I," the "I think"—all come from the *πνεῦμα*, passing through the *ψυχή* to the *σῶμα*, whence they come forth in words and acts. I believe that this is the idea in the mind of the writer of the paper we are discussing, but I do not think that he sees the definition clearly. He says, in the sixteenth section, "The *quid est* of mind belongs to mental science, just in the same way as the *quid est*, or what it is, of matter belongs to physical science. These sciences are wholly distinct

from each other, yet have their respective truthful foundations in the nature and constitution of man himself."

The CHAIRMAN.—But he also says in another place there is the "quiet state of spirit."

Sir TILSON MARSH.—Well, allowing that, which I am glad you have pointed out, we grant all that need be allowed. God is infinite spirit, and in giving us the breath of life He has imparted to us a portion of Himself, thus creating our immortality, which can never pass away. Therefore I think that in this respect you and I are distinct from any being whatsoever, except the angel world, which we have not yet seen,—distinct from all the material beings around us in the possession of that portion of the Divine Spirit, the *πνεῦμα*, for which, of course, we become responsible. United with this is the *ψυχή*, which has also been given to the whole animal world, over which we have control, as being inferior to ourselves, and we have also the *σῶμα*, or body, which likewise belongs to the animal world. If you will only look at this argument and examine the various facts which have been brought out by philosophers, I think you will see that it meets their arguments: they cannot get over the fact that there is the "cogito, ergo sum," which remains in its full vigour,—oftentimes when the material form is decaying and dying away. Those who are clergymen, or medical men, have often been by the bedsides of dying persons and seen how, when the bodily powers are decaying the "I" which thinks, the immortal spirit within, remains as clear and powerful as ever—nay, sometimes even more powerful. (Hear, hear.) This fact distinguishes us from all other animals, and this being so, we argue that it is not sufficient to look at the external world; we say that, although cordially agreeing with many of the statements made by the materialistic philosophers, we think they stop short of what they ought to arrive at, and that they ought to go on and account for the phenomena of spirit, for the psychological phenomena which we assert can only be accounted for by the existence of that independent, individual, isolated "I" which resides within us. Then we come to divine revelation and say this is exactly what is stated to us by God in His word, and it meets and satisfies every argument drawn from what we see around us.

Rev. R. W. GREAVES.—May I ask if you consider that the reason is part of the *ψυχή*?

Sir TILSON MARSH.—Whatever there is instinctive in man, is, I believe, part of the *ψυχή*: whatever is rational is part of the *πνεῦμα*.

Mr. GREAVES.—The purely logical faculty of man, where do you place that?

Sir TILSON MARSH.—In the *πνεῦμα*.

Mr. GREAVES.—Then you do not look upon the *ψυχή* as inspiration?

Sir TILSON MARSH.—I look upon it as distinct from reason, which evidently is progressive, and can be cultivated to any degree. This is the peculiar faculty of the *πνεῦμα*, as I apprehend.

Mr. GREAVES.—You admit that a man is sinful by nature, *πνεῦμα*, *ψυχή*, and *σῶμα*?

Sir TILSON MARSH.—Yes ; the whole of man.

Mr. GREAVES.—And yet you say he is part of God.

Sir TILSON MARSH.—Yes, I believe the *πνεῦμα* to be derived from God ; but it is quite possible that the *πνεῦμα* may be given to man by τὸ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, the Holy Spirit, but limited and finite in character as compared with the Unbounded Spirit, and liable to evil, which God cannot be.

Dr. DENDY.—Which is it that thinks—the *πνεῦμα* or the *ψυχὴ* ? That will enable us to get at something.

The CHAIRMAN.—I believe Sir Tilson Marsh said it was the *πνεῦμα*.

Sir TILSON MARSH.—Yes, if pressed on the point, I think that I would draw this distinction, that in all probability the *πνεῦμα* when imparted to man, breathed by God, who, we are told, breathed into man the breath of life, was then under circumstances which could not have applied to it except as united to the material.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think it is wrong to say that the *πνεῦμα* is part of God, because we believe God is without parts. It would, perhaps, be better to say, it is an emanation from God.

Sir TILSON MARSH.—Exactly ; it is an emanation from God.

Mr. GREAVES.—God is said to have breathed into man the breath (*Ruach* is the Hebrew word) of life, but I do not think that the distinctions which you have so nicely and so beautifully drawn exist as you have stated them. I do not think that any lexicographer would give the distinction you have drawn between *πνεῦμα* and *ψυχὴ*. If you go back to trace the history of man as it is written in the earlier pages of Genesis, you will not be able to draw that distinction ; and I do not think you will be borne out by Liddell and Scott, or by any other Greek lexicographer. I have gone very carefully into the various definitions of the words *πνεῦμα* and *ψυχὴ*, and they run into each other so as not to permit those nice distinctions which you have drawn, although there certainly would be much that would be satisfying if you could bind us down to such limitations and definitions.

Sir TILSON MARSH.—You say the Hebrew word *Ruach* is the breath of life ?

Mr. GREAVES.—Yes, it is in the singular that the word occurs.

Sir TILSON MARSH.—I would not appeal to the first chapter of Genesis as the ground of my definition, but would go to the first epistle to the Thessalonians as giving the definition I have stated. A careful distinction is, however, drawn between the spirit and the soul in the Old Testament.

Mr. GREAVES.—In the 15th chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians the body is called a *σῶμα ψυχικόν*, and in reference to that I looked very carefully into the lexicographical distinction between *ψυχὴ* and *πνεῦμα*, and I certainly could not find any line so definite as that which you have drawn ; if it were so, I think the question might be easily, permanently, and happily settled.

Sir TILSON MARSH.—I remember some time ago looking at the passage in the Septuagint which speaks of the spirit of the beast which goeth downward, and of the spirit of man which goeth upward, and the word *πνεῦμα* is there

applied as pertaining to man. It is quoted by our Lord, and therefore has His direct authority. I only contend that the definition of St. Paul meets the various facts of nature as they are presented in what we see around us, and he says, "The very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved,"—his definition of the "whole" of man being given in these words—*σῶμα, ψυχή, and πνεῦμα*.

MR. GREAVES.—That is perfectly true.

SIR TILSON MARSH.—Therefore I hold that the Apostle lays it down that there is a trinity in our nature as God has planned it, and that this is consequently opposed to the dual theory of a simple body and soul.

REV. MR. JAMES.—If I may be permitted to bring the meeting back to the paper before it, I should be glad to preface what I am about to say by a reference to lexicons. I think it is unfair to resort to lexicons for the philosophical meanings of words. My idea of lexicons is that they take certain words from certain authors and find out the derivative senses in which these words are used. The fact is, that one author employs a word in one sense and another uses it in another sense, and sometimes you find words confounded one with another, as, for instance, in the case of the words *πνεῦμα* and *ψυχή*. In the very paper before us, the author often confounds the mind with the soul; some writers again use the word "mind" for "instinct," while others use it as meaning spirit. And as this must, therefore, necessarily be the case with lexicons, I do not think we should look to them for the real inner basis of the meaning of any particular word. This I put forward as a sort of protest against the very common mistake of looking at dictionaries for the radical or primary meaning of words, instead of expecting thereby simply to ascertain their derivative meaning from the way in which they are used. I now turn to the paper which has been read this evening, and I will begin by saying that I quite agree with the criticisms made upon it so far as they concern some passages. It has some indefinite expressions, more particularly as regards the point that has been raised with respect to the mind, the spirit, and the soul. The word instinct does not occur in this paper, so far as I can remember, and I observe the author frequently uses the word mind as applied to animals. For instance, in one place he says, "the mind in these lower animals." Now, here he must mean the instinct, or the soul. The soul includes all the instincts both of the very highest of the lower creation and of ourselves, and tends to further the growth and perfect development of the animal to which it belongs, but it is distinct from mind. The writer of the paper also, at times properly, uses the word mind when he must mean spirit. I think it a pity that there should be such a confusion of terms in a philosophical paper; especially in one so valuable as this is. I think its main object is fully attained, so far as I can gather it from reading it cursorily. I do not know the author personally, and never heard of the paper before to-day, when I first became aware that the subject was to be treated; but my impression is, that he has proved a great point in section 16, for he there distinguishes between spirit, and mind, meaning soul, *ψυχή*, and matter; and asserts that the spiritual sense

is one thing, the mental sense another, and the physical sense a third. I conceive that the effect of the paper is to prove, what every one of us must go away with a full conviction of,—namely, that any science which calls itself a science dealing with man,—consisting as he does of spirit, and soul, and body,—any such science intending to discuss the nature of man scientifically ought to do so in a spiritual, as well as in a psychical and physical sense. I think I may appeal to the conviction of everybody here when I say that this is really a self-evident matter. The paper supports this proposition very satisfactorily. It also declares, with reference to those who call themselves anthropologists, and who write in propagation of their views, that in speaking of what is peculiar to man in relation to mind, they probably do not consider spirit at all, but argue as if all man's highest intellect, all the superior faculties of his mind, grew out of his physical conformation—out of the actual construction of his physical frame. Now, this is a point on which I think most of us here will agree, namely, that the anthropologists are clearly mistaken, for they not only take up this position, but also deny what has been so well stated by the gentleman who first addressed us, that the spiritual quality of man is an endowment—not a mere development of the physical structure, but a positive endowment, a gift from God, and as plainly a gift from God as any of the other gifts of his manhood—a spiritual gift. The only question in the mind of the speaker who raised the latter point appears to have been as to whether this endowment is something which is given afresh to every human being, or whether, having once been given to our first parents, it is conveyed on to other generations, just as the soul is. My own impression is, that it is an endowment once for all given to man as an integral part of his distinctive nature, and not as an emanation of his structural development; undoubtedly concerned with all his other constituent parts, and interfusing them; but how?—This is a mystery, in the same way as the living structure of a flower and of everything else is a mystery.

Mr. GREAVES.—It is easy to cast distrust upon lexicographers, because they give the meanings deduced from certain authors whom they have consulted; but it is indisputable that our blessed Lord put the question, “What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?” It matters comparatively little whether I deduce a meaning from Cicero, Plato, or any other author, if I cannot deduce that which will permit of such accurate definition as would be satisfactory and conclusive; but we cannot here arrive at that conclusive accuracy. The word in the passage I have quoted is “ $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ ”—“What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$?” Now in the Hebrew the *Ruach* is translated both as the word $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ and the word $\piνεύμα$ would be defined; and I must say that, having examined the matter rather carefully from the Holy Word itself, I cannot think that the definitions which have been given, and the distinctions which have been so beautifully and so graphically put before us by a previous speaker, will stand the test of a very close examination.

Rev. C. GRAHAM.—I should like to say a word or two on the theological

aspect of this question. I think it is clear that the passage which has been quoted from the first epistle to the Thessalonians does indicate the tripartite distinction which one of the speakers has stated. There we have a body, a soul, and a spirit, all recognized in Holy Scripture as distinct from each other. There can be no question about that ; but I am fully convinced that it is not a distinction that will critically be borne out by other statements of Holy Scripture. You will find $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ used for $\piνε\upsilon\mu\alpha$, and several instances occur to me. "Fear not," says our blessed Lord, "them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul : but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$) and body in hell." Take another passage from the epistle to the Hebrews. It is there stated—"If any man draw back, my soul"— $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ —shall have no pleasure in him. This is applied to Jehovah—to the immortal God Himself, and it is also applied, as I have shown, to the immortal part of man. Over and over again have I looked at all the passages in the New Testament where $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ occurs, and I am satisfied that it corresponds with *Nephesh* in the Old Testament, and that $\piνε\upsilon\mu\alpha$ corresponds with *Ruach*. I do not agree with what has been said as to the spirit of man being an emanation from the Spirit of God. If the spirit have come direct from God, it has no need of the sanctification which has been referred to in the passage quoted from the First Thessalonians,—“And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly ; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless.” We may regard it that the spirit is recognized there as undergoing the process of sanctification or purification. If the spirit be an emanation from God, I hold that it cannot require sanctification, and upon this principle I quite differ from the gentleman who has stated that he regards the spirit as an emanation from God. In the passage in Ecclesiastes, where it is said that “the spirit of man goeth upward and the spirit of the beast goeth downward to the earth,” the word is *Ruach*, and that word corresponds with $\piνε\upsilon\mu\alpha$ in the New Testament. I have made these observations in order that, in the Transactions of our society, it may appear that we have no fear of discussion ; and that there are some of us who are not afraid to stand on the good old orthodox principle in regard to these matters.

The CHAIRMAN.—There is the passage in Ecclesiastes : “And the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.”

Mr. GRAHAM.—I take it that it must be a part of the Spirit of God, if it be an emanation from God. I take it as incontrovertible that you cannot regard the spirit as an emanation from God without looking at it as part of God. I object to the statement of Dr. Young, who regards the soul as “a spark struck from Paternal Deity” ; that idea runs through the theology of a great many excellent men who could not at all substantiate it from Sacred Scripture. The spirit is not “a spark struck from Paternal Deity” : it is a creation. I hold that the spirit of man was first of all created by God, and, if I express my mind clearly about it, I maintain, with some of our excellent divines, that, as man’s flesh begets flesh, man’s soul begets soul. I do not wish to insist upon my particular view, but I certainly do feel that I must

here be antagonistic to the view which has been put forth, because I hold that an emanation from God does not need sanctification.

Sir TILSON MARSH.—I would not contend for the use of the word “emanation”: it is almost impossible to apply human language to such a subject. I contend that there is the same relationship in the use of the word *πνεῦμα*, as applied to man’s superior part, as there is in the use of the word *πνεῦμα*, when God speaks of Himself as τὸ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον.

Mr. GRAHAM.—I think that the word *πνεῦμα* is applied to the *ψυχή* by some of our best expositors—that the *πνεῦμα* in its earthly aspect is regarded as the *ψυχή*, but that the *πνεῦμα* is contained in the *ψυχή*. This, to my mind, is distinctly proveable in the New Testament.

Sir TILSON MARSH.—I believe there is some truth deeply underlying the use of the word *πνεῦμα*, which we cannot at present quite see, and that it has yet to be revealed to us.

Mr. GREAVES.—That there is a distinction running through Scripture I agree; but that the lines of demarcation are as distinct as you make out I cannot see.

Mr. ROW.—I am quite in accord with those who think it impossible to draw a narrow and close line. I am not quite sure as to the exact number, but I am tolerably certain that the words *πνεῦμα* and *ψυχή* occur at least two hundred times in the New Testament, and I am quite satisfied that it is impossible to draw that hard-and-fast line which has been laid down this evening respecting the meaning of these words. I am quite aware that the term *πνεῦμα* is only used in divine revelation: I have never seen it applied to the mind of man in any Greek author. Of course I only speak from my own experience. It seems to me that the term is one that has originated independently of revelation, and of course it is meant to point to a certain sort of division in the human mind; but I should hesitate to say that the *πνεῦμα* contained the whole of man’s rational powers; because, considering the extent to which this subject was discussed in ancient philosophy, which discussed nearly everything connected with the rational powers, it is strange that the word does not appear; but I admit that there is a higher principle referred to, which is called the *νοῦς*. But, taking the general run of Greek philosophers, there is no other idea than that man consists of two portions—mind and body, the mental including the various forms of reason; but one speaker who has addressed us seemed to think that the whole of man’s reason exists simply in his spiritual portion, which I think is an assumption very much greater than the Scripture seems to warrant, and one which seems to contradict all the truths of mental philosophy with which I am acquainted. If I were to lay down a distinction, I should be inclined to think that the *πνεῦμα* referred to the higher operations of the mind—to all those higher conceptions of things not seen—rather than to the more logical powers of the human mind. But this is a question which hardly seems to have been touched upon by Dr. Hitchman. I must say that I concur in a great deal that has been said this evening respecting his paper, but feel unprepared to join in the debate thereon, for,

although I have read it through, I do not completely understand it. The reasoning seems obscure, and some of the sentences are too long. There is one point which has been raised this evening, namely, as to whether the mind is capable of action independent of its physical structure. I should say, we want evidence that it is; at any rate I have never been able to ascertain distinctly whether such is the case. At the same time I should think that the will is in some degree independent of it. The only argument I can bring from my own experience is this. One night at Oxford I was reading the second chapter of the Sixth Book of Aristotle's Ethics, and I fell asleep in my easy-chair, and I then did during my sleep what I could not do when awake—I went through and analyzed the whole passage. This is a fact, however it may be accounted for, but it seems to me, that certain portions of the brain continue asleep while one is dreaming; this may impart extra power to those portions which are awake. But taking the whole of our mental phenomena, it seems to me that they are exerted through the medium of the brain. This brings me to what has been said about the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$. The ancients held that vitality was inherent in the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, and I find in the New Testament that the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ is spoken of as an immortal principle. But I consider that we cannot possibly arrive at any essential knowledge of the actual forms of human consciousness by analyzing the mere terms used by Divine Revelation, which I do not think was intended to give us any idea of what the soul consists of, but simply to make us wise unto salvation.

Mr. FURNIVAL.—I quite agree that man is of a dual nature, consisting of body and soul. With regard to the distinction between reason and instinct, I believe that reason in man is only a fuller development of what is found in the lower animals. We have a key to the distinction between soul and spirit in what our Lord says:—"That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the spirit is spirit" (St. John iii. 6), where spirit is something altogether distinct from the soul. If, as I believe, the spirit be an emanation, I quite agree with the assertion that it cannot be capable of sanctification, because it must be perfect in itself; it is the spirit that sanctifies the man, and prepares him for a purer and a happier state of being.

Dr. DENDY.—With all due respect to the gentleman who was kind enough to agree with me with regard to the endowment of the brain by the Deity, I think he totally misconceives the opinion of the anthropologists. He has made the sweeping assertion that they do not believe in immortality at all. He has taken his evidence from Carl Vogt, and perhaps from Professor Huxley and those who hold extreme opinions; but the opinion of anthropologists generally by no means goes so far.

Dr. THORN.—As an old friend of Dr. Hitchman I must beg pardon for intruding when so abstruse a question as the duality or tri-unity of man's nature—whether he be possessed of soul and body or of soul, body, and spirit—is discussed; but I cannot forget St. Paul's words, already quoted. And certainly the body is of the dust. It was said when Cain slew Abel, "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground." Here was, first, the manifestation of body; then, secondly, the manifestation which

was called psychical ; and then we come to something which was greater still, and that was spirit, or *Ruach*—the immortal breath which must live for ever either in happiness or misery. The spirit was considered by the ancient philosophers as something invisible. This was shown when they made the Hebrew letter Teth and the Greek letter *Theta* stand for 9, which was the invisible number. Were Dr. Hitchman here, he would be able to explain whatever required explanation.

Mr. JAMES.—St. Paul has given a philosophical distinction from which we may fix *πνεῦμα* as one part of manhood, *ψυχή* as another, and *σῶμα* as a third. I think we may take advantage of this distinction, although it has never been noticed by any other sacred writer.

The CHAIRMAN.—I may say that this has been a very interesting discussion, and I am sure I am only expressing the general feeling when I state that it is to be regretted Sir Tilson Marsh speaks so seldom, for his remarks have been extremely interesting. There is only one point in reference to the question which has been raised that seems to me to have been overlooked by all the speakers, and it seems to some extent to reconcile the conflicting notions that have been expressed. In the account of the creation we are told that God breathed into man the breath of life, and as a consequence man became a living soul : there you have the two things intimately connected together. The discussion on this point has been well sustained, and I think it will form a very pregnant subject which may be treated specifically afterwards when we see the discussion in print. As regards the paper, I think that the author is wrong in attributing materialistic notions to anthropologists generally, and one of the things in his paper which astonished me most was that he should be running a-tilt at the anthropologists of London, Vienna, Paris, and Madrid, and the societies founded in connection with the London Society, more especially since he himself has founded an anthropological society in Liverpool. But the best proof that the anthropologists do not accept these notions, do not exclude religion from the data they take in arriving at conclusions as to anthropological truth, is to be found in such evidence as is afforded by the book which I hold in my hand ; it was written by the late M. Boudin, who belonged to the Anthropological Society of Paris. The work begins by quoting Cicero, who very many centuries ago described man as a religious animal. But M. Boudin is in no way led astray by those false notions which confound all religions together. (Apparently Professor Huxley and some other of our modern anthropologists are exercising their ingenuity to confound them.) He actually argues that religion is not even an effect of the idiosyncrasies of a people, but that it is actually the cause of their rising—in other words—"The religion of a people is the cause, and not the effect, of the civilization of the people or of its barbarism"—"la religion d'un peuple est cause, non effet de sa civilisation ou de sa barbarie." It is attempted by some anthropologists (it would be unfair to say that all anthropologists agree with these views) to make out that pantheism is peculiar to certain peoples, and that a belief in one God is peculiar to certain other races. This was refuted long ago, and by no less an authority than Voltaire,

who is quoted here by M. Boudin :—“ On a cru au polythéisme dans tous les climats ; et il est aussi aisé à un Tartare de Crimée qu'à un habitant de la Mecque de reconnaître un Dieu unique. . . . La religion Chrétienne, née dans la Syrie, ayant reçu ses principaux accroissements dans Alexandrie, habite aujourd'hui le pays où Teutate, Irmensil, Frida, Odin, étaient adorés.” It is very important that we should have points of this kind brought out, because, as Dr. Hitchman says, we are now, in the year 1870, seeing produced what was brought out in 1670, and there are unfortunately very few sources of refutation. A great many organs of the press eagerly copy what is said by eminent men like Professor Huxley, and probably we are almost the sole society making a stand and pointing out how very old-fashioned and very untenable these things are.

The proceedings then terminated.