

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/robbadshaw>

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 SECRETARY.

VOL. XXXIV.



LONDON :
(Published by the Institute, 8, Adelphi Terrace, Charing Cross, W.C.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.
1902.

ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.*

PROFESSOR EDWARD HULL, LL.D., F.R.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read and confirmed and the following paper was read by the author :—

ON THE SPRINGS OF CHARACTER. By ALFRED T.
SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D., M.R.C.S.E.

IN offering a few remarks upon the springs of character, it will be well to clear the ground first by a brief consideration of character itself. The first question is, What is character? Character etymologically is the mark of the brick-maker on the Babylonian brick, by which it is recognised as his own. In the same way character may be defined as *the shape that the mind becomes by use*, just as a glove or shoe—perhaps at first exactly like thousands of others—becomes individually specialized by the shape of my hand or foot by wear. This gives a fairly good idea of character in one of its aspects. It may be defined as the *εικων* of the *εγώ*, or likeness of the self—the psychic likeness, exactly as the body is the physical likeness. The physical impress of my being is in what meets the eye in the body generally—the psychical impress of my being consisting of my mental attributes, and the amount that is seen of the character I possess.

Character has its home in the unconscious region of the mind and it is only by an effort of introspection, more or less difficult, that we can even partially discern our own characters.

In saying this I must just make one observation on mind in general. I regard mind as never being wholly in consciousness, or within the range of what may be called our

* March 19th, 1900.

own mental vision. It is a natural error, into which many have fallen, to limit the term *mind* to what is seen of mind. But sight is not our only method of investigation, either in the physical or in the psychical. The fact that our thoughts are largely governed by what we see may be instanced when we call the top of a high coral mountain, say in the South Pacific, an island of a certain size; we say it is so many miles long and broad because that is all of it that is visible above the water, but in fact at low tides and on very calm days we can see that it stretches away underneath the water to a much greater extent, and we know well by other agencies than sight that our island is really the top of a vast mountain made up of minute organisms rising from the depths of the ocean. So only a limited part of the mind is ever in full consciousness, more may be seen by careful introspection, but there still remains a vast area beyond consciousness that is recognised by other methods.

Again a thermometer only recognises the extent of temperature within its range or scale, just as only those waves of ether or air are called light or sound that are within the range of our vision or hearing. But we know well in all these cases we are merely recognising the middle regions of phenomena that really extend both below and above the range of the thermometer scale, or of our sight or hearing. So with our minds,—what we generally call the mind is that psychic action that is within the range of our mental sight or consciousness, and we only say we are thinking when we know we are thinking.

Such a mode of speech is safe and convenient, but it is limited and not strictly accurate. If we dogmatise on it and say that consciousness alone is mind, we are led into the serious error of denying that we have any psychic powers that are beyond the range of our own consciousness. In astronomy some most remarkable advances have been made by inference. Planets have been discovered from the deviations caused in the motions and orbits of planets already known, from which their existence was correctly inferred. In like manner we can, with the utmost certainty, infer and prove the existence of extensive psychic processes beyond the range of our own consciousness. No one who does not recognise unconscious mind, or unconscious psychic powers in individuals, can really form a clear idea of what character is, or where it is to be found.

We are here to-day, however, to speak, not of character,

which may be defined as the sum of our mental and moral attributes; but of the springs of character—something deeper still! If the whole of character lies hidden in the unconscious mind, so *a fortiori*, do the springs on which it depends. In using the word *spring*, one must distinctly understand that it has three, or more meanings. It is a season of the year, it is a source, and it is a power. A spring is the source of a river or the power in a watch. In speaking of the “springs of character” we use the word in both of these two meanings, and we say that the main springs of character are three in all—the sources being two-fold, constitute two of the springs, and the power is the third; the three being Heredity, Habit and Will—heredity and habit having been very aptly and alliteratively termed Nature and Nurture.

Let us then look very briefly, first of all, at these three and then consider them a little more in detail.

With regard to the first spring, Nature or Heredity, we have in an infant the product of at least six human beings—four grandparents and two parents being generally more or less clearly seen in the product (the child). If we consider this for a moment we see at once what extraordinarily different characters we can get from the same hereditary stock. Many have been much puzzled as to why the same system of treatment that answers so well with one child is purely hurtful to another. It is because these parents have never really grasped in the first place the all-pervading power of heredity, nor seen in the second, as a cook would, the enormous variety of dishes that can be produced from the same ingredients according to the proportions that are used. Thus if we get a boy with a dash of the maternal grandmother and the rest mainly paternal grandfather and father, we get a very different character from one with a good deal of the maternal grandfather and only a little of the paternal ancestry. In this we have the key to the extraordinary diversity of characters seen in one family descended from the same stock.

When we pass on to the second spring—Nurture, or the formation of Habit—we come to a power which has the property of infusing new principles into the character; new principles so strong that they may have the power of overcoming those qualities that were derived from heredity. Herbert Spencer has observed, with immense force, with regard to this, that “a man is more like the company he keeps than that from which he is descended.”

Now in considering habit as a source of character we must be clear about one point. New acts, or the motives that cause new acts, do not form a fresh part of character until they become unconscious. As long as an action is performed each time by effort or from a conscious impulse, it forms no part of the character; because when the impulse comes into consciousness, the mind has to consider what it will do, seeing the action is not yet natural to the individual. The moment it becomes natural or, in other words, sufficiently habitual, that new action, or that new principle, begins to form an actual part of the character. This is an important fact—that acts must sink, in their motives, into unconsciousness, and be performed without conscious effort before they express a part of the character of the individual. This I will enlarge upon a little later. Let me give an instance—I may tell the truth in a court of law, or I may tell the truth under certain circumstances, with undeviating regularity, and yet I may not be a truthful person habitually. A liar may on certain occasions speak the truth when there is sufficient impulse or consciousness present to prevent his telling his habitual lies. It is only when I tell the truth unconsciously and naturally that you can call me a truthful person. Again, I may exercise great care in the pronunciation of French and speak it with the utmost nicety, but that does not make me a careful person or careful in doing other things—such for instance as riding a bicycle. But if I am a careful person naturally I shall show care all round—it comes unconsciously into play whenever occasion arises.

The third spring is the Will, and to this merit and direct responsibility attach. Direct responsibility does not attach to what I do unconsciously. Direct responsibility does not attach to unconscious principles that I have inherited from my parents. Merit, demerit, and direct responsibility attach to the energising of these into actions by the will. This is the direct work of the *ego*. We must remember with regard to will, that a strong will simply means a strong character; but not necessarily a good character, any more than a weak character implies bad morals.

Now let us look a little closer, in what time we have at our disposal, at these three intricate springs of character.

First—Heredity. In heredity we must remember that we no longer believe that we inherit fixed qualities nearly so much as that heredity shows itself in tendency or potenti-

alities : tendencies which, by education and culture, can be converted into flowers or weeds, into virtues or into vices. This is the case nearly all round. It is true even in our physical nature. It is very rare indeed for a man to inherit a disease, but it is exceedingly common for him to inherit a *tendency* to disease ; and this saves us from fatalism, because we are certain that in time we may prevent the tendency, but we cannot prevent a fact that is already established. Therefore, I repeat, instead of looking on children as ready formed compendiums of virtues and vices, we rather look on them as teeming with endless potentialities, filled as they are, with tendencies that have been derived from their ancestry. Let me give an illustration of this.

Battered and defaced though the Divine image may be in the human mind it is still clearly to be traced, and especially in infancy. All infants are distinguished by inheriting two remarkable tendencies, or principles. The one is love, and the other is justice. All children love, and all children, in infancy, have a most marked sense of justice or right, which often causes them great distress when they find the limits overstepped by those whom they are taught to believe are wiser than themselves. Now love and right are, simply, love and light, and love and light are essentials in the character of God. God has impressed these two qualities on every infant mind. But, observe, that love may be changed into a positive vice when it becomes love of self, or pure egoism. Justice itself may be changed into positive evil if it is developed into nothing but standing up for one's own rights. On the other hand, the two may be made to blossom and bloom into two most beautiful virtues—the love of others and standing up for the rights of others: in short, we have tendencies which may become altruistic or egoistic virtues or vices. This is effected by the training of these potentialities, which is largely carried on in early life by the unconscious influences by which the child is surrounded. Environments and suggestions are, undoubtedly, two strong forces by which a child's early life should be trained—by which its infant mind is evolved—suggestions of good and not of evil: for suggestions have an enormous weight when those suggestions come from one having such a powerful influence over a girl or child as its own mother. It is hardly too much to say that a mother is nearly as all-powerful over a child's mind as that of a hypnotizer over the hypnotized: the re-

lation, I need hardly say, being very different. Of course, the results of such training may not be seen till long after; for we may notice here that the springs and roots of character lie deep in the unconscious mind—the flowers and fruit blossom—and bear in consciousness.

Now with regard to the second great spring of Habit, may I just turn your attention, for one moment, to the physical side of the question? Professor Hill at Cambridge and others have shown that sensations and impulses that at first rise into consciousness and require effort and will to produce action, if sufficiently frequent and the resulting action be the same, eventually do not rise into consciousness at all, but are "short circuited," and performed without effort, or the active intervention of the will; in other words, actions at first consciously performed become unconscious as they become habits, as, for instance, walking and the act of reading. To put my left (or right) foot first into my stocking soon becomes an unconscious habit, and I do it as a matter of course. As long as an action proceeding from a new principle is performed consciously, or is performed with a certain amount of effort, we have no reason as we have seen to believe that the principle forms part of character—in fact, it is clear that it does not, because on other occasions we do not act in the same or similar way. But when an action becomes habitual the principle at the root of that action begins to form part of character, and is a spring of conduct that can be relied and calculated upon; in other words, I may possess a virtue, or a virtue may possess me, and there is all the difference between the two. If I teach a dirty boy to wash his hands before meals I do not make cleanliness a part of his character; but if he habitually washes his hands and is made to be clean in other ways by a watchful parent or teacher, for a length of time, he eventually becomes a clean boy, and cleanliness becomes engraved on his character, so as to form a fresh spring of action throughout his life that can be relied upon. This is shown in the principle, "Train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he *will* not depart from it"—(because it is made part of his character). At the same time let us guard against the error of supposing that nothing can be a part of character that is performed consciously. I may be a most truthful person naturally, and yet tell the truth deliberately.

It is well to note therefore in this instance, and in many others, because a positive statement is made on one side,

the corresponding negative on the other side must not be taken for granted. It is too often assumed in regard to statements that an assertion implies a direct denial of its opposite. It is not always so.

We have now, perhaps, sufficiently insisted that when an action ceases to require conscious effort for its performance and then becomes unconscious, by repetition, it begins to establish a fresh principle in the character; and we may now pass on to look at the way in which habits are formed.

The Greeks were very fond of the word wisdom; 'O Σωφρων' or the wise or prudent man, was really the product of perfectly organised habit, and could be relied on to act wisely in every path in life as the result of a formed character.

What are the means by which habit is formed? There are two—environment, or what is *around* the man—the habit of the same atmosphere; and ideals, or what is *before* the man. An illustration of the power that breathing the same atmosphere has in producing fresh springs of character may be found in considering the professions.

Supposing a man sends one of his sons to be a sailor, another to be a soldier, another to be a doctor, another to be a lawyer, another to be a merchant, and, perhaps, another does nothing at all. At forty years of age a very marked difference will be seen between these men. The sailor has not only a characteristic body and gait, but a sailor's mind—he is a sailor all through his character. In short, there would be more fresh springs seen in his character than in that of any other class, because he begins earlier, and the atmosphere he breathes on board ship is more intense and specialised than in any other profession. A sailor, therefore, is stamped through and through in character, in thoughts, mind, consciousness and unconsciousness with all those traits that are the hallmark of his profession.

A regular soldier again differs from a volunteer in that the latter is a civilian at heart, though a soldier when he is being paraded and on duty. In himself he is a clerk, or accountant or student who at particular times puts on his uniform and does his drill. But that does not affect his character materially. Now a soldier, who enlists for a certain time in the army, becomes changed in his character by the fixed environment he is forced to breathe. He is a soldier when off duty as much as on parade. This shows the power of habit in producing fresh springs of character. I cannot

enlarge on or labour this subject further, but it is sufficient for us to see how, in varying degrees, professional influences alter the man himself.

Let me say a word about the surroundings of character. One character acts upon another to an immense extent. A remarkable sentence, that I have never since forgotten, dropped on my ears on attending a little village church some years ago. Just as I was falling asleep in an old worm-eaten pew, and the clergyman was reading an old sermon, by the light of a tallow candle, he said, "Never forget, that the mind casts a shadow just like the body."

It is thus we influence others unconsciously for good or for evil. In fact, character is just like that mysterious substance in the body known as a ferment. We have, all our lives (after six months old), a ferment in the mouth which has the power of changing the starch in our food, which is indigestible, into sugar, which is digestible. This ferment changes, by virtue of its presence simply, the one into the other. In the same way our characters are potent as ferments, and it is well when they can change the starch in others into sugar. There are characters that are health-giving; there are characters that are nothing less than moral ozone, who do good to everyone who breathes their influence; and there are characters that are not less poisonous and infectious than sewer gas. With regard to unconscious influence Maeterlinck says, "In silent company with another, the character is often deeply formed; and a truth, which cannot be even taught in words, may be learned in silence."

Secondly, with regard to ideals, or what is before the mind as forming fresh springs of character. Introspection, as a former of character, is no good. We never benefit any characters by taking a piece off here and putting a piece on there. To continually explore the character by forced introspection is as injurious as having an arc light burning all night in one's bed room. It is intended that we should have darkness at night, in order that the brain should rest, and if we turn night into day literally, or figuratively by prying into the unconscious recesses of the mind, we produce troubles. Close introspection, therefore, will not benefit our characters. The pursuit of a noble ideal turns the eye outward, and not inward.

These ideals vary from the highest to the lowest. I believe there exist some who absolutely say, "Evil, be thou

my good!" and set before themselves ideals that are absolutely bad. That is the lowest class. Then there are morbid ideals—people who aim at what is not necessarily bad, but which certainly ought not to form an ideal. In my profession, for instance, we often meet with those who "enjoy bad health"!—whose ideal is really to be invalids, and who have nothing before them but sickness, and enjoy it as long as they can keep it. Then we have the man whose ideal is pleasure. If he can only fill his life with a round of pleasure, he has satisfied his highest ideal.

Then there are those whose ideal is negative. Their great idea is never to do anyone any harm, and if they succeed in passing through life without doing others injury, they fulfil their highest expectation.

Then there are those who go a step higher, whose ideal is to excel others in quantity, in acquisition, to store up, to be the richest, and to acquire millions. Others desire to excel in quality, to be the first and best, and not necessarily the largest or richest.

Higher still are those whose ideal is domestic, and who seek to fulfil their highest aspirations, as a good father, a good mother, daughter, or son. Then there are those who are actuated by philanthropy, and those whose aim is highest of all, and who feel that no ideal is satisfactory until it reaches God Himself. The higher and loftier the ideal, the nobler and more spiritual the character.

The third point is the will, and that is a spring of character in the sense of being the force that produces conduct from character; and yet the will itself is moulded by the character which it energises. Of course, we understand a strong will may be used for good or evil. We cannot will a new quality in our own character, or in that of anyone else. We cannot even *will* to play the violin, or retain our balance on a bicycle or a pair of skates by an effort of the will alone. But we can will the practice that will produce it. We can will the means that will ensure it; and so we can get our results, not by directly willing the thing to be acquired, but by willing those means by which it may be obtained. The will, of course, can be enormously strengthened, particularly in childhood. A child can be accustomed, and should be accustomed to fixed purposes, which it should not be allowed to change lightly, and thus it should acquire a habit of keeping to what was originally willed. Many are too strong-willed, and some are weak-

willed, and so education proceeds wisely to modify the one or stimulate the other. Will comes mostly into play as a factor in the formation of character, when we have left our parents, and when our home education is well nigh finished. Previously to that time, our characters are mostly formed by them, and after that they are mostly formed by us by means of our own will.

I will say one word, in conclusion, about growth of character. Character grows. I do not say it gets fresh springs, but it grows, as the body grows, by food and exercise. The food of the character is ideas, and the exercise of the character is the circumstances of life. Now food, as we know, to nourish the body, must be of somewhat the same material as the body is composed of. A substance similar to the material of which the body is formed is called homologous, and is a food. If it is different in composition, it is called heterologous, and is a poison. This casts a flood of light on what has puzzled many people, viz., why the same idea is absolutely food to some minds and poison to others. It is because with some it is related to their own character, and with others it is not. This is a matter that would furnish most interesting material for study.

Character, which is thus fed by ideas, is exercised practically, as we have said, by the circumstances of life. Strong persons and strong characters can stand severe exercise. The more severe the exercise and discipline through which they pass, the better and quicker does the character grow to perfection.

The value of character, I need not say, is immense. It is our acts that always really tell our worth.

“ Still, as of old,
Man by himself is priced ;
For thirty pieces Judas sold
Himself—not Christ ! ”

Before closing may I add that parents should accustom themselves, figuratively speaking, to look at their children through the Röntgen screen. You do not see by means of these rays whether a woman has got on a particular dress, or cloak, but you see what the heart is doing. And so children, by the maternal eye, should be looked through and through and not merely seen outwardly.

Again, for child training parents should be provided with

tools. Allow me to point out in a few words twelve tools with which each mother should be equipped :—

1. First of all parents can form *habits*, of moral value, as none other can, in a child's character.
2. Parents can control a child's *environments* by suggestions of good and not of evil.
3. Parents can, by example, fill a child's mind with inspiring *ideals*.
4. Parents can feed a child's mind with *ideas*, the character of which ideas they can largely control.
5. Parents can *exercise* a child's moral powers by the circumstances of life, not too hard, lest it be discouraged; not too soft, lest it have no moral backbone.
6. Parents can by watchfulness and tenderness *balance* one characteristic against others, so as to produce an even and not a one-sided character.
7. Parents can strengthen the *will* power and make it act with energy and decision.
8. Parents can educate the *moral sense* and keep it strong so that it may last good through life.
9. Parents can increase the sense of *responsibility* to themselves, to others, and to God.
10. Parents can teach, directly, moral principles and the *sequence of cause and effect*.
11. Parents can inspire *faith* in God and in Christ and a right spirit of humility.
12. Lastly—Parents can at least *obey* the two divine precepts, “Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it.” “Offend not, despise not, hinder not one of these little ones.”

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN expressed the interest and pleasure with which he, and he believed all present, had listened to the paper, which was both wise and suggestive; and remarked, in illustration of the subject, upon the effects of habit in moulding the physical and moral character of our soldiers and sailors, who often entered the service of their country under most unfavourable surroundings

and conditions of life, but ultimately, in consequence of their training, became bodies of men to whom the honour and defence of their country and of the empire could be safely entrusted.

The Rev. F. A. WALKER, D.D.—Time will only allow me to allude very briefly to a few of those points that I have noted in the course of the instructive and edifying address we have had the privilege of listening to.

The point that impressed itself on me particularly was the very striking way in which the lecturer remarked on habit and its power which coincides with the text-book we used to read at Oxford.

I notice that Dr. Schofield's deductions from habit agree almost entirely with Aristotle's Ethics, and I suppose no book, with the sole exception of Holy Scripture, has exercised such an influence on the mind of scholars as Bishop Butler's "*Analogy*."

There was one passage about habit that also struck me, and that was that the constant repetition of acts tended to produce a habit so strong that it became, in time, overpowering in its influence; and then those habits—all unconscious, as Aristotle tells us—reproduce acts; nor can anything, he says, that was accustomed to be done in one particular way be done otherwise. We may remember the text in Job—"Man is born unto trouble as the sparks fly upward." That seems to contain the same illustration as Aristotle on habit.

Professor ORCHARD, B.Sc.—While thanking the author for his paper I may say that his remarks upon ideals struck me as particularly valuable, and also what he said about tendencies. I cannot but regret that an address which certainly affords considerable scope for discussion, as the Chairman has pointed out, should not have been put before us in a printed form. It is exceedingly inconvenient, especially in matters philosophical, to criticise, unless you have the very *ipsissima verba* before you. It is hardly fair, indeed, to the author of the address to do so.

I have noted some expressions which Dr. Schofield used to which I am sorry to say I can by no means assent. "Character is the sum of our mental and moral attributes." No doubt we may agree to that; and its "springs and roots . . . lie deep in the unconscious mind." "The springs are," says Dr. Schofield, "heredity, habit, and will." First of all, I must entirely differ from the author that any such thing exists as "unconscious mind." The great

mark which distinguishes mind from matter is consciousness. Perhaps the learned author has found some other distinction between mind and matter, and will favour us with what he takes it to be. But all philosophers, from the time of Aristotle, have held consciousness to be the distinguishing peculiarity of mind as distinguished from matter. In the different operations of the mind, everything is a form of consciousness. You cannot have a sensation without being conscious of it, or any kind of feeling, desire, emotion, or sentiment, without being conscious of it. You cannot know a thing without being conscious. To speak of unconscious knowledge is nonsense. You cannot will a thing without being conscious that you are willing it.

It is frankly admitted by Agnostics, that between unconsciousness and consciousness there is an impassable barrier. Apparently the learned author thinks not. Unconscious mind! What produces, if you please, unconscious mind? The springs of unconscious mind are, however, said to be "heredity, habit, and will." Heredity has been, I think, broadly defined as referring to tendencies only. Have you any mind as long as you have tendencies only?

Habit:—In habit, surely Will is much concerned. It requires considerable perseverance, as a rule, to form habit. Surely that is not an unconscious thing. Even if you take the most mechanical habit, as it might be called, of putting one foot before another, we have never done that in life yet without being conscious.

So with taking your breakfast. I never had my breakfast without being conscious of it. What it appears to me is being done is to confound together consciousness and attention. That we do a number of things without particularly attending to them is true. There are many operations of the mind, which we perform without any special thought, but at the time we perform them we are conscious of performing them; we may not give them much attention, but we are conscious that we are doing them.

The third spring is Will itself. Will is distinguished from Habit, though I cannot see how there can be habit without will; but let that pass. Will, surely, is no part of unconscious mind. If Dr. Schofield says it is, it would be very interesting to know the relation of pain to the unconscious mind.

It appears to me that there is great danger in this doctrine. It has a tendency to take away Will; to take away the great

distinction that separates matter from mind; to open the door to the false theory of materialistic evolution in asserting, as is done by Spencer, that all things have come about by mechanical force acting upon mere matter.

What Dr. Schofield said about tendencies is to my mind of very great value. Any system of education is bound to take account of tendencies; to cultivate, or repress or check them; and we should be always keeping before us when we can the Röntgen screen, to which the Doctor so beautifully alluded, and a high Christian ideal.

Mr. MARTIN ROUSE, B.L.—I understood Dr. Schofield, when he used the term "unconscious mind," not to mean that mind was like matter, or was like forces inter-acting mechanically, like a set of wheels started in a factory by an engine, and doing a great deal of work in spinning bobbins and so forth without their own will; not exactly that, but that we were not aware of the operations of this unconscious part of our brain, and that in being aware of the operations of what he would call "the conscious part," we knew that we willed to do a certain thing, and we did it. (Hear! hear!) Further, that when he said that will was one of the springs of character, and that character found its home in the unconscious mind, he did not mean to say that will was an unconscious thing, but that will, together with heredity and habit, built up a character which then worked unconsciously; that a man told the truth without effort or determination to tell the truth, but simply because it was perfectly natural to him. In the same way, an Englishman who has lived in France or Germany for some little time will quite unconsciously speak French or German, instead of first speaking English in his mind and then turning it into French or German. The phrase comes to the mind without effort—without saying, "I want to express that idea in German," but it is used as naturally as the English phrase would be. I know this through having spent a year and a half in Switzerland as a boy; the latter part of the time I dreamt in French and, as a habit, I prayed in French. It did not seem to be a strained effort, or unnatural, but it came quite naturally. In the same way we have been told by Professor Orchard that we are always conscious, that he has been conscious all his life, and that we are so in putting one foot before another, which we are taught as school boys. But, I maintain, that is not the case. He used his will, at the beginning, at the

bidding of the drill sergeant, until it became a matter of habit to put the left foot before the right in starting to walk.

No doubt many present have experienced that in reading aloud the mind has wandered off to some subject urgently important, and we have gone on reading and not known what we were reading. That is certainly an unconscious habit. We were not conscious of that operation of the mind. I have always held (though I have not studied mental philosophy) that we cannot think of two things absolutely at the same time. Therefore, the mind is certainly acting mechanically in reading aloud, if we are at the same moment thinking of some other subject.

Rev. Dr. PORTE.—It appears to me that both the lecturer and Professor Orchard are right—one philosophically and the other practically. We all have experience, in daily life, of what the lecturer said on unconscious acts of mind, so to speak, though that may not be the philosophical expression. I had an experience of it a few Sundays ago. On reading the service, which I trust I do not read carelessly without entering into it, I was startled to think that I had omitted two pages of the service, and when I went into the vestry I said to my curate, “Is it true that I omitted two pages of the service to-day?” He said, “No; not a word.” I replied, “All I can say is that from such a collect to such a collect was a perfect blank to me.” He said it was quite right. That is not the only time that such a thing has happened to me. Have not some of you repeated with your lips a collect or prayer, and yet have been unconscious that you have done so? That is a simple and practical proof I think of what Dr. Schofield referred to a few minutes ago.

The CHAIRMAN.—I am afraid time is against the discussion being extended, so I will ask Dr. Schofield to reply briefly, and before doing so I am sure we desire to return a hearty vote of thanks to him for his address.

The vote of thanks was then put to the Meeting and carried.

Dr. SCHOFIELD.—My remarks at this stage will not only be brief on account of time, but because there is little to reply to expect from my very good friend, Professor Orchard. I have gone over the ground with him carefully on previous occasions, and such a discussion if resumed this evening would be purely academic. I must admit that he has made a very good point; but I think, throwing myself on the audience, my meaning was sufficiently

clear. I believe I did say *spring*; but it has, as I said, the meaning of source or of power. When I said, "Springs are the root of character," that could not mean *will*—it is *power*. I was only using the word *spring* then as *source*, and I maintain still that the source and root of character are in the same unconscious mind; but I quite go with Professor Orchard in saying that will is a conscious exercise as a rule. But if Professor Orchard lays down, *ex cathedrā*, that consciousness is mind and mind is consciousness, and connects the one with the other, he must take account of its various degrees. There is that condition called *attention* and degrees less and less extreme until it oversteps the threshold of consciousness and falls into regions we know not of. A genius cannot tell you where he gets his inspiration from, and to limit mind to consciousness is equivalent to limiting the body to what is seen by the eye. A man who limits mind to consciousness has to maintain that all that comes from mind is of material origin. I see Professor Orchard shakes his head. He says we are conscious of every sensation.

Allow me to say that we are conscious of what we are conscious of; but there are an enormous number of perceptions which do not rise into consciousness. If I were to tickle the sole of Professor Orchard's foot he would feel it; but when he was reading a book he would not notice the same amount of tickling if he were sufficiently absorbed in his book.

I will not multiply these instances. We are hopelessly irreconcilable on this question, but we are very good friends on every other.

The HON. SECRETARY (Captain FRANCIS PETRIE, F.G.S.).—Before I announce the next meeting there was one remark of importance that was made a few moments ago, in regard to the absence of a printed paper. That we could not avoid. We must either have taken, as we have, this valuable address, without its being printed beforehand, or have done without it altogether. That I am sure we could not have done.

The Meeting then terminated.