Constance Naden and hylo-idealism : a critical study / by E. Cobham Brewer ; annotated by R. Lewins.

Contributors

Brewer, Ebenezer Cobham, 1810-1897. Lewins, Robert, 1817-1895. Royal College of Surgeons of England

Publication/Creation

London : Bickers & Son, 1891.

Persistent URL

https://wellcomecollection.org/works/xgrmydse

Provider

Royal College of Surgeons

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by The Royal College of Surgeons of England. The original may be consulted at The Royal College of Surgeons of England. where the originals may be consulted. This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection 183 Euston Road London NW1 2BE UK T +44 (0)20 7611 8722 E library@wellcomecollection.org https://wellcomecollection.org

CONSTANCE NADEN AND HYLO-IDEALISM

A Critical Study

29 JUL 91

BY

E. COBHAM BREWER LL.D.

Author of "Dictionary of Phrase and Fable;" "The Reader's Hand-Book;" "Historical Note-Book," &c.

ANNOTATED BY R. LEWINS M.I.

"It is with nations as with individuals. In tranquil moods and peaceable times we are quite practical; facts only and cool commonsense [?] are then in fashion. But let the winds of passion swell and men begin to generalize, to connect by remotest analogies, to express the most universal positions of reason in the most glowing figures of fancy; in short, to feel special truths and mere facts as poor, narrow and incommensurate with their feelings. . . . At the commencement of the French Revolution, in the remotest villages every tongue was employed in echoing and enforcing the almost geometrical abstractions of the physiocratic politicians and economists."—Coleridge's Statesman's Manual.

LONDON

BICKERS & SON LEICESTER SQUARE

1891

Price One Shilling.



CONSTANCE NADEN AND HYLO-IDEALISM

A Critical Study

BY

E. COBHAM BREWER LL.D.

Author of "Dictionary of Phrase and Fable;" "The Reader's Hand-Book;" "Historical Note-Book," &c.

ANNOTATED BY R. LEWINS M.D.

"It is with nations as with individuals. In tranquil moods and peaceable times we are quite practical; facts only and cool commonsense [?] are then in fashion. But let the winds of passion swell and men begin to generalize, to connect by remotest analogies, to express the most universal positions of reason in the most glowing figures of fancy; in short, to feel special truths and mere facts as poor, narrow and incommensurate with their feelings. . . . At the commencement of the French Revolution, in the remotest villages every tongue was employed in echoing and enforcing the almost geometrical abstractions of the physiocratic politicians and economists."—Coleridge's Statesman's Manual.

LONDON

BICKERS & SON LEICESTER SQUARE

1891

WORKS BY MISS NADEN.

SONGS AND SONNETS OF SPRINGTIME. Small Crown 8vo. 5s.

A modern Apostle; The Elixir of Life; The Story of Clarice, and other Poems.

Small Crown 8vo. 5s.

INDUCTION AND DEDUCTION. A Historical and Critical Sketch of Successive Philosophical Conceptions respecting the Relations between Inductive and Deductive Thought, and other Essays.

With Memoir and Portrait. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

ALSO

CONSTANCE NADEN : A Memoir, with Portrait, by W. R. Hughes, F.L.S.

Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Shortly.

FURTHER ESSAYS FROM HER REMAINS. With Portrait, edited, with preliminary Analysis, by George M. M'Crie.

Svo. 7s. 6d.

CONSTANCE NADEN AND HYLO-IDEALISM.

THERE cannot be a doubt that Dr. Lewins, of the Army Medical Department, gave Miss Naden her mental bias. He met her first at Southport, some fifteen years ago (1876), when she was still in her teens; and I first met the Doctor some sixteen or seventeen years before, when resident in Tours.

It would be quite impossible to be long in the company of Dr. Lewins without knowing him to be a man of great originality of thought, with an excellent memory, and of very extensive reading, especially in Scotch and German philosophy as well as in Poetry. But Dr. Lewins lives for a purpose, and that purpose is to advocate his own world thought—that every individual is bounded by his own egoity, and is both his own "Be all and end all." His fulness is captivating, and his persistency irresistible.

I am by no means sure that I ever fully grasped his idea, but he always told me that Miss Naden had both mastered and asselfed it. Probably my education and habits of thought prejudiced my judgment, and shaped difficulties which the fresher mind of Miss Naden never saw. She was too young to be strongly biassed, and listened to learn rather than to dispute.

As Miss Naden herself puts it : "Philosophers set problems which poets and artists, and every-day men and women and little children, unwittingly solve. Symbol and song and healthy sensation yield a clue not always grasped by the weary metaphysician who wanders amid a crowd of ideas which have too often outgrown all resemblance to their parent facts, and of words which have forgotten their ancestry of ideas."

The seed which falls into the virgin soil of a young girl just opening into womanhood, may readily take root and flourish; but the same seed dropped into a soil choked with the cares of this world, and hardened by self-interest, might remain sterile; or, if it springs up at all, may never prove a healthy and vigorous plant.

Be this as it may, Miss Naden was a far better disciple of Dr. Lewins than I have ever been, and not only mastered the subject, but rounded off some of its difficulties. It was Miss Naden who changed the term Hylo-zoism into Hylo-idealism, and she helped to popularise the subject by numerous contributions to different periodicals.*

In 1881 she contributed to the *Journal of Science* an article entitled "Hylo-zoism v. Animism";

In 1882 appeared "The Identity of Vital and Cosmical Energy"; and an article entitled "Animal Automatism";

In 1883, "The Brain Theory of Mind and Matter"; and "Paracelsus";

In 1884, "Hylo-idealism—a Defence." Here it will be observed the term Hylo-zoism is changed into Hylo-idealism. And in the same year Miss Naden contributed to *Our Corner* an article entitled "Hylo-idealism, the Creed of the Coming Day";

In 1885 she contributed to *Knowledge* "The Sentient World"; "Idealism"; and "Hylo-idealism: Does a Universe Exist exterior to Ourselves?"

And in 1887 she wrote a Preface to a series of Letters in a pamphlet by her friend Dr. Lewins.

These contributions show how earnestly the subject had interested the young and talented writer. Miss Naden herself says in a 'Prefatory Note' to her article written for Mrs. Besant, "the letters addressed to myself by Dr. Lewins, in the years 1878-1880, aided by conversation and by study of the

^{*} Note by Dr. Lewins. In reality the term was coined by myself though the concept was her suggestion, and is already implicit in my identification of Thought with Cerebration (organic function), all such being necessarily egoistic or personal; the "impersonal" being mere vulgar realism.

exact and moral sciences [have] convinced me of the truth of his position."

The question which requires answer is what is Dr. Lewins's 'position,' which Miss Naden felt to be impregnable ? I will answer what the scientific part of it seems to me to be.

Apparently, Dr. Lewins divides the universe* into two parts —the *Terra Cognita* and the *Terra Incognita*. Every individual known to man is a living museum in the Terra Cognita, and that museum with all its varied contents form what is called a separate Ego or Individuality.

All that may by hypothesis be supposed to belong to the Terra Incognita is a sealed book, wholly unknown to man; and this region, with its unknown contents, is called the Non-ego.

In the Terra Cognita there is no Non-ego, and in the Terra Incognita no Ego. But it is quite possible for an avatar to proceed from the Terra Incognita to the Terra Cognita, and *vice versâ*, certain factors of the Ego may pass out of knowledge, and get buried in the great Unknown.

Thus, since telescopes and microscopes were used, thousands and tens of thousands of far-off worlds, and countless myriads of protozoa, too small to be discerned by the naked eye, have made their advents from the Terra Incognita to the now wellknown world. While they were unknown they belonged to the Non-ego class, now they are known they are naturalised denizens of the Ego world So again, both in life and death, there are parts of what we call 'us,' which go no one knows whither; and therefore fly away, like the swallows in the fall of the year, to the Land Unknown. They pass from the Ego to the Non-ego.[†]

^{*} In Hylo-idealism there is no universe outside the Universal Idea or Thought. Its formula in this aspect, is L'Univers c'est Moi.-R. L.

⁺ I do not find so far as I understand it, this division into two worlds—a Known and Unknown one—compatible with the strict monocosm of Hylo-idealism,—R. L.

So far the scheme is simple enough for anyone to follow, but we must now come to the Ego, and see how Dr. Lewins disposes of that difficult problem.

According to the author of this synthesis, as I understand him, every separate individual is a sort of living museum, and each museum with its varied contents forms a separate Ego. The stores vary with each individual according to circumstances: one will contain many articles and another fewer; but whatever the collection, be it more or less, each museum with its stores forms a distinct Ego. The museum is the substance, the stores are all that any individual knows or thinks he knows.

So far there can be no possible difficulty in following out our subject; but we must now approach the Hylo-idealistic Ego, or the relation between man and what is usually called the objective world.

As there is no Non-ego in the Ego, it follows of necessity that what is usually called the Objective World is not objective, but to each individual subjective only, so far as he knows it; and what he knows not of it belongs, as far as he himself is concerned, to the Non-ego of the Unknown World.*

We see not *without* but *within* ourselves; we hear not the sounds dispersed in air, but only those which enter our own auditorium. And so with smell, or any other sense-object,— it must become an inmate, and be converted into a subjective idea, before we can even discern it.

If our organs of sense and imagination were removed, whatever the world may be to others, to us it would be a dead blank. Take away the five doors of knowledge, and man is an isolated being, a mere shell or *caput mortuum*, cut off from all the world,—an empty sepulchre, no better than an automaton of Vaucanson of Grenoble or the eagle of the German Regiomontanus.

* With which "Unknown World" we have no concern whatever.-R. L. If this is the case, every man's world is within his own cerebrum, and is there moulded and fashioned before it can be cognized. We see not and know not the world without, but only the world photographed on our own brain. It may appear to be without, but this is a similar delusion to a reflexion in water or in a mirror. The mirror may be only the eighth of an inch thick, but may give a reflexion of many feet or yards apparently behind the glass and in front of the spectator. The picture is made by the mirror, and characterised by the mirror. It may be distorted, broken, multiplied; of fair proportions or the reverse. Whatever the object, the glass gives it its form and pressure, and every mirror preserves its own rôle.

So with the brain and the objective world. Man knows nothing of the objective world. It must be made subjective before he can know anything about it. He sees not the world *without* him, but only the world presented to him by the mirror of his own mind, each individual brain being a separate and several mirror. So that, in fact, there are as many worlds as there are individual brains, and no two worlds are precisely alike.

Now, if everything must be asselfed, and converted into thought before it can be cognized, it follows, as a matter of course, that everything cognized is a part of our Ego. Every man, in a *relative* sense, the absolute being beyond him manufactures his own world, and that world is smaller or bigger, according to the measure of his knowledge. Every man may say truthfully with Alexander Selkirk, "I am monarch of all I survey,"* inasmuch as all that he surveys is in himself, a part and parcel of his own egoity.

[&]quot;We receive but what we give,

And in our life alone does Nature live ;

Ours is her wedding garment, ours her shroud."-R. L.

This I think is a rough outline of Hylo-idealism without its lemmas and deductions, which cannot be introduced into this essay. Its speciality is the ignoring of the Non-ego. "The world," says G. H. Lewes, in his *Problems of Life and Mind*, " is to each man as it affects him. To each a different world. Fifty spectators see fifty different rainbows, and all believe they see the same one. Nor is this unanimity delusive for 'the same,' [in this case] means...similarity in their states of consciousness;" but the "consciousness" is a *sine quá non*, and consciousness certainly is part of ourselves; that, at least, cannot belong to the Non-ego of an exterior world.

No illustration runs quite on all fours, but perhaps a pretty correct idea of what is meant by the foregoing may be gained from a camera obscura. Everything must be thrown into the camera before the sensitive plate can record it. Call the camera the individual, and the sensitive plate the brain. So far as the camera obscura is concerned, whatever is photographed must first be asselfed or made part of the sensitive plate; and before the mind can cognize any object, that object must be thrown into the mind, and impressed on the brain. If two or more plates are exactly alike, the photographs will very minutely resemble each other; if not, they will differ more or less, and in some cases be almost unrecognisable.

Of course, this does not touch the question whether or not, independent of ourselves, there is an objective world. That is quite a separate question. It only determines that so far as you, or I, or any other individual, is concerned there is no such thing as the Non-ego; for all that anyone can possibly cognize must first be asselfed, or made part of his Ego; as all things to be photographed must first be taken into the camera obscura, before the sensitive plate can take any notice of them.

Miss Naden, speaking on this subject, makes an objector say, "Each man's mind, Ego or personality, is peculiar to himself. It is his inalienable heritage...If [however] the Ego be encompassed by impregnable barriers, if between man and man there is a great gulf fixed, which none can pass over; how can the common earth and sky, which belong to the whole human race, be an integral part of any individual mind? These, one would think, must be outside not inside.... They yield their meaning not to one pair of eyes and ears, but to all who have hearing and vision. We all see the same sun, stars, and flowers; we all hear the same thunder and the same music. How else were conversation possible? How else could we carry on the ordinary business of life?"

That is the question of the supposed objector, and this is Miss Naden's answer:

"Science says You are wrong. No two persons ever see the same sun; and no one person sees the same sun for two minutes or two seconds together. There are as many suns as human beings, and as many earths as brains. *Quot mentes tot mundi.*"

This is quite true so far as the latter part of the objection is concerned, but it is no answer to the main question. It does not matter a jot if, on looking at the rainbow, "your eye," as Miss Naden says, "receives one set of light waves, while a friend half a head taller receives from the same source quite a different set of waves, corresponding to a different colour." The question to be answered is this: Not if two persons see the same phase of the sun, but whether they see the sun at all. Not whether the shorter man sees the same identical rays as the taller man, but whether the rays which reach them both come from the same rainbow; or, in other words, whether, if the sun and rainbow were not in the heavens, outside the spectators, they would see any phase of the one, or colours of the other.*

Miss Naden does not deny the existence of an objective world, how could she? She might with the same consistency

^{*} On the hylo-ideal hypothesis nothing can be outside the Mind, rigid Auto-Monism being its Ideal.—R. L.

deny the existence of a fourth dimension. What is unknown and unknowable she does not pretend to explain. All that Miss Naden affirms is this: Whatever we see or hear, know or think we know, is in the brain; and the whole universe is only an idea, so far as we can possibly judge.

Dr. Johnson kicked a stone, and asked if that were not an object outside of himself? What could he mean? If that he *saw* the stone, undoubtedly he saw it only on the retina of his eye; if that he *felt* the resistance of the stone, that feeling was in his own nerves. And if he had neither eyes nor feeling, he would have known nothing whatever of the stone, kicked he ever so hard.

Dr. Johnson had a sort of *ad captandum* cleverness which passed for wit, but much that he said might be bottled with Astolfo's brains and left in the limbo of the Moon.

But, to return, in a telegraphic communication the report of clock B is not the *ipsissima* message of clock A, but only a more or less perfect interpretation thereof; yet clock B could make no report at all unless operated upon by something exterior to itself. Miss Naden says, "If you glance at the pavement underfoot and the sun overhead you have practically a report of the present state of the one, and a report of what the other was $\$_4^1$ minutes ago. Jupiter takes 20 minutes to send his dispatches, and Sirius more than 20 years."

Just so, and it is supposable,* at least, that some stars may be extinct before the telegram of their once existence reaches our earth, so that we are seeing what does not even exist.

This again does not seem to me to touch the objection started by Miss Naden. It is no disproof of objective phenomena to say their telegrams are not simultaneous, or

^{*} But all suppositions are like all "things" else, engendered by some brain. All scientific discovery and invention is ; till so engendered they are non-existent.—R. L.

are so long in coming that the objects had ceased to exist before they reached us. The spectator could not cognize them till their messages arrived, and even then he only received a telegram and not the *res ipsissimæ*. The objects, however, must have existed, or no messenger could have been sent from their courts.

Dr. Lewins's position stands unshaken, but not the argument of Miss Naden.^{*} Dr. Lewins says there is no such thing as a Non-ego in the range of man's knowledge, for the instant it enters into man's knowledge it becomes part and parcel of his ego; so that man is a microcosm, in which is arked all the universe, so far as he knows it; and whatever is not so asselfed and reduced to thought, to him has no existence. Each man is a separate microcosm, yet any number of individuals may share and share alike.

The very word Hylo-idealism implies this much. The *hylo* is the original object or stimulus, the *idealism* is the reduction of the thing into a 'think.' Of the original *hylo* or thing we know nothing; all we can possibly know is its ideality, a mental perception, more or less perfect, read from the writings on our own brain-plates.

One might suppose from the loose way of speaking of those who oppose the Hylo-idealistic theory, that Dr. Lewins teaches that the whole universe is carted bodily into our brains,—that towns and nations, forests and trees, the multitudinous ocean and all the host of heaven are trundled bodily from their native localities and tossed into the minds of each individual who cognizes them. This is too absurd to need answer. Dr. Lewins does not teach that the mind is full of houses and trees, suns and moons, mountains and seas,—but that these and everything else must be converted into subjective "thinks" before the mind can take knowledge

^{*} I find no fallacy in Miss Naden's argument any more than in my own "original position."-R. L.

of them; and all we know, or can by any possibility know about them, is only the tale told by our own brain.

That they "yield their meaning not to one pair of eyes but many" is no difficulty at all, for the same may be said of cameras and mirrors.* With *objects* Dr. Lewins has no concern. They are wholly unknowable. They may or may not exist. All that man can know must be wholly subjective. Not things but "thinks." And Dr. Lewins does not trouble himself to pretend to explain what is physically impossible for any man to know. Let Dr. Lewins speak for himself.

"Hylo-idealism, which deals alone with the relative, ignoring the absolute as utterly beyond human gnosis, in no sense denies the so-called objective; but only contends for identity of object and subject," so far as cognizance is concerned. Let there be an objective sun, and objective trees,—all that man can know about them is a subjective sun, and subjective trees. The objective must be converted into the subjective, or must remain unknown. For myself, I do not like the word "identity" in this connection, because by no possibility can a "think" be identical with a "thing," or vice versá. One may represent the other, one may be converted into the other, or the two may be amalgamated, but this, in no case, would be "identity." Till the conversion or amalgamation, or substitution has taken place, the object, whatever it may be, is a stranger in the region of the Nonego or Terra Incognita, not yet having made its advent into our mind, or come within our knowledge, and de non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio.+

Dr. Lewins evidently recognizes an intermediate region between the Terra Incognita and the Terra Cognita, although he does not, to the best of my knowledge, distinctly state

^{*} A better reason is the substantial morphological identity of each human cerebro-spinal centre and axis.—R. L.

⁺ I do not see any force in these objections.-R. L.

the fact in any of his writings. In this intermediate state float all those "phenomena" at present unknown to any individual, but which are waiting to emigrate from his Nonego to his Ego,—such, for example, as the revelations made from time to time by science, as those of geology, chemistry, and astronomy.* These avatars from the Land Unknown are on the road to human knowledge, and to some are known; but till they have reached the coast of Ego, are a sort of *Tertium Quid* to those who have not yet taken the strangers in.

I think Dr. Lewins sometimes calls these "intermediaries" Non-ego,⁺ but I prefer to speak of them as a Tertium Quid, between the known and unknown, because they are known to some but not to the general, and are quite ready to enter into the gnosis of all. The Non-ego I would restrict to those hypothetical quiddites which no man knows anything about; no, not so much as whether they exist or not.

If I mention to a boy some sesquipedalian word he never heard before, he looks at me with blank unintelligence. He can form no idea of what the word means. The subject has not yet entered into his Ego. Well, I explain the word. I state to what kingdom it belongs—animal, vegetable, or mineral; I draw a picture of it; I describe its habits; I classify it into some known genus and species; and the boy grasps the new idea, asselfs it, and it becomes part of his store of knowledge. Now, it would be just as absurd to ask Dr. Lewins to define and explain any object not made subjective to him, as to ask the boy the meaning of a word which he never heard before. The Doctor, like the boy, must first learn his lesson, and then can only know what he has

^{*} Here Dr. Brewer characteristically ignores Biology or the science of life proper, though the main-stay of the theorem involved.—R. L.

⁺ No intermediaries are allowable in Hylo-idealism between Brain and Thought, differing thus *in toto* from the "intentional species, &c." of John Locke.—R. L.

learned. His knowledge is wholly limited to what he apprehends. It may be right, it may be wrong, no matter. The witch or fairy believed in is as real to the believer as the revelations of the telescope or microscope to the scientist. The truth or untruth of the "think" cannot in the least affect its "reality." Its reality is the thought, and that thought is only subjective. Of the object itself he cannot form the remotest idea, because no object can possibly intrude into his brain. Our only world is the world of our own thoughts, no more.

The ancients believed the earth to be a flat surface surrounded by the horizon on its four sides, and roofed by a ceiling of clouds—that is all scientifically wrong, but was as true to them as the more modern theory of Copernicus is to you and me. Their earth was what they believed it to be, and so is ours. It was a "think," and that is all.

I have dwelt somewhat at length on this part of the subject, because many imagine it to be the pinching point of the system, and some that it wrecks it altogether. Dr. Lewins is pressed to state categorically whether or not he believes in an outside world,-whether or not he believes that the stone kicked by Dr. Johnson was *intra* or *extra*; and he replies, very properly, I can only believe what I think. He is asked again what are the multitude of objects all around, above our head and under our feet? He replies they are what we see, and that which we see we see in our own cerebrum. Being driven still furthur, he is asked if he believes the thoughts of his brain are identical with the objects around? He can only reply: Of the unknown I can predicate nothing. Put the object or objects into my brain so that it can asself them, and I will answer your question; but till then all I can say is I can recognize no other universe than that of my own thoughts.

The boy referred to above would answer in the same way,

and answer rightly. I ask him about the pterodactyl, and he says, What is that? I never so much as heard the word before. I then ask him whether it is fish or fowl, flesh or good red herring? He replies how can I tell? for I know nothing about the matter. Still further pressed by the question whether or not it is like anything he knows about, he can only answer I cannot tell, because I have not the most remote idea what the word means. Tell me what is meant, and if I understand what you say, and believe it, I will answer your question. That is, when he has asselfed the subject he will tell me what he has asselfed. It will only be a "think," and there the matter ends.*

As an axiom it may be stated in the words of Cardinal Newman, "There is no ultimate test of truth besides the testimony borne to truth by the mind itself;" or in the words of Miss Naden: "The whole universe of things and thought is [to each individual] only an *automorphosis*; each Ego being to itself, as Protagoras postulated, the measure and standard of all existing things, of all thought and objects of thought."

Miss Naden, following the footsteps of her friend and teacher, says quite correctly: "Paralyse the brain, and you paralyse the intellect; intoxicate the brain with opium, and you create within it a wondrous new heaven and new earth; make the brain dead drunk, and you degrade the inner deity to the lowest of brutes." By stimulating certain parts of the brain of a dog or monkey, you can produce movements of the limbs such as are usually the sequence of volition. Electricity plays the role of will. We thus have evidence that physical forces can direct and modify thought, imagination,

^{*} What I term a "think" is named by Bishop Berkeley "the idea of a thing,"—a position so contemptuously rejected by Dean Swift, Bishop Warburton, and other "downright" realists. The late Mr. Bradlaugh rejected Hylo-idealism, though yielding a *scientific* basis and formula for his own, more or less empiric, atheism.— R. L.

action. We have no evidence whatsoever that there is any other kind of force which gives like results.

"Reasoning from analogy, we may justly conclude that thought, imagination, action, are normally directed and modified by physical forces. The God within is simply the energy stored up in the thought cells; and this energy is no separable spiritual being, but [only] a specialised form of that cosmic vitality, or vis insita, which is inherent in matter. The plant wins its life from earth, air, and water, which, in ordinary parlance, are not alive; [and] yields that life to nourish the tissues of thinking and feeling man (animals). Some goes to feed the muscles, and is consumed in muscular work; some goes to enrich the blood, and to form the various secretions; some goes to renew the brain, and is burnt up in cerebration. The circle from inorganic to organic, and back again—from death to life, and from life to death—is never interrupted.

"Here comes, says Miss Naden, the most critical point of the enquiry : If the Universe be simply a more or less coherent vision ; ...how are we to know that there is any such thing as Matter? ...how are we to be sure that the brain itself exists, and that the all-generating cells are not mere illusory appearances?" Here stop a moment. Dr. Lewins does not say that the Universe is only a vision,* but only a photograph, or telegraphic message sent from the unknown without; and that all we know of that "unknown without" is copy stereotyped on our brain. There *is* a without, but it belongs to another firm. There are two clocks, one at a distance, and one at home. They are in constant correspondence, but all we know anything about is the tell-tale of our own clock. The word "vision" does not correctly represent the

^{*} Yes, he does, viz. :—A phenomenon or apparition. This is the real present standpoint of Science, which treats of phenomena as the only accessible realities.—R. L.

idea. A photograph is not the original, but it is no vision.* The furthest from it possible. It is a reality from a reality. Not the real or original reality, but nevertheless an abiding witness thereof. Man knows nothing of the original, because it is in some far country quite inaccessible; but he knows the copy which he keeps at home, and he presumes it to be pretty correct, because millions untold have similar copies, and they fairly coincide with each other.

The true question should have been put thus: If all we know of the Universe is what our senses have asselfed, how can we be sure that the brain itself exists? And the answer is obvious: the brain could not asself, if it did not exist. The fact that it gives a report proves its existence. It may be a cracked mirror, a distorting mirror, a badly made mirror, but it gives some sort of reflection, and therefore exists.

Miss Naden talks of "Matter...How are we to know that there is any such thing as Matter?" But we ought to have been told what is meant by Matter. If the stuff of which things are made [materies] well and good; but if what is ordinarily understood by the word; that is, a multiple of indivisible atoms, I must confess myself wholly unable to grasp the idea. Euclid tells us that a point has no dimensions, a line only one, a superficies two, and a solid three; but this is simply definition. He does not say that a line is a multiple of points, or a superficies a multiple of lines. If an atom is a mathematical point, without dimensions, no multiple of atoms can make a solid. It is possible to talk of a solid reduced so far as to have neither length, breadth nor thickness, but it is wholly impossible to conceive of such a thing as a real entity.[†]

^{*} Surely yes. Still this distinction between idea, vision, photograph, &c., I find quite beside the question.—R. L.

⁺ I find no bearing whatever in these remarks on the truth of Hyloidealism. In the biological sciences Mathesis is quite out of court, supplanted by Logic.

Miss Naden goes on to say: that Hylo-idealism may be called by those without "the gospel of selfishness,"* but adds, "Self, in common parlance, signifies a little private enclosure, jealousy walled around; in philosophical language, it is coextensive with the cosmos. Every man his own universe." This, without doubt, is Dr. Lewins's standpoint. His alpha and omega is the practical annihilation of the Non-ego, by its absorption into the Ego the instant it comes into the field of man's cognizance. Dr. Lewins is not so illogical as to deny the Unknowable. Every positive must of necessity have its negative or opposite-to truth falsehood, to honesty dishonesty, to known unknown, and so on through the whole gamut. All Dr. Lewins affirms is, that the unknown, so long as it remains unknown is unknown; and if unknowable, can never enter into the field of the known. That which is known becomes by that very fact a part of man's Ego, where it is moulded and fashioned by the idiosyncrasy which constitutes man's individuality. Even deity and revelation form no exception to this universal rule, and hence the thousand-and-one sects, the multitude of religions, and the numberless interpretations even of what is called divine revelation; for being cognised and then made part of ourselves, its 'thinks' become our own thoughts, and always smell of the cask. Each recipient of the idea fashions it in his own mould, and then believes what he believes he believes. If, however, deity and revelation were a rigid A-per-se, and fell presumably into the human mind, they would remain alone, not mixing with man's thought, nor forming alliances with man's nature. This is incontrovertible, for an A-per-se cannot possibly become an A-cum-multis-aliis.

Dr. R. W. Dale in an article entitled "Constance Naden," in the *Contemporary Review*, of April, 1891, says: "The philosophical creed which, under Dr. Lewins's teaching, Miss

^{*} Selfism, not selfishness, is its true connotation. Egoism, not Egotism.—R. L.

Naden accepted, is called Hylo-idealism...but I have been unable to think myself into the position of an Hylo-idealist... The theory begins...on familiar ground : Its first position is that we have no knowledge of the thing as it is; that all our knowledge is relative. Its second position is also well known to all students of philosophy; it assumes that, if all knowledge is *relative*, all knowledge is purely *subjective*; forgetting that a relation is the synthesis of two terms, and that if either of the terms is suppressed, there is no relation. Our universe, says Miss Naden, is made up of sensations...and beyond sensation we cannot pass."

In this quotation some little obscurity is introduced by the word sensation, which means here offspring of the senses.* Our only doors of knowledge are the senses, and all we know of the Universe must have entered by one of these doors. And when it is said that all our knowledge is relative. Miss Naden means it is not absolute, not unconnected with our egoity. It is part of ourselves, in ourselves, and therefore subjective; not out of our egoity, or objective. Miss Naden, being impressed with the idea of the Ego and its contrary the Non-ego, says virtually, "Our universe is part of our Ego, because our knowledge thereof is acquired by the senses; and, being so acquired, becomes part and parcel of ourselves." It is not apart from our Ego,-not in the enemy's camp call Non-ego,-but one of our allies; so that Dr. Dale's remark that "a relation is the synthesis of two terms" has no bearing on the subject. The quotation given by Dr. Dale from Miss Naden's Essay, called "Induction and Deduction," is this: "Practically we may say of self...In it are all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth,-things visible and things invisible,-whether

^{*} But sensation includes not only the five special senses, but general sensation and thought as well, being indistinguishable from, and synonymous with, consciousness. All the senses are modes of tact or touch.—R. L.

thrones or dominions, or principalities or powers ;—all things have been created through it, and unto it ; and self is before all things ; and in self all things consist." The only word

all things; and in self all things consist." The only word objectionable in this paragraph is the word "created "—made out of nothing—which should have been sensated or rendered by our senses subjective.* Man does not create his universe, or it would be absolute and not relative at all; and it would give man the power of producing something out of nothing, which is not Dr. Lewins's idea, *me judice*. Perhaps "differentiates" would better express the Doctor's meaning: Every man differentiates his idea of the Universe according to the texture of his own mind—one man's mind may be tinctured with Otto of Roses, another with asafœtida, one with honey and another with gall, and whatever is cast into these vessels *testam olebit*. That is how I understand the quotation.†

Dr. Dale, continuing the same remark, tells us in a note to one of Miss Naden's essays, [contained in the same volume], "Dr. Lewins gives his own account of the theory. He says that when Napoleon, on his way to Egypt, objected to the materialism of modern science by pointing to the stars, and asking, 'Who made all that?' the answer of his *savans* was probably 'No one, they are eternal.' But Dr. Lewins thinks the true answer would have been 'Yourself.' What you see is ...only an organic function of your own *sensifacient* organism."[‡]

This answer is quite consistent from Dr. Lewins' standpoint. What we see we see in ourselves, not out of ourselves. As Miss Naden said "all our knowledge is relative," and

[‡] Strong evidence in support of Individualism supplied by the morphology of the eye, in the fact, that the rods and cones of the retina—the essential factors in vision—face inwards towards the bottom of the organ, not outwards towards the *pseudo*-outer light.—R. L.

^{*} I find this objection hypercritical. The brain *does* create or generate its own imagery.—R. L.

^{*} This reading I cannot accept. My meaning is that all we can see is brain-born. It is only Kant's negation of *Thing in itself*, which leaves, as the only alternative, *Thing in myself*, with the Materialism more clearly developed than seems practicable in Metaphysics.—R. L.

therefore cannot be disconnected with ourselves. We must sensate before we can ever know or see anything, and what we see we see in our own camera obscura—the head. Of course, the eye does not see the object looked at, but only its reflection on the optic nerves, telegraphed to the brain. So that in this sense every one makes his own universe; or else the non-ego must be absolutely separate from the ego, and yet in relative union with it—an obvious contradiction.*

Dr. Dale in his concluding remarks says: "In her philosophical expositions, ...Miss Naden shows acuteness and a charming lightness of touch. Her style is singularly graceful and clear, and her illustrations felicitous....

"I called upon her a few days after her grandmother's death, [and she] then told me how great a change had passed upon her whole conception of human life and destiny. My little 'Consie'...had faced the eternal problem of human thought... The heavens and the earth, truth and beauty, the awful contrasts between right and wrong, and the glory of the Supreme, [all these] she had come to think...are the creations of the grey thought cells of the cerebral hemispheres."

I do not think that Dr. Dale fully understood the young philosopher. Perhaps the indefiniteness of the words with which she tried to make her subject clear was in some measure at fault; but I do not believe Miss Naden meant that heaven and earth, truth and beauty, right and wrong, creator and creation, were sickly dreams, the mere imaginings of the mind.⁺ She speaks of the "stimulus of thought," the

^{*} Here Dr. Brewer conflicts with what he asserts above as to "Creation." For to make a world or create it is identica'.—R. L.

⁺ She certainly did not consider truth and beauty as sickly dreams. But Creator and Creation she necessarily held to be the mere provisional "imaginings of the [human] mind." Dr. Dale's gloss is certainly a misconception ; Miss Naden's point being that all each self sees or feels is the product, or eject, of the grey thought cells of the supreme cerebral ganglia. This point is only an extension of Shakespeare's : "There is nothing good or bad but thinking makes it so," or of Luther and Cardinal Newman's "Private Judgment."--R. L.

something which generates it, and this being given or planted in the mind, its form and pressure must depend on "the grey thought-cells of the cerebral hemispheres," for they may be changed at will by the surgeon's knife.

Dr. Aitken tells us, in his Science and Art of Medicine, that slicing the hemispherical ganglia of the cerebrum has no other effect than to make the victim of the vivisector stupid or demented; or, in other words, to take away its mind, *i.e.* its power of will and ideation. You can remove, without death supervening, the whole brain proper from animals so high in the scale as cocks and hens; and they eat, drink, and get fat,—only their mind is quite gone. They are pure machines, and seem to have no will, or desire, or thought; just like men under the influence of narcotics: as for instance, Nepenthe, so graphically described in Homer's Odyssey (book IV, verse 301, &c.)

To this quotation Dr. Lewins adds from Bishop Berkeley's "Principles of Human Knowledge." "Some truths there are so near and obvious to the mind, that a man need only open his eyes to see them. Such I take this important one to be,—that all the choir of heaven and furniture of earth—in a word, all those bodies which compose this mighty frame of the world, have not any substance without a mind." Which Dr. Lewins explains to be this: "that we perceive nothing but our own perceptions." Just so. Till our senses have made them subjective, to us they are virtually non-existent.

Dr. Lewins continuing his exposition (2 January, 1879) says to Miss Naden: "Just realise the idea, the feeling, or vision, that you are one with all the objects of sensation and thought to the furthest confines of the starry heavens, millions and quadrillions of times beyond the range of the telescope, wherever light and motion ... exist; and the whole problem that has maddened ... the race of man is ... solved. It is a solution sublime beyond the ... dreams of poetry and philosophy." Here the doctor most distinctly recognizes a "starry heaven" and an existing world, a non-ego till it has entered the realm of our Ego,* and then we are one together heaven and earth, the fields of imagination, subject and object, all that is and all we think there is, all is one Ego. We do not create this mighty store out of nothing, but we asself it, and give it "a local habitation and a name." I am quite prepared to echo the quotation "truly we are fearfully and wonderfully made." It is wonderful beyond the range of words that this little organism, called man, should yet be a sensitive camera upon whose brain is writ all that eye can see, or mind conceive; all that is, and all that is supposed to be, a macrocosm of a vast microcosm without beginning and without end. Yet so it is, for man's Ego is all this.†

I was not asked to write a Memoir of Miss Naden, others who knew her well have done that. All I have been asked to do is to show how far this rare youthful Englishwoman was a faithful exponent of Hylo-idealism, as I myself read the subject. Probably I have been but a halting interpreter, but I have known Dr. Lewins for more than thirty years, sometimes as travelling companion, sometimes as an intimate friend, and sometimes as a frequent correspondent. He well knows that we do not at all times see eye to eye. I do not

^{*} Both Miss Naden and myself everywhere contest Kant's dualism in separating the motions of the celestial bodies from those of his own mind—the former for us having no *locus standi* till merged in the latter.—R. L.

⁺ And yet it is only common sense and commonplace reality that all man sees, or can possibly see (percept and concept alike)—in all senses of the term—is but the project of the Self. Fact is indeed stranger than all fiction, both of which, however, being alike issues of the vesiculo-neurine. A dream and waking reality only differ in the condition of the Brain. In the dream there is less than normal circulation, through it, of arterial blood. A Brain not properly supplied throughout with that *pabulum vitae* is thus a dream-land. And that, as yet, is the state of the vast majority of our race, and especially of specialists. See Miss Naden's poem, *The Pilgrim*, at page 39 of "Songs and Sonnets of Springtime."—R. L.

pretend to be an Hylo-idealist, but I have studied the subject; and perhaps, next to Miss Naden, know more of Dr. Lewins as a scholar and a thinker than any other person.

It must, however, be distinctly understood that I do not pledge Dr. Lewins to any statement here made, nor do I pledge myself to be one in thought with him throughout. This perfect unity was not essential for the work allotted me. All I undertake to do is to write a short article on Miss Naden as an expositor of Hylo-idealism, of course as I myself understand the subject. Her talent is undoubted, her sincerity none can gainsay, her singleness of mind was beautiful in the extreme. Whatever her creed she "let her light so shine before men that they saw her good works." Mrs. Daniell, who had travelled with her, and lived with her, tells us "All her thoughts were noble and generous. The smallest evasion was a difficulty, and any approach to untruth in any shape was an utter impossibility." Such talent, backed with such truthfulness, is a splendid Letter of Recommendation to Hylo-idealism.

Miss Naden was young for a philosopher, but had all the stuff out of which philosophers are made. She shone on earth for only a few brief years, and passed away before the morning dew of her glory had felt the chilling touch of an unsympathetic and un-ideal world.

E. COBHAM BREWER.

62

Dryden Press : J. Davy and Sons, 137, Long Acre, London, W.C.



