

only occasionally dream and always remember that they have dreamt. If the former is true, as Sir Henry Holland supposed, then something in us is independent of sleep, wants no rest while it lives, a strange fact from every point of view; if the second, what is it that suddenly disconnects the slumber of the body from the slumber of the mind? Can the nerves sleep and the mind act? and if so, why should a concussion of the spine necessarily produce partial fatuity? Many Asiatics, and we have read somewhere, some tribes of Russians, have a ghastly superstition about sleep. They believe that people exist who, waking, can talk the talk of sleepers, who can whisper, that is, to sleepers in a tone which compels the mind to act without waking the body, can therefore pour ideas and facts into the brain, say of a king, without his ever knowing the source of his beliefs. That superstition is groundless, and was probably built on the observation that some men are awaked instantly by the human voice and sleep again the moment it ceases, but it is an expression of the truth that the mind can acquire while the body sleeps. Then do people ever wake? Sleep is not stranger than the cessation of sleep, and can this ever occur without external influence, light, or sound, or pain? Suppose a man accustomed to sleep in the dark kept carefully away from light, and sound, and new currents of air, would he not sleep on till awoke by the actual pain of hunger? If the will is asleep he ought not to awake himself, and the common experience of mankind suggests the possibility of such oversleeping, but yet it also informs us that if we go to bed strongly willing to wake at a particular and unusual hour, we do so awake. Was the will half asleep, dozy, as it were?

much more vulgar, but also much more useful one, stands some chance of being neglected, has indeed been neglected, rather to the discredit of physiology. Sleep being a physical condition, is it not possible to induce that condition without the use of drugs? A writer in the *Cornhill Magazine*, not very long since, discusses that question, of course without definite result, but he states in a popular form the most essential datum of the proposal, one much misconceived by the public. It used to be believed that the cause of sleep, or rather the proximate cause, was the turgidity of the blood-vessels of the brain. They pressed on something too hard and the man went to sleep. Alcohol, it was said, made them turgid, visibly flushing the face, and alcohol, it was clear, produced sleep. Unfortunately for the theory, physiologists, when they came to examine the matter with their clean minds and sceptical criticism, doubted if the facts corresponded to it, found that it was exactly the reverse of facts. A woman got her head broken conveniently and was watched, animals' heads were opened remorselessly, and it was ascertained that the probable cause of sleep was low circulation in the arteries of the brain. They got pallid in perfect sleep, and flushed in imperfect or dreamy sleep. "The principal evidence as to the human brain in sleep is derived from the observation of a woman at Montpelier, a case well known and often quoted. She had lost a portion of the skull-cap, and the brain and its membranes were exposed. "When she was in deep or sound sleep, the brain lay in the skull almost motionless: when she was dreaming, it became elevated, and when her dreams, which she related on waking, were vivid or interesting, the brain was protruded through the cranial aperture. This

Among speculations of this kind a