

mental organization, I mean every fibre of the whole nervous system, the brain being its highest or intellectual portion.

If there were any doubt of the proposition that mind and body are one, and of the material order, that doubt should be set at rest in the mind of every reasoning man by Dr. Maudsley's last edition of the Pathology of the Mind, which in my idea is one of the best works that has ever been written on the subject, notwithstanding the howl that has been set up against it. Dr. Maudsley says, "It is a robust faith which enforces the certitude of a resurrection to life eternal of this mind, which is seen to dawn with the opening function of the senses, to grow gradually as the body grows, to become mature as it reaches maturity, to be warped as it is warped by faulty inheritance, to be sick with its sickness, to decay as it decays, and to expire as it expires."

Dr. Maudsley has in the above quotation spoken a great scientific truth; but if he so pleased he might have added that, as man's *soul* is not mind, there is no reason why a man by faith should not believe in its resurrection to everlasting life, or rather that the soul never dies. But Dr. Maudsley was not writing on religious faith, but on science, and wished to show how absurd and materialistic was the teaching that soul and mind were one, and that the logical inference of such a theory must be that the mind was to rise to everlasting life independently of the material body whence it proceeded.

The sciences of anatomy, physiology and pathology prove without a possible doubt that the mental organization is material, and that thought is one of the products of that material organization, and that the characteristics of thought depend upon what that organization may be either from heredity or its development after birth.

You are aware that to give an abstract definition of anything is under the most favorable circumstances a very difficult task, and it is more particularly so when we try to define man, there are so many different sorts of men. On this point Dr. Maudsley says: "To affirm that all men are born equal, as is sometimes heedlessly done, is to make as untrue a proposition as it is possible to make in so many words. There is as great a variety of minds as there observedly is of faces and of voices. As no two faces and no two voices are exactly alike, so are no two minds exact counterparts of

one another. Each person present a certain individuality, characteristic marks of feature and disposition which distinguish him from any other person who may resemble him ever so closely, and I hold it to be true that every special character which is displayed outwardly is represented inwardly in the nerve centre—that it is the outward and invisible constitution of nerve structure." It is easy then, he says, to perceive that we have, as original facts of nature, every kind of variation in the quality of the mind and in the degree of reasoning capacity; and that it is as gross a mistake to endow all persons with a certain fixed mental potentiality of uniform character as it would be to endow them with the potentiality of a certain fixed bodily standard. If a man's nature have a radical flaw in it he can no more get entirely rid of it by training than the idiot, whose want of parts is incontestable, can raise his intelligence to the average level by much study, or than a short man can, by taking thought add one cubit to his stature. Acquired habits may do much to compensate for natural deficiencies, but the misfortune is that the deficiency often shows itself in a constitutional inability to acquire the habit."

From these stubborn scientific facts, so ably put forward by Dr. Maudsley, you will at once perceive how difficult a task I have undertaken—to define man in the abstract. I will assume that you all know the anatomy of man.

Man is an animal, and, in common with all other animals, possesses a mental organization, divisible into intellectual, moral and emotional faculties, none of which are altogether independent one of the other, no more than is any other part of his physical organization independent of all other parts. In virtue of this animal mental organization, man, in common with all other animals, is intelligent, moral and emotional, differing, however, in degree from his fellow, and from all other animals, because of the perfection or imperfection of his physical mental organization, as do all other animals differ from the same cause from one another, that is, animals of the same species. Dr. Maudsley says, and I perfectly agree with him, that man, in common with the whole of the animal and vegetable kingdoms, has a non-corporal entity but what that entity is he does not define; some of his critiques call it self—*EGO*—but if such were the case *quoad* man we should have the *ego* also in all other animals, and not only in animals but in