

them. But it is because *attention* at first occupies itself with the sounds referred to and chooses to neglect them after they have become familiar?

From the above we see that the explanation given by M. Jouffroy to account for the fact referred to is that the waking mind, becoming acquainted with the noise, intelligently decides that it is needless to arouse the man. The strength of his argument turns on the sufficiency of this explanation. It will be our endeavour to show that there are grave objections to his explanation, and also that the facts can be at least equally as well accounted for on the supposition that the mind sleeps.

M. Jouffroy states that the ever conscious mind does not arouse the senses after it becomes aware of the nature of the noise. Well then, let us suppose that this stranger had taken great pains, before retiring the first night in Paris, to inform his mind thoroughly that those street noises it was about to hear during its sleep were very unimportant. Would the stranger in that case sleep on because his intelligent and waking mind would find it unnecessary to arouse him? Certainly not. If the theory is correct why not? But again if all that is necessary is that the sleepless intelligence within become acquainted with the nature of the sounds, why should it not become sufficiently informed on this point at least after the first night's experience? Plainly more time is necessary. And this leads us to offer another explanation of the phenomenon. It is simply that the *sleeping* mind and brain and body, having, according to a natural law of habit, become accustomed to the new conditions after a few nights, varying in number with the individual, can sleep on without being necessarily aroused by the noises. The body can become accustomed to sleeping on a hard board. The nervous system can so conform itself gradually to new conditions that it can sleep under the influence of strong stimulants. So, may it not be possible for the mind to accustom itself to slumber on amid noises at first disturbing and distracting? The actual organs of sense need not become dulled as M. Jouffroy appears to suppose; but the whole nervous, sensational and mental activities concerned in the recognition of those street noises may become much less sensi-

tive to them after a sufficient time, because of the peculiar effects of habitual experience upon us. Just *how* this may take place, we may be unable to explain. M. Jouffroy would object to the dulling of the sensational activities from habit because they are often sharpened from the same cause. To which it may be replied that our sense perceptions may be both dulled and sharpened through habit according as we may choose to encourage or oppose any given influences affecting our sense faculties. The sense faculties of an Indian are rendered acute because he throws his whole soul into the line of sense perception. On the other hand a philosopher might be surrounded by the same sense cultivating influences and opportunities and yet, by engaging day after day in profound metaphysical meditation, might soon become wholly indifferent to the former. The case of the Paris stranger is analogous. He strove to shut out the noises. Does not then the wonderful power of mind and body to adapt themselves to varied conditions furnish a satisfactory explanation of the phenomenon in question, without supposing the constant consciousness of mind?

Again it is asked by M. Jouffroy how we can account for the fact of nurses being undisturbed by all noises foreign to the patient and yet awaking by the slightest movement of the patient. How can this be explained unless the mind never sleeps? The mind of the nurse is evidently in no condition to slumber soundly. It only partially sleeps. Well then the little conscious activity which it does have in sleep is probably all constantly directed towards the condition of the patient, thus becoming of course more oblivious to other matters. The case of the footman of Halle who always awoke before reaching the small footbridge with steps, as given by Sir Wm. Hamilton is in point here. What conscious activity of his mind was at work was all directed towards awaking at that one place and time. The proposition is a very conceivable one, for have we not ourselves in our waking moments become so absorbed in one subject of contemplation as to be largely unconscious of the great world of forces about us. Therefore the case of the nurse above referred to does *not* prove that the mind cannot be wholly unconscious under conditions *favourable* to sound slumber.