

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Kara L. Fromke entitled "From Hyperspace to Mental Hygiene: A. T. Schofield's Conception of Mind and Spirit." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in History.

Denise Phillips
Major Professor

We have read this thesis and
recommend its acceptance:

John Bohstedt

Ernest Freeberg

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the
Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

**FROM HYPERSPACE TO MENTAL HYGIENE:
A. T. SCHOFIELD'S CONCEPTION OF MIND AND SPIRIT**

**A Thesis
Presented for the
Master of Arts Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville**

**Kara L. Fromke
August 2007**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following individuals for their support in the completion of this thesis:

My professor and advisor, Dr. Denise Phillips, especially for her willingness to read countless drafts on the fourth dimension and for her patience with me, an unreformed “deadline pusher.” Thank you for all the moral support you offered me, for your mentorship, and for an excellent grounding in the history of science—and religion, too! I will most definitely continue to seek out your advice and guidance, which I value highly—you have been of immeasurable help to me these past two years. I look forward to seeing you often in the small community gatherings of historians of science.

Dr. John Bohstedt, my professor and co-advisor on topics related to British history. I tried to include at least one good riot for you—a street skirmish, of sorts, will have to do. Thank you for giving me a solid background in British history and revolutionary Europe, and for opening my eyes to facets of “politics” I had not seen before. You provide a model of active, informed, and responsible citizenship to emulate; and your dedication to teaching serves as an example I hope to follow one day.

Dr. Ernest Freeberg, my professor in American religious history. Thank you for challenging my preconceived ideas of American religious life, and for encouraging me to thoughtfully consider how to share and preserve an American heritage, formed out of many religious traditions, while still holding individual beliefs and respecting difference. The respect you extended in the classroom will not be forgotten.

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the intersection of psychology and religion in late-Victorian Britain through the life of medical psychologist and lay religious author, Dr. Alfred Taylor Schofield. Extending the work of recent scholarship on the contested nature of nineteenth-century sciences of mind, this study focuses on the interplay between popular and professional communities engaged in discourse over mind/body issues and the unconscious mind, and the relevance of these contemporary topics to debates over the certainty of natural versus supernatural knowledge.

In the period between 1890 and 1910, when psychology ('the new psychophysiology,' in Britain) emerged as an autonomous scientific discipline separate from its past disciplinary home within moral philosophy, the application of psychology within medicine (early psychiatry) encountered institutional and philosophical impediments that hindered the incorporation of psychodynamic theories and new psychotherapeutic regimens into medical curriculum and clinical practice. This paper examines the rising cultural phenomena of faith healing, the responses of religious and medical communities to popular healing movements, and the implications that these movements had for both the development of early psychiatry as well as for contemporary transformations in religious sensibilities.

Utilizing the unique position of A.T. Schofield, who straddled a popular-professional divide in mediating between medical and lay religious communities, this paper seeks to explain how the proliferation of popular healing movements *provoked*

professional interest in new psychotherapies while psycho-physiological explanations of faith healing *altered lay religious* understandings of ‘miracles’ and transcendental knowledge.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
CHAPTER ONE	1
Introduction.....	1
‘The Controverted Question of our Time:’	6
<i>Debating the Supernatural at the Interface of Expert and Amateur Knowledge</i>	6
<i>Historiography</i>	11
CHAPTER TWO	21
Unconscious Beginnings:.....	21
Heavenly Visions and Transcendental Knowledge	21
CHAPTER THREE	30
Another World; or, The Fourth Dimension	30
<i>Finding the Fourth Dimension</i>	30
“Seating” Mind in a Higher Dimension.....	37
<i>Thoughtland and the Fourth Dimension</i>	41
<i>Connecting the Fourth Dimension with the Unconscious Mind</i>	43
CHAPTER FOUR.....	51
The Unconscious Mind and The Science of Mental Therapeutics	51
<i>Establishing ‘The Unconscious Mind:’ Setting the Broad Agenda</i>	51
<i>Constructing Authority on ‘The Unconscious Mind’</i>	56
‘The Unconscious’ Versus Divine Agency:.....	65
<i>The Fine Line Between Faith-Healing and Fraud</i>	65
<i>Bishops and Physicians Cautiously Get on Board</i>	68
CHAPTER FIVE	76
Conclusion	76
<i>The Re-enchantment of Science ~The Relocation of Miracles</i>	76
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	79
Vita.....	83

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
Figure 1 – Photograph of Dr. Schofield.....	22
Figure 2 – The Laws of the Fourth Dimension.....	44
Figure 3 – Schofield’s Provisional Model of the Brain	59
Figure 4 – The Disturbances at St Martin’s Town-Hall	70

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Interest in ‘psychological medicine’ flourished outside of institutional boundaries in late-nineteenth-century Britain. There was a definite need for individuals who treated patients with ‘functional disorders’ (disorders with no known physiological basis, contrary to ‘organic disorders’), but no *specially trained* corps of physicians actually existed to fill this need. Early psychiatry in Britain fell to the lot of either general physicians or neurologists who developed an approach to the psychology of disease, somewhat autonomously, without clear professional criteria. This made for an ambiguous boundary between professional and amateur when it came to the early practice of psychotherapy, or as it was more popularly known, mental healing. The public had a diverse body of “experts” available to treat their psychological ailments and to inform them on mind/body matters—a frustrating fact for naturalistic advocates. To the dismay of T. H. Huxley and other watchdogs of the scientific community, this unstable professional boundary permitted a discursive space for a range of late Victorians who insisted on retaining mystic sensibilities in dialogue with a scientific naturalistic philosophy. Dissatisfied with reductionism in contemporary science, these modern mystics often found contemporary explanations of mind to be the most promising doorway through which metaphysical considerations might re-enter scientific dialogue in a post-Darwinian world. Moreover, in their quest to bring about ‘the re-enchantment of science’ through the emerging sciences of mind, they discovered a scientific space more

open than other contemporary disciplines to the discussion of religious experience and belief.¹

This study considers the religious metaphysics of Dr. Alfred Taylor Schofield, a medical specialist and lay religious author who skirted the boundaries of early psychiatry in late-Victorian Britain, drawing spiritual implications from contemporary developments in mental physiology. Influenced by vocation as well as religious commitment, Schofield welcomed both the fourth dimension and the unconscious mind as new and promising borderland areas of science that would allow the pendulum of scientific philosophy to swing back from its materialist extreme. According to Schofield, “Spirit truths” had been all but banned from consideration by scientific men “under the [materialist] pressure of Huxley and Tyndall and others, whose great works on this side [of the pendulum’s arc had] led all men for a time to forget almost that there was another [side].”²

In 1888, Schofield first wrestled with his conceptualization of ‘unconscious psychism’ (his own terminology, employed in later literature) in his popular account of

¹ Anthony Symondson and Robert M. Young, *The Victorian Crisis of Faith: Six Lectures* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1970), 21-22. Young explained the terms set in early debates over the science of mind in his chapter on “The Impact of Darwin on Conventional Thought,” noting that Christian beliefs and evolutionary thought came into fundamental conflict over “the relationship of the mind and the brain” and over the mandate “that science cannot sanction a metaphysic which allows any forces or events which transcend the continuity of nature or natural laws” (21). Roger Smith shows the later integration of the mind-brain issue with the theory of evolution in the periodical literature from 1868-1875 while arguing that psychology existed “as a scientific discourse of non-academic writers and readers” with religious overtones before it emerged as a distinct science; see Smith’s chapter (five) on “The Physiology of the Will” in Sally Shuttleworth and G. N. Cantor, *Science Serialized: Representation of the Sciences in Nineteenth-Century Periodicals* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2004). Alison Winter creatively demonstrates the ambiguous boundaries of the mental sciences in early- to mid-Victorian Britain, in Alison Winter, *Mesmerized: Powers of Mind in Victorian Britain* (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press: 1998). She explores mesmerism as a pseudoscientific social laboratory useful in understanding early- to mid-Victorian culture; she, thus, challenges the marginal status of ‘animal magnetism’—in its broad cultural interpretation and application—placing it front and center in Victorian debates related to the boundaries of expert knowledge in the emerging sciences of mind, as well as to the major social and cultural issues of the day.

² A. T. Schofield, *The Unconscious Mind* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1901), xv.

Another World; or, The Fourth Dimension, a work which drew parallels between the “laws” of the spiritual world of biblical Christianity and those of the fourth dimension (a popular term referring to an abstract mathematical space of four dimensions, derived from n -dimensional geometry). Essentially, he speculatively located heaven in hyperspace. In this hyperspace apologetic, Schofield implicitly linked the unconscious mind, inchoately conceived, with spiritual discernment and with the reception of transcendental knowledge. By the time Schofield composed *The Unconscious Mind* in 1898, he firmly believed that “the psychological moment [had]...arrived for establishing the Unconscious on a firm and lasting basis.” Psychology would be “rescued from the contempt into which it [had] fallen,” escaping from an introspective fixation on the conscious mind. Medicine would “occupy a higher and more philosophical position,” at last valuing “the psychical factor in disease and cure.” Finally, “child culture [would] no longer remain the hap-hazard, capricious and contradictory task it [had] been,” but could now become “a reasonable and natural science.”³ And best of all, believed Schofield, now that these unconscious faculties had been given their proper place in the concept of mind, it could be hoped that, in studying the natural world and its laws, “men’s ears [were] now open to hear, and their hearts to believe Spirit truths, especially when they [were] supported as they now [were] from the other side by the best physiologists.”⁴

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.; See also Robert John Richards, *Darwin and the Emergence of Evolutionary Theories of Mind and Behavior*, Science and Its Conceptual Foundations. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987). Richards’ dense analysis of late-nineteenth-century permutations of evolutionary biopsychology—understood within his ‘Natural Selection’ framework—is helpful in understanding Schofield’s appropriation of German evolutionary biopsychology. One interpretation of the physiological evidence related to automatism derived from a class of evolutionary thought on mind and behavior that essentially rejected natural selection in favor of “internal, vital principles of psychic evolution” (523). Schofield appropriated explanations of heritable behavior traits from Eduard von Hartmann, a German biopsychologist connected with Wilhelm Wundt and other German scientists whose work reflected this

Schofield's proposed project—to open the doors of scientific inquiry to “Spirit truths” once more—makes him an ideal case study for analyzing late-Victorian science in theistic contexts. His work is considered here, along with his practical engagements, to gain a better understanding of contemporary questions regarding the relationship of science to religion, and of natural to supernatural knowledge. This study examines the fraught cultural and intellectual position of Schofield, exploring the religious commitments that shaped his unconventional psychotherapeutic methods and the professional commitments that lent authority to his commentary on popular religious movements of the day. In tracing the etiology of Schofield's conception of the unconscious mind, from his early employment of hyperspace to his later promotion of mental hygiene and unconscious education, this intellectual biography examines the ways in which culturally embedded traditions and practices shaped Schofield's theoretical commitments, and vice versa. Furthermore, in historically reconstituting a subjective view of religious experience and inward religious certainty, this paper suggests that conservative Christian belief of an evangelical, biblio-centered nature uniquely transformed in response to scientific developments in psycho-physiology and related popular religious movements in fin-de-siecle Britain; ultimately, in accommodating new science within their existing theistic framework, individual adherents modified their

vitalist viewpoint in evolutionary biopsychology; von Hartmann theorized that a causal connection existed between unconscious knowledge produced in an individual and underlying “unconscious purposive and formative activity” occurring at even the most basic cellular levels of a human being's physiology (523). Richards describes how evolutionary biopsychologists fell into one of three distinct schools of thought at the turn of the century in Germany, England, and America, with differential adaptations of natural selection theory demarcating the lines of division between the three classes of scientists (522-524). Schofield credits German physiologists, most notably Wundt and von Hartmann, for turning his attention to unconscious purposive activity, which he terms ‘unconscious psychism’ to avoid a reference to ‘mind,’ a connotatively conscious-laden term in British psychology.

explanations of the supernatural as well as their acceptance or rejection of certain varieties of religious experience.

Schofield received recognition as an important public figure of his time, but only *in his time*. His name has surfaced occasionally in recent historical studies, where he is either momentarily cited for his role in popularizing the fourth dimension as a spiritual realm (*Another World; or, The Fourth Dimension* went through five editions between 1888 and 1920), or for his part in perpetuating demonology within psychiatry in its earliest years of formation as a medical specialty, thus resisting the mainstream of his profession.⁵ As a prominent medical practitioner who was also a prolific author of over forty books (popular, professional, religious, scientific—many printed in multiple editions), Schofield stands as an important figure peculiarly absent in histories of psychiatry, psychology, and religion. His navigation between two communities of discourse and practice, one professional and secular, the other lay and religious, makes him an ideal subject of study, particularly for understanding the historical interchange between professional and popular culture in late-Victorian Britain from a unique perspective. Schofield moderated between his own professional community of medical psychologists and a lay community of religious adherents, and examining his mediating role reveals the degree of exchange that occurred between these two “sites” of knowledge production as well as between Schofield’s medical and religious knowledge.

Schofield was also involved in a turf war between medical professionals and religious adherents over the phenomenon of faith healing. Along this professional-

⁵ See Jonathan Smith, *Fact and Feeling : Baconian Science and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*, Science and Literature. (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994).; and Rhodri Hayward, "Demonology, Neurology, and Medicine in Edwardian Britain," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 78, no. 1 (2004).

popular divide, physician and bishop, amateur and layman engaged in a struggle over spiritual and biological interpretations of mental healing; this cultural contest involved multiple, often overlapping, claims to religious as well as scientific authority. Schofield's story intersects with this larger story of popular contestation of professional medical consolidation. Engaged in the contest over faith healing, the public and the medical professionals (who had the support of Anglican leadership) endeavored to answer a significant question: to what extent, and to what effect, would natural knowledge continue to marginalize the supernatural?

'The Controverted Question of our Time:'

Debating the Supernatural at the Interface of Expert and Amateur Knowledge

Schofield's proposal to re-introduce "Spirit truths" within science struck a common chord with many Britons—and with others, a discordant one—hitting upon what Huxley termed in 1892, "the Controverted Question of our time," an issue he saw as central to contemporary debates regarding Science and Christianity. Huxley referred to the growing sense that belief in the supernatural had been receding as man's knowledge had been increasing; more precisely, he argued that throughout the historical evolution of humanity, man's changing conception of the cosmos indicated that natural knowledge had "gained in precision and trustworthiness" while supernatural knowledge had grown increasingly "vague and questionable" in man's estimation. Though Huxley believed this widening difference to be an indisputable fact, he noted that public opinion remained unsettled over the ultimate value—positive or negative—that this reversal of fortunes, for the natural and the supernatural, would have for humankind. The great "Controverted

Question,” then, came down to one of future extent. How far would this inverse relationship between naturalism and supernaturalism extend in this and future generations? In Huxley’s own words,

Whether this difference of the fortunes of Naturalism and of Supernaturalism is an indication of the progress, or of the regress of humanity...is a matter of opinion...[Nonetheless] the difference exists and is making itself felt...The question—How far is this process to go?—is...the Controverted Question of our time.⁶

Huxley’s republication of past essays on *Science and Christian Tradition* in 1898 readdressed this question to the British public in a timely manner. New developments in the centuries-old project to sustain a *modus vivendi* (to use Huxley’s own words) between science and religion were perceptible in social, cultural, and intellectual milieus of the day. In light of these developments, Huxley found it necessary to reiterate his position, and that of allied scientists, with respect to what he termed pseudo-scientific realism, to hinder any supposed alliance of science and religion that he considered to be at odds with modern science. He characterized two groups of people as having misappropriated the forms of science, for example, in interpreting a “law of nature” as an active agent rather than as a record of experience:

[These] two classes...[include] those who are ready to believe in any miracle so long as it is guaranteed by ecclesiastical authority; and those who are ready to believe in any miracle so long as it has some different guarantee...[including] the spirit-rappers, table-turners, and all the other devotees of the occult sciences of our day.⁷

During the last decades of the nineteenth century, a movement for a naturalized Christianity cleansed of “cosmogonies, demonologies, and miraculous interferences”

⁶ Thomas Henry Huxley, *Science and Christian Tradition*, Collected Essays by T.H. Huxley, Vol.V; (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1898), 7.

⁷ Ibid., 79.

gained momentum from liberal adherents of the faith informed by the new social scientific and comparative studies of religion. Scientific agnostics, like Huxley, were often sympathetic to the liberal Christian's goal of retaining a reconstructed Christianity for its appeal to the ethical, more than the spiritual, sense.⁸ On the other hand, an intellectual tradition emerged in the 1890s that mediated between science and religion, supporting "religion-in-general" through a psychology of the subconscious mind.⁹ The main representative of this strand of modern thought, William James, adapted evolutionary principles in claiming a scientific reality for the unseen world of supernatural belief, pioneering (along with other American scholars) a psychological theory of religion. His approach gave a natural explanation for the reality of this other world and, in this way, argued for 'true' religion and religious experience on a natural basis, assuming a subjective reality:

[t]he unseen region [of religious belief] is not merely ideal, for it produces effects in this world. When we commune with it, work is actually done upon our finite personality, ... consequences in the way of conduct follow in the natural world upon our regenerative change....[T]hat which produces effects within another reality must be termed a reality itself, so I feel as if we had no philosophic excuse for calling the unseen or mystical world unreal.¹⁰

Heterodox spiritualists, modernist Protestants, and sectarian Protestant groups adapted the mediators' formulation of mind for use in popular religious movements (Christian science, Emmanuel movement, faith healing, religious education reform, etc.), as metaphysical concerns were allowed within its scientific frame, in contrast to

⁸ Ibid., 58.

⁹ Ann Taves, *Fits, Trances, & Visions : Experiencing Religion and Explaining Experience from Wesley to James* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999).

¹⁰ William James quoted in Richards, *Darwin and the Emergence of Evolutionary Theories of Mind and Behavior*, 442.

materialist formulations.¹¹ As one scholar of Anglo-American religion has pointed out, the “popularization of [this] mediating position gave Protestants the option of arguing that God and Satan acted through the subconscious to create both real and counterfeit experiences.”¹² Religious communities received an adaptable scientific support for transcendental experience from the contemporary theories of mind that the mediators put forth; the ways in which religious groups adapted this psychological tool and applied it to the practice of faith healing engendered cultural contestation that disputed both medical and religious authorities’ claims of exclusive jurisdiction in matters of healing.

In Schofield’s synthetic writings on the unconscious mind, he selectively utilized the ideas of William James and other psychologists, physiologists, and philosophers amenable to a mediating position, finding a sympathetic view to support his own cause of re-enchanting science. But as he had one foot planted in the scientific field of medical practice and the other fixed firmly in a Protestant evangelical religious community, Schofield more specifically supported a Christian theistic reading of current psycho-physiological theories. I want to suggest that Schofield’s re-enchantment of science, popularly received by many Christians eager to reconcile science and religion in late-Victorian Britain, entailed a re-location of the miraculous, from the external world of creation to the internal realm of psycho-physiological activity in man.

Throughout the nineteenth century, moderate and conservative Protestants in Britain had defended external Christian Evidences of the faith in the miracles debate that had waxed and waned since William Paley’s publication of *Evidences of Christianity* in

¹¹ See Taves, *Fits, Trances, & Visions*, as well as Raymond J. Cunningham, “The Emmanuel Movement: A Variety of American Religious Experience,” *American Quarterly* 14, no. 1 (1962).

¹² Taves, *Fits, Trances, & Visions : Experiencing Religion and Explaining Experience from Wesley to James*, 308.

the late eighteenth century. In the last decades of the nineteenth century, as biblical miracles were de-emphasized in liberal theology as well as in the popular apologetics of more moderate churchmen, the significance placed upon miraculous activity in the external world of creation diminished while increased importance was placed upon the internal world of creature, or man, where spirit, mind, and matter were seen as vitally interconnected. In the open fields of late-Victorian discourse, literary works as well as scientific literature broadly reflected this relocation of ‘miracles’ to the internal realm of psycho-physiological activity in man. Explanations of divine activity similar to Schofield’s psychological formulations circulated in the literature of the period, defining ‘Spirit’ as an interposing force present where mind and body interfaced—a frontier of science where mystery strongly persisted. As the founder of Christian fantasy, George MacDonald, queried in his essay on the *Miracles of Our Lord*, “Where, when, or how the inner spiritual light passes into or generates outward physical light, who can tell? This borderland, this touching of what we call mind and matter, is the region of miracles—of material creation, I might have said, which is the great—I suspect, the only miracle.”¹³ Just a few years after Schofield posited his theory of the fourth dimension as a heavenly, spiritual realm, MacDonald similarly (albeit, figuratively) employed “the much debated *fourth dimension*” in his last fantasy novel, *Lilith* (1895), a work he initially composed in one sitting, in a spontaneous mode that reflected his acquaintance with contemporary theories on the mythopoetic function of the unconscious.¹⁴ *Where, when, and how* this

¹³ George MacDonald, *The Miracles of Our Lord* (New York: G. Routledge, 1871).

¹⁴ Greville Macdonald, *George Macdonald and His Wife* (New York,: Johnson Reprint Corp., 1971), 549. MacDonald’s son, Greville, explicated the seventh-dimensional setting of *Lilith* for the public after his father’s death, leaving us with an idea of what mystically inclined Christians “commonly” thought about the fourth dimension: “[*Lilith*]...unfolds the world of concrete Beauty and the realm of abstract Truth...it

relocation of the miraculous took place in late-nineteenth-century British religion—and how the fourth dimension provided a convenient means of explanation for the ‘miraculous’ commingling of mind, matter, and spirit—are central, guiding questions in this biographical narrative.

Historiography

The following three chapters feature a religious conversion experience (chapter two), a fourth dimensional realm (chapter three), and a theory of the unconscious mind (chapter four), all through the eyes of Alfred Taylor Schofield. Such a range of topics necessarily touches upon numerous historiographical traditions. This paper adds to a growing revisionist literature on nineteenth-century popular science that seeks to correct a past narrative tradition shaped by the “positivist diffusion model.” This disputed model proposed a two-stage process defining the popular dissemination of scientific knowledge. First, a scientific elite claimed the privileged right of interpreting nature and producing *bona fide* natural knowledge. Popularizers then disseminated this natural knowledge to a passive reading public through simplified accounts. Revisionists are discrediting this model by exposing its flawed assumption, that popularizers and their reading audiences were passive in the making of scientific knowledge.¹⁵ This paper also challenges a triumphalist perspective, underpinned by British success in neurological science and

also treats of their condition in dimensions—of which there be seven in all, three concrete...and four abstract interblending but more positively vital. These four compose an inseparable unity commonly spoken of as the much debated *fourth dimension*—that concept of existence which, being spiritual, is not indeed independent of the concrete, but contains and controls the concrete three dimensions in creative manifestation” (549).

¹⁵ Bernard V. Lightman, “the Voices of Nature”: Popularizing Victorian Science,” in *Victorian Science in Context*, ed. Bernard V. Lightman (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 188-89.

medicine, that has obscured contestation over authority in the history of early psychiatry in Britain. Lastly, I want to suggest the need for further scholarship on the relationship between a fin-de-siecle re-enchantment of science—in which individuals insisted that religious experiences lay within the purview of legitimate scientific inquiry—and a concomitant shift in theologians’ definitions, and adherents’ location, of the miraculous.

This paper recovers A. T. Schofield’s popular and professional productions of scientific knowledge as well as the social and cultural contexts in which he reshaped existing scientific knowledge, synthesizing contemporary scientific accounts and reinterpreting them for specific reading publics. Schofield’s position as an expositor who investigated and explained psychic phenomena for religious lay audiences as well as for medical professionals allows for the exploration of various overlooked “sites,” or contexts, involved in the making of scientific knowledge. This follows the recent call made by historians of Victorian science and culture (Bernard Lightman, Roger Cooter, Stephen Pumfrey, etc.), to focus on the forgotten popularizers who enjoyed commercial success with contemporary reading audiences but failed to gain recognition in early histories of science. In pursuing these lost sources, revisionists are attempting to contest the generations of histories swayed by the scientists’ well-executed campaign against competing “voices of nature” (Lightman, for example, explored a tradition of natural theology that persisted in spite of the rise of scientific naturalism).

Furthermore, the revisionist approach conscientiously treats the production of popular science as “a sophisticated production of knowledge in its own right.”¹⁶ In the case of Schofield, this entails paying close attention to his construction of authority,

¹⁶ Ibid., 190.

analyzing his written works in light of his understood position on the periphery of his profession as well as his role as a lay authority in a religious community. Also, when analyzing Schofield's most enduring popular work, *Another World; or, The Fourth Dimension*, the very fact that he openly revealed his interest in the fourth dimension, much less offered a spiritual interpretation of it, must be taken into account. The popular fourth dimension had ties to spiritualism, theosophy, and psychical research. During this period, fledgling disciplines, especially academic psychology, self-consciously constructed themselves as sciences by putting distance between their subject matter and any research associated with mystical, psychical, or occult topics (William James, for example, privatized his interest in the hyperspace philosophy of Charles Hinton—though, notably, he was openly interested in psychical research).¹⁷ The eschewal of psychical, mystical, and occult associations also occurred in the case of medical experimentalists and practitioners seeking professional status for their specialties. Schofield's mentor, Hughlings Jackson, established the "doctrine of concomitance" to bypass the mind/body problem in studying nervous disorders, and also to separate neurological science from the interactionist position held by psychical researchers.¹⁸ Notably, Schofield set aside his earlier interest in the fourth dimension when he stepped up his campaign for the unconscious mind in medicine—ironically, his reading public sustained their interest in *Another World; or, The Fourth Dimension* well into the twentieth century.

¹⁷ Ann Taves, "From Religious History to the Cultural History of Religion," *J Am Acad Relig* 71, no. 4 (2003): 891, Marvin H. Ballard, "The Life and Thought of Charles Howard Hinton" (Thesis, M. A., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1980).

¹⁸ R. D. Hinshelwood, "Psychodynamic Psychiatry before World War I," in *150 Years of British Psychiatry - Volume I I: The Aftermath*, ed. G. E. Berrios and Hugh L. Freeman (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Athlone, 1996), 201-02.

Dr. Schofield shows up briefly in previous scholarship by Rhodri Hayward as one of “the points of contact between the medical and demonological communities” at the turn of the century. These two groups were supposedly opposed to one another—amateur versus adept. But Schofield, as a medical professional who facilitated an exchange of knowledge between these two “rival” groups, comes belatedly as key evidence in Hayward’s revised narrative of the contested nature of biomedical innovation: popularized scientific knowledge was produced through an act of expert collusion with amateur outsiders. This was not the story cast by “proselytizing scientists and secularizing psychiatrists” who founded histories of early psychiatry on “triumphant origin myths” about the cleansing of any lingering demonology, theology, and metaphysics.¹⁹ A more extensive study of Schofield’s complicated role in early psychiatry, undertaken here, uncovers his progressive part in advancing the reception of psychodynamic thought in England. Yet a close analysis of his theistic construal of physiological research helps to explain why he was often seen, nonetheless, as a retrograde in his profession. In chapter four of this paper, Schofield plays a central role in another forgotten story that further challenges the standard accounts of the history of early psychiatry.

Previous histories have largely dealt with what *hindered* the development of British psychiatry, having focused on the late and resistant reception of Freudian psychoanalytic methods more than on manifestations of an earlier dynamic psychiatry defined in the works of Henri Ellenberger, Adam Crabtree, and other scholars of

¹⁹ Hayward, "Demonology, Neurology, and Medicine in Edwardian Britain," 37.

psychiatry.²⁰ R. D. Hinshelwood and Roy Porter offer intellectual and institutional perspectives on a psychodynamic turning point, a period around 1908 when a ‘new psychiatry’ first became discernible by the blending of psychodynamic methods with physiological and moral treatments, but they do not explain why the turning point occurred. Porter’s history of expanding public interest in the “psy-sciences” (his catchphrase for pop-psychology) gains a social interpretation as his analysis moves further into the twentieth century, but even then he does not draw causal connections between the reception of psychoanalytic theory in the quality or vulgar press and the reception in professional literature and practice.

Porter’s analysis of the early decades of the century emphasizes institutional realities that *hindered* the specialization of British psychiatry, in contrast to the success of neurology in Britain (the physiological basis of this specialty lent it a higher degree of authority—early psychiatry in Britain was essentially a sub-specialty of neurology without a distinctly defined professional status). In his social analysis of mental disorders, Porter described a sharp contrast between the publicly suspect nerve specialist in Britain and his more fortunate counterpart in America: the professional advancement of British psychiatrists remained stunted even into the 1920s while “Freud, psychiatry and psychology-for-the-millions” flourished on the other side of the Atlantic.²¹ Porter explained this difference by offering two developments unique to English psychiatry that rendered its professional forms less “user-friendly” to Britons suffering from nervous

²⁰ Henri F. Ellenberger, *The Discovery of the Unconscious; the History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry* (New York: Basic Books, 1970), A. Crabtree, ““Automatism” And the Emergence of Dynamic Psychiatry,” *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 39, no. 1 (2003).

²¹ Roy Porter, “Two Cheers for Psychiatry! The Social History of Mental Disorder in Twentieth Century Britain,” in *150 Years of British Psychiatry - Volume II: The Aftermath*, ed. G. E. Berrios and Hugh L. Freeman (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Athlone, 1996), 383-406.

complaints. In England, psychiatric experts were generally concentrated in large, isolated public asylums instead of universities. London consultants, like Schofield, offered an alternative to this situation, but these practitioners were more likely to specialize in neurology than “in psychiatry proper,” and to inherit a tainted prestige from “old-style general practitioners...committed to a pastoral role [that preferred]...bluff moralising common sense” (prescribing exercise, diet, balance, and bromides) to new psychotherapies.²² This is the context in which Schofield carried out his campaign for the therapeutic powers of the unconscious mind within the medical community, but his efforts achieved little success before healing movements *outside* the bounds of medicine became a prominent menace. It will be argued that this popular-professional contestation over faith healing *provoked* serious medical interest in mental healing *prior* to World War I, before the public was overwhelmed with wartime evidence of clearly psychogenic disorders amenable to mental therapy.

This argument, featured in chapter four, offers a new vein of explanation for the professional interest in psychotherapeutics that emerged steadily after 1900 in Britain, culminating in 1906 with the foundation of the Medical Society for the Study of Suggestive Therapies (later known as the Psycho-Medical Society). Propelled by the proliferation of popular healing movements that challenged medical and religious orthodoxy and authority, bishops and physicians formed a coalition to protect their respective domains. They jointly acknowledged the efficacy of psychotherapeutic treatment, asserted that physicians alone possessed the capability to discern when such treatment was necessary or beneficial, and delineated the role of clergy in consultation

²² Ibid., 385.

with physicians when the spiritual condition of a patient affected his/her mental well-being. Schofield was sympathetic to this position but also remained cautiously open to religious claims of spiritual healing that extended beyond the line drawn by the Church and Medical Union (officially formed in 1909). Examining this transition within early psychiatry in light of “nearby” claims of healing has allowed for a cultural history of psychiatry, here, that tries to explain what *provoked* rather than what *prevented* the move toward psychodynamic theories in British psychiatry.²³

Finally, I want to propose an idea that deserves further attention in cultural studies of fin-de-siecle science and religion: that the re-enchantment of science, mediated through a new psychology armed with theories of expanded consciousness, entailed a re-location of the miraculous from the external world of nature to the internal realm of psycho-physiological activity in man. A similar theme shapes the thesis of Robert Mullin’s research on *Miracles and the Modern Religious Imagination* (1996). Working mainly within an American context, Mullin implies a connection between the disintegration of the traditional view of a limited age of miracles (the ‘biblical age’ of the early church) within Protestant theology and a growing “popular interest in the ‘modern miracle’ of healing,” though other causal factors for the shift in theology figure into his argument as well (related changes in theology, psychical research, literary influences, etc.).²⁴ Still, late-nineteenth-century derivatives of biblical psychology in the British Isles—some of which appear in the aforementioned article by Hayward—remain an untapped source of popular science and religion that holds great promise in establishing

²³ Taves, "From Religious History to the Cultural History of Religion," 892.

²⁴ Ann Taves, "Reviewed Work: *Miracles and the Modern Religious Imagination*, by Robert Bruce Mullin," *The Journal of Religion* 78, no. 3 (1998): 438-40.

the connection between a fin-de-siecle re-enchantment of science and the relocation of miracles.

Schofield's goal to re-enchant science was shaped by a particular cultural context. During this period, individuals sympathetic to religion sought to secure the domain of religious knowledge against the epistemological objections raised by the more privileged domain of scientific knowledge, even hoping to re-establish a supportive connection between the two disciplines. This occurred even while uncertainty crept widely "into the domain of legitimate intellectual inquiry," the role of subjectivity in all scientific research becoming more pronounced through physiological discoveries related to sense perception. Psychologists, above all, understood "the psychological appeal of certainty" and the need to shore it up.²⁵ Inward certainty, based on the subjective self, became the primary target and location of many individuals' work within the psychology of religion. A. T. Schofield, shared a similar desire with his American contemporary, William James: to understand the psychology of religious experience and, using human science from this angle as an intermediary, to re-establish a connection between the sciences and religion. This was a distinctly new project, different from eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Natural Theology, which had focused instead on external evidences of God, as seen through the natural world of creation. Christian apologetics of this period, likewise, seemed to shift away from traditional apologetic reliance on external Christian evidences

²⁵ Paul Jerome Croce, *Science and Religion in the Era of William James* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 224.

and toward an increased emphasis upon internal religious experience, “from an argumentative and intellectual to a confessional and personal approach.”²⁶

Beginning in his earliest works, Schofield incorporated the concept of the unconscious mind, imbuing it with spiritual significance and applying an explicitly Christian interpretation of its meaning within human science as well as within religion. *Another World; or, The Fourth Dimension* contained an inchoate conception of the unconscious mind, an idea that Schofield developed in his later works and applied to his medical practice through a science of therapeutics. This was at a time when introspective study of consciousness was the reigning framework for psychological research in Britain, increasingly influenced by physiological and evolutionary theories on the concept of mind. In a sense, Schofield contested the limited scope of mind as defined by British psychology, then emerging from its historical origins within moral philosophy, but he embraced the moralistic tradition retained by many of these psychologists. Likewise, he contested the material reduction of the concept of mind by the “new” psycho-physiologists who vied to define the fledgling profession as an inductive scientific field, even as he selectively used physiological research on automatism to support his metaphysical arguments. Lorraine Daston has argued that, in the late-nineteenth century, traditional moralistic moorings persistently shaped the response of British psychologists to the “new” psycho-physiology (naturalist advocates described it as a ‘scientific psychology’), resulting in a spectrum of professional positions, many that accommodated a theory of volition, to varying degrees, and a continued concern for practical and ethical

²⁶ Dale Johnson, "Popular Apologetics in Late Victorian England: The Work of the Christian Evidence Society," *Journal of Religious History* 11, no. 4 (1981): 576-77.

applications.²⁷ Schofield's evolving theory on mind, and his cultural applications of it, reinforce both the contested nature of mind at that time, as well as the role that moralistic tradition played in keeping the category wide open; this provided a convenient opportunity for the support of "Spirit truths" through the emerging sciences of mind.

²⁷ Lorraine J. Daston, "British Responses to Psycho-Physiology, 1860-1900," *Isis* 69, no. 2 (1978).


CHAPTER TWO

Unconscious Beginnings: Heavenly Visions and Transcendental Knowledge

“Kept on a very short chain” by his dutiful nurse during retirement, Alfred Taylor Schofield (see figure 1) amused himself by penning “what little Life Stories” he could recall from his earliest childhood to the years he spent as a Harley Street physician and a highly active participant in public life.²⁸ Written and published in the very last years of his life, when poor health limited his activity and time out of doors, these scattered memoirs provide a unique window into Schofield’s private and public life. In these reminiscences, Schofield explained how the brass plate materialized late on the front door of his Harley Street office; his medical career began in the middle of his life, as first he tried, unsuccessfully, to stay in commerce despite his “crotchety conscience” getting in the way, just as his father’s had in his own jettisoned business ventures. He agreed with his brother, Harold, a medical missionary in China, that perhaps he was “quite unfit” to be a doctor, just as he had proved ill fit for business earlier in life, but he credited this lack of suitability for his getting on so well in the peripheries of the field. In his own words, he did not follow “very stereotyped medical lines.”²⁹ An 1899 edition of *Men and Women of the Time* confirmed this fact, noting how in the very same year that Dr. Schofield returned from passing his M.D. examination (1884), with honours, at the University of Brussels, his attention turned immediately from general practice to

²⁸ A. T. Schofield, *Behind the Brass Plate: Life’s Little Stories* (London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co., 1928), v, vi.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 76.



DR. A. T. SCHOFIELD.

Figure 1 – Photograph of Dr. Schofield
Behind the Brass Plate: Life's Little Stories (1928)

specialized knowledge and treatment of nervous diseases—a pursuit “in which he...[became] almost exclusively engaged.”³⁰

This occupational turn toward the interplay between psychology and medical pathology resulted from Schofield’s fascination “with the unconscious mental origin of most of these [nervous] diseases” and led to his subsequent study of psychology, his membership in the Philosophic Institute, and his authorship of numerous popular and professional reviews on mind and body relations.³¹ Apart from lay devotional works, physiology texts, and practical handbooks promoting hygienic practices among working class women, Schofield published a considerable number of books and papers on the interconnectedness of physical, mental, and spiritual wellbeing.³²

Schofield’s infusion of spiritual principles into his medical practice and scientific writings was an outgrowth of his deep religious convictions, formed at a very early age. He professed no sectarian allegiances, but the visible signs, or orthopraxy, of his preferred religious beliefs indicated evangelical influences on the formation of his faith.³³

³⁰ Victor G. Plarr, *Men and Women of the Time: A Dictionary of Contemporaries*, 15th ed. (London: Routledge, 1899).

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid. *Nervousness; A Brief and Popular Review of the Moral Treatment of Disordered Nerves* (London, New York; 1909, 1910); *Christian Sanity* (London, New York: 1908, 1926); *Nerves in Order; or, The Maintenance of Health* (London, New York: 1905); *Nerves in Disorder; A Plea for Rational Treatment* (London, New York, Glasgow: 1903, 1919, 1927); *The Force of Mind; or, The Mental Factor in Medicine* (London, New York, Philadelphia: 1902, 1903, 1905, 1908); *The Unconscious Mind* (1898, 1899, 1901, 1903, 1906); *[A Study of] Faith Healing* (London, New York: 1892, 1899); and *Another World; or, The Fourth Dimension* (London: 1888, 1890, 1897, 1905, 1911, 1920).

³³ A. T. Schofield, *The Knowledge of God: Its Meaning and Its Power* (Glasgow: Pickering & Inglis, 1905), 9-11. See, for instance, this passage where Schofield expressed his views on the nature of biblical authority. Schofield held a high view of Scripture, in keeping with evangelical expressions of the faith, and typically expounded upon biblical text in supporting Christian belief through his writings. “Many of us may not have noticed that one of the great marvels of Scripture is that it can express so much as it does of the revelation of God in the words of men. It is this fact that makes it difficult for me to conceive of any inspiration that is not verbal, for it is on the very words used that the accurate expression of the Divine thought depends...no reverent mind can study the Greek Testament without seeing the truth of this on every page” (9-10). Also see Hy Pickering, *Chief Men among the Brethren* (Neptune, N.J.: Loizeaux Bros.,

To better understand his eventual employment of hyperspace in defending supernatural agency, one need only look to Schofield's account of his conversion, as well as an experience at the end of his life, to notice how central the on-going work of the Holy Spirit was to Schofield's conception of religious faith and 'inward certainty.' As a man of science, Schofield sought out scientific means of understanding spiritual, divine intervention in the life of individual believers. Throughout his whole life he seemed to pursue concrete answers to the question of how the Holy Spirit communicated and worked in this world. In the end, he found that whatever certainty he held with respect to religious truths always rested on the basis of faith, with human reason tagging along closely as a crucial if limited guide. Once again, Schofield's narration of personal memories, from cradle to old age, serves as the window into these two retrospective and subjective moments.

From a remote period in the eighty-second year of his life (1928), Schofield described his conversion experience at age fourteen as "a genuine influx of the Divine Spirit," vividly recalling the commitment he made to lifelong Christian belief at that coming-of-age moment as mediated through a "Heavenly vision" in the middle of the night.³⁴ He had stubbornly put off a schoolmate that day, a boy he boarded with at a Private Academy in Rhyl, who had asked him whether he was a Christian or should like to become one. In that year (1860), "there was all over England a great wave of religious revival," and that night his friend was headed to a prayer meeting: "[Would he] not like

1986), 200-02. for a short biography describing Schofield as a religious leader in the broad (not the exclusivist branch-off), evangelical Brethren movement.

³⁴ Schofield, *Behind the Brass Plate: Life's Little Stories*, 37, 38. "A genuine influx of the divine spirit" represents the kind of explanatory language used by proponents of the subconscious, or in this case unconscious, mind.

to be prayed for?”³⁵ Schofield retorted a second time with a negative dismissal, “...it will do me no atom of good, I’ve been prayed for often enough[;]” and so he had, “being religiously brought up” by his mother and father, who “had done their best,” but so far, had only sown “the seed on stony ground.”³⁶ He retired to bed early with a slight cold, ruminating on his dismal spiritual condition. But he rested little, feigning sleep when his friend returned, whispered his nightly prayers, and quickly entered a peaceful slumber. He thought to himself, “[what] a strange thing that God should look down...into that little room and see two boys on two beds, one all right and the other all wrong.”³⁷ And tossing about uneasily until nearly two a.m., he at last asked himself, “why [couldn’t I] quietly rest like that boy?” only to be surprised by a verbal reply to his question, not sensibly of his own making. Then came his ‘Heavenly vision:’³⁸

Suddenly there came to my consciousness rather than to my mind the words, “Because you won’t take it.”...”Take What?” I said. And as I lay in my bed, lo, I saw in my mind that I was very sick of a mortal disease, and that by the bedside was a table, and upon it a bottle of medicine which I was perfectly sure would cure me. And there was I asking, “Why am I not cured?”...And the answer was, “Because you won’t take it.”...And then I saw that my sickness meant my state, and that this alone was the cause of my sleeplessness. The remedy clearly was belief, true, personal belief in Christ my Saviour. “Well, if that’s all,” I said, “I won’t wait another moment.” But how was I to do it? Of course I had known the Gospel story since I could speak, but it had never seemed to do me the least good...I saw that to believe in the medicine could do me no good, and could never cure me, I must do more than believe in its value. I must “take it.” So here was I, at age fourteen, plunged at 2 a.m. into divine metaphysics. But the Spirit of God was hovering over that young boy, for I thought, “I cannot do better then[,] than to settle it now.” So I knelt...and solemnly and from my heart said aloud, “O God! I *take* Thy Son, Jesus Christ, to be my Saviour this night,” and feeling I could do no more, I dropped asleep. The crisis was over.³⁹

³⁵ Ibid., 38.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid., 39.

³⁸ Ibid., 38, 39.

³⁹ Ibid., 39.

Schofield never, at least admittedly, experienced another such crisis of faith, but he did, by admission, always pursue his “intense desire for the truth,” meaning, when doubt occasionally clouded his “inward certainty that Christianity was true,” he followed a necessary path of testing his certainty against others’ claims to religious truth.⁴⁰ Schofield stressed the inward conviction of truth based on the nature and content of revealed knowledge; and he relied on spirit-based experiences as a means of proof as well. When, later in life, he considered the transformed landscape of religion in England after ‘the historical century,’ and the “many eminent and thoughtful men” all around him who were “practically pagans wholly or in part,” he could not “at times help wondering if [he was] a fool to be a Christian.”⁴¹ He decided at this time that he ought to “more closely...examine the faiths, or unfaiths, around [him] of which [he] knew nothing.”⁴² So he “invited representatives of every fancy religion [he] could find in London” to his Harley Street office on Sunday afternoons.⁴³ On four consecutive Sundays, thirty to forty guests of diverse beliefs, only one other being a Christian, assembled to discuss a broad range of religious topics. Schofield’s recollection of the discussions and the conclusions he drew from them reveal, partially, the grounding for his continued adherence to “old-fashioned” Christian belief in the face of many competing new rivals of that day:

I said I had called them together as I was an old-fashioned Christian, which now-a-days was quite out of date, and I heard Christianity was now entirely superceded by many new religions. I wanted to have the best, and I would ask each one kindly to state the leading points in their faith...The four afternoons were most interesting, and there was perfect freedom of discussion. At the conclusion I thanked them that I was now in a position to judge. As far as I

⁴⁰ Ibid., 307.

⁴¹ Ibid., 306-07.

⁴² Ibid., 307.

⁴³ Ibid.

could see there was not a single religion that even offered me the advantages that Christianity promised. As to which...would perform their promises time would show. I thought therefore that this was solid ground for sticking to Christianity.⁴⁴

In convening this forum of religions, drawn from cosmopolitan London, and in responding to the panoply of religious outlooks presented him there, Schofield appeared the utilitarian moralist; yet his subsequent statements on spiritual experience suggest that a transcendental encounter sustained his Benthamite reasoning. Beyond noting the advantageous promises that Christianity offered him in contrast to alternative religions, Schofield went on to explain his willful belief in a supposedly outmoded religion by alluding once more to the ‘Heavenly vision’ of his conversion experience. The inspiration for naming his “idea”—here described as everyman’s spiritual encounter—came from Scripture, further evidence of his bibliophilic, evangelical background:

I have another idea, and that is that every man and woman passing through this life has had at some time his Heavenly vision. “Whereupon O King Agrippa,” said St. Paul, “I was not disobedient unto the Heavenly vision.” I believe at some time, it may be at Church, by a death bed, on a walk, or holiday, at business, in a ballroom, or in the night watches, that God speaks to man. The veil drops, all else disappears, the Soul and its Maker are brought together, and the whole future for eternity probably depends upon obedience to that Heavenly vision. It will be remembered that I myself in early years obeyed this vision, and that is probably the reason I am writing these pages...[H]ow unconscious we are of the limitation of the brain...We can never comprehend God; at most we can but apprehend some small part of His ways, for ‘our two-foot rule of logic only measures earthly things.’⁴⁵

As we shall see, Schofield used scientific conceptions to help him *apprehend in part* the ways of his God more than to *rationaly prove* the existence of God. He placed a higher priority on spiritual experience, and the consequences of obedience to such

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 308-09.

experience, as a support to faith. This experience included the believer's approach to Scripture, in Schofield's mind, as the Holy Spirit alone could reveal to the believer's mind the spiritual principles and truths contained in the text; and the depth of this spiritual knowledge, with "its effects indelibly impressed upon [one's] life and character," was seen by Schofield as related to one's nearness to the spirit of Christ.⁴⁶ This line of thinking reflected the theological turn, at this time, toward interest in the subjective conditions of transcendental knowledge; these ideas also resonated with William James' work on the psychology of religious experience, and his arguments for the inclusion of religious belief as a subject of scientific study based upon the outward manifestations of related psychological processes.

In a devotional work of 1905, Schofield, through biblical exegesis, differentiated between three kinds, or gradations, of knowledge that man could attain to regarding God: οἶδα, or "intellectual knowledge," γινώσκω, or "personal knowledge," and ἐπιγνώσις, or "full knowledge," the term used in the New Testament when referring to Christ's knowledge of God and, in Schofield's wider analysis, when referring to "the greatest nearness to God attainable on earth...[that] is the result of the gift of a spirit of special wisdom and knowledge from God."⁴⁷ Schofield trusted that, when God is *personally* known by a man, such a believer is "not only content but overwhelmed with gratitude to have unfolded to him by revelation through the Spirit anything of the Divine...[A]s this personal knowledge is enjoyed it leads to a further and fuller understanding of the οἶδα or

⁴⁶ ———, *The Knowledge of God: Its Meaning and Its Power*, 81.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 11, 12, 76.

intelligence in the Divine revelation; which intelligence alone, however diligently pursued, is barren and unfruitful apart from the real knowledge of God.”⁴⁸

Since his faith rested upon the inward presence and activity of the Holy Spirit—moreso, upon the assurance of that spiritual presence—Schofield sought out psychological concepts to be used as subjective apologetic tools in understanding this dimension of faith for himself. Once he wrestled personally with the internal workings of religious experience and came to some settled conclusions, he generally presented his ideas in popular works blending science and faith. Interestingly, psychology, in its philosophical home, had perennially dealt with the epistemological problem of spatial perception. Perhaps Schofield, then, widely reading the academic literature of psychology in the 1880s, came across epistemological and ontological debates over the fourth dimension. But it seems more likely that Schofield’s preference for personal interviews with expert individuals eventually guided his search for in-depth information about the fourth dimension. Whatever his path of discovery, he at last found his first psychological device in the late 1880s, hoping to unfurl the complexities of religious faith from these modest beginnings.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 42, 82.

CHAPTER THREE ANOTHER WORLD; OR, THE FOURTH DIMENSION

Finding the Fourth Dimension

It is not likely that Schofield encountered any geometry other than Euclid's during his early education and later medical studies, so he must have first learned about the fourth dimension as most Britons had, from popular accounts circulating in the late 1870s and early 1880s. In fact, in the introduction to *Another World*, he acknowledged "deep indebtedness to the anonymous author [Edwin Abbott, 1884] of a small book, called 'Flatland,'" from which he borrowed liberally in writing his hyperspace apologetic, "and without which [he was] quite sure the public would never have been troubled with [his] remarks" on the subject.⁴⁹ Abbott's social satire, set in a plane of two dimensions, with inhabitants unaware of a higher third dimension containing their own flat 'world,' sparked diverse responses and interpretations from the wide public audience it gained. Even today, Victorian scholars differ in their interpretations of the satirically veiled meanings embedded within Abbott's text.⁵⁰ Schofield, however, made his apologetic intentions very clear in contrast to his predecessor; in his own words, he meant to...

...carry on the line of argument there [in *Flatland*] brought forward, to what seems to me its true and necessary conclusion. We therefore propose, in the following pages to discuss from a somewhat new point of view the question of the existence of such a world [of four dimensions], what are its powers, its laws, and its relationship, with this universe, and in doing so, will observe how far

⁴⁹ A. T. Schofield, *Another World; or, The Fourth Dimension*, 2nd ed. (London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1897), 3.

⁵⁰ For a sampling of the scholarly dissent, see K. G. Valente, "Transgression and Transcendence: *Flatland* as a Response To 'A New Philosophy'," *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 26, no. 1 (March 2004).; Jonathan Smith, Lawrence I. Berkove, and Gerald A. Baker, "A Grammar of Dissent: *Flatland*, Newman, and the Theology of Probability," *Victorian Studies* 39 (1996).; Rosemary Jann, "Abbott's 'Flatland': Scientific Imagination And 'Natural Christianity'," *Victorian studies* 28, no. 3 (Spring 1985).

these powers and laws, deduced by analogy from mathematics, correspond to the claims of the Christian religion.⁵¹

Schofield, then, engaged with two significant questions surrounding the much debated fourth dimension: what is it, and does it actually exist? No other conception of ‘dimension’ existed at that time, other than the idea of spatial extension in a direction necessarily perpendicular to every other direction of spatial extension; naturally, only three of these directions, or dimensions, could be conceived of—whether ideally imagined or physically experienced. Certainly, like all the other contemporary theorists on the fourth dimension, Schofield posited nothing conclusive; the definition remained open to debate.⁵² As Schofield even prefaced in his third edition, “no theory carries conviction, and indeed the whole is a speculation;” still, he did privilege his interpretation as the most convincing analogy out there, albeit based upon a purely hypothetical ‘*what would be true:*’ “...the interest however of which remains untouched in the close parallel afforded between what would be true of a fourth dimension and all that is written or known concerning the spirit world.”⁵³

This popular notion of the fourth dimension had sprung from the academic realm of nineteenth-century mathematics, with the emergence of non-Euclidean and n -dimensional geometries (1820s and 1840s, respectively). For Britons, Euclid had a long and distinguished history within British culture. Therefore, they privileged Euclidean

⁵¹ Schofield, *Another World; or, The Fourth Dimension*, 3, 4.

⁵² For a concise overview of the popularization of the fourth dimension in late-nineteenth-century Britain, see Linda Dalrymple Henderson, *The Fourth Dimension and Non-Euclidean Geometry in Modern Art* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1983). For circulating theories on the fourth dimension, especially those proposed by mathematicians and scientists of the day, see Florian Cajori, "Origins of Fourth Dimension Concepts," *The American Mathematical Monthly* 33, no. 8 (1926).; Alfred M. Bork, "The Fourth Dimension in Nineteenth-Century Physics," *Isis* 55, no. 3 (1964).; James H. Hyslop, "The Fourth Dimension of Space," *The Philosophical Review* 5, no. 4 (1896).

⁵³ A. T. Schofield, *Another World: or, The Fourth Dimension*, 3rd ed. (London: S. Sonnenschein, 1905), 4.

geometry and its description of real space. This meant that the public, as well as most mathematicians, resisted giving the alternative geometries an equivalent truth value as that accorded to Euclid's geometry (with some notable exceptions). British mathematicians even had a difficult time figuring out how to integrate the new geometries into their existing conception of geometry, and how to reconcile them with their present ideals of mathematical truth; of course, the very nature of geometry and its foundations underwent reconstruction and change as a result.⁵⁴ Their discomfiture, and the public's, too, represented the gradual and resisted realization, during that century, that pure mathematics was the arbitrary invention of man, a creation of the intellect, rather than the accurate reading of nature in its ideal form. Possibly, nothing nudged this realization along so much as the development of n -dimensional geometry.⁵⁵ Remarkably, the public's multi-faceted popular response to the fourth dimension—fascination, derision, ambivalence, gullibility—somewhat mirrored that of the rising mathematical professionals; non-professionals just had less technical knowledge with which to camouflage their intellectual and cultural struggles with the concept.

Popular expositions like *Flatland* and *Another World* moderated between the public and the professionals in this case, when incommensurate levels of knowledge and technical expertise provided a formidable gap to bridge. However, more than mathematical certainties got communicated through these popular vehicles; cultural

⁵⁴ For a thorough discussion of the reception of non-Euclidean geometries into British mathematics, including the social and cultural dimensions of this process in the nineteenth century, see Joan L. Richards, *Mathematical Visions: The Pursuit of Geometry in Victorian England* (Boston: Academic Press, 1988).; Joan L. Richards, "Projective Geometry and Mathematical Progress in Mid-Victorian Britain," *Stud. Hist. Phil. Sci.* 17, no. 3 (1986).

⁵⁵ Morris Kline, *Mathematical Thought from Ancient to Modern Times*, vol. 3 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), 1030. Grassmann's work, from 1844, has been seen as the basis of the concept, "in full generality."

applications of four-space necessarily circulated via lay expositions, with or without professional authorization. Schofield, for his part, received scientific approval by riding on the didactic coattails of Abbott's *Flatland* account, already a proven success with professional mathematicians and lay audiences alike. In a letter to fellow mathematician Arthur Cayley in November of 1884, J. J. Sylvester, the new Savilian chair of Geometry at Oxford, had personally endorsed the utility of *Flatland* in acquainting his students with helpful analogues to employ in understanding higher spaces, unseen except by two-dimensional "shadows" in the flourishing study of projective geometry. "I recommended to my hearers to procure *Flatland* in order to obtain a general notion of the doctrine of n dimensions."⁵⁶ Coming from a professional mathematician, this recommendation certainly validated the mathematical content and worth of Abbott's popular publication. Schofield's extended argument, published four years later, received a favorable review in the journal *Nature* for "bringing out [*Flatland's*] salient facts," but the editor coyly dodged commenting upon the theological content of the book, only saying that...

Here we must close our notice—as we cannot go into examination of these topics in our columns...there is much of interest in the pages before us, and for some readers the speculations of the later chapters may have as much interest as the mathematical certainties of the earlier chapters have for others.⁵⁷

The clear distinction drawn here between mathematical *certainties* and theological *speculations* reveals the degree to which these two domains of knowledge had come to be perceived as separate by this time in Britain. Earlier in the century, the epistemological certainties associated with an unrivalled Euclidean geometry—the

⁵⁶ Karen Hunger Parshall, *James Joseph Sylvester: Life and Work in Letters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 254-55. (from a letter addressed to Arthur Cayley on 2 November 1884)

⁵⁷ Anonymous, "Our Book Shelf," review of *Another World; or, The Fourth Dimension*, by A. T. Schofield, M. D. (London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1888), *Nature* 38 (August 16, 1888): 363.

mental ideal that mapped precisely to the physical real—transferred easily over to religious truths mediated through Natural Theology, giving transcendental knowledge a certitude essentially similar to that of scientific knowledge. The arrival of alternatives to Euclid shook the surety that Britons had in the mental ideal, the physical real, and, especially, their relation to one another—though they did protest greatly to the contrary for quite some time. Schofield had expert guidance on these issues as he prepared his hyperspace apologetic. Yet, he still maintained a careful posture of humility, asking for...

...the indulgence of my more advanced mathematical readers for the many fallacies and ‘non-sequiturs’ that doubtless abound, in spite of my true endeavours simply and impartially to draw none but legitimate and logical conclusions from the arguments and facts I have advanced.⁵⁸

Schofield disclosed on the dedication page of *Another World* that he had received “valued help” from Professor J. H. Gladstone, “Ph.D, F.R.S., F.G.S., etc., etc.,” one of the founding figures of physical chemistry in Britain, and a friend of Schofield, committed to many of the same interests. The men devoted a significant amount of time to similar philanthropic, educational, and religious movements, claiming no sectarian preference beyond a broad Protestant association, both “mix[ing] and work[ing] with the Christians of most of the Protestant Churches” in their lay ministrations.⁵⁹ Gladstone wrote and spoke often on behalf of the Christian Evidence Society. As a member of the scientific community, he “annually convened a religious meeting, as a practical expression of his views concerning the relation of science to religion.” He endeavored to reconcile the Scriptures with Natural Science, and also worked out an apologetic formula

⁵⁸ Schofield, *Another World; or, The Fourth Dimension*, 4.

⁵⁹ Victor L. Hiltz, "A Guide to Francis Galton's English Men of Science," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 65, no. 5 (1975): 49.

for supporting biblical “Miracles as Credentials of a Revelation.”⁶⁰ He could offer Schofield help, then, in two ways: in constructing an accurate mathematical account, and in constructing authority, since Schofield was writing as a layman, in this case, with respect to both mathematics and religion, the subjects to be merged in *Another World*.

One of Gladstone’s main research interests involved the use of spectroscopy in chemical analysis, in exploring the “relationships between the chemical composition of substances and their optical properties.”⁶¹ As a physical chemist, Gladstone had experience applying n -dimensional geometry to the visually unseen, but experimentally verified, world of molecular physics. “Visualizing” and understanding the molecular structure of isomers, for example, was found to require the dual advantage of geometrical language and analytical symbolism available in the new mathematics. Wislicenus’ research in paralactic acid led him to use the convention of n -dimensioned *space*, to differentiate spatial position of atoms in explaining “the differences of isomeric molecules of the same structural formulae.”⁶² As explained by Hermann Schubert (from a conventionalist/instrumentalist viewpoint), the use of an abstract four-space, or even n -space, in this way, should pose no greater difficulty to human reason than using the theoretical concept of an atom:

...if the independence of all the possible distances between the atoms of a molecule is absolutely required by theoretical chemical research, the science is really compelled, if it deals with molecules of more than four atoms, to make use of the idea of a space of more than three dimensions. This idea is...simply

⁶⁰ T.E.T., "Obituary Notices of Fellows Deceased," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London* 75 (1904-1905): 190, W., "London Letter," *Science* 9, no. 210 (Feb. 11, 1887): 127.

⁶¹ Michael A. Sutton, Gladstone, John Hall (1827-1902), in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004), <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33418> (July 19, 2006).

⁶² Hermann Schubert, "The Fourth Dimension. Mathematical and Spiritualistic," *The Monist* 3, no. 3 (April 1893): 426.

an instrument of research, just as are, also, the ideas of molecules and atoms... Whether a four-dimensioned space really exists is a question whose insolubility cannot prevent research from making use of the idea, exactly as chemistry has not been prevented from making use of the notion of atom, although no one really knows whether the things we call atoms exist or not.⁶³

The fact that n -dimensional aggregates of points became an increasingly valuable tool within science gradually lent greater credibility to the generalized idea of space in British mathematics—long held to a physicalist tradition—despite human inability to truly represent extension of space in a fourth, or higher, direction. But a human being's ability to perceive reality truly, as it actually is, had become a deeply doubted supposition prior to this time, with new geometries, new technical instruments, and new optical discoveries all revealing the illusion of accuracy in human sense perception. Schofield's hyperspace apologetic contained recognition of the illusory nature of sense perception, in a way resembling recent physiological research, which was illuminating subjective conditions more and more through the study of optics.⁶⁴ Schofield mentioned the fact that objects, seen "by a single eye" in three dimensions of space, appeared as surfaces to the subject viewing them; "We see bodies as solids, not surfaces, simply because we have two eyes, and can see them from two points of view at once. The stereoscope is founded on this fact."⁶⁵ Such flourishes drawn from physical science constructed credibility for Schofield's popular view of the science of space, and especially supported his overall argument that real space may not be exactly what it appeared to be to the human eye. The subtle and subversive skepticism Schofield cast upon the 'citadel' of scientific

⁶³ Ibid.: 427.

⁶⁴ See Jonathan Crary, *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1990).; and Jonathan Crary, *Suspensions of Perception: Attention, Spectacle, and Modern Culture* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1999).

⁶⁵ Schofield, *Another World; or, The Fourth Dimension*, 57.

methodology (one of its most vulnerable components being observation)—with the dart aimed and thrown from within its own walls—suited his plan to relocate misplaced trust in material truths, “apprehended by the senses,” to spiritual truths, that “the human mind cannot fully grasp,” all that “refuses to be measured, weighed, and arranged” by the standards of materialist science.⁶⁶

“Seating” Mind in a Higher Dimension

“All spiritual perception of this world is by internal eyesight, the ‘eyes of our understanding’ (*Ephesians i. 18).”⁶⁷ This biblical quotation followed Schofield’s demonstration of the laws of the fourth dimension—the theoretical phenomena of that imaginatively conceived world drawn from analogy—and their “close parallel” to the laws of the spiritual world, “as current in tradition, as experienced by individuals, and as recorded in books...mainly in the Bible, this being the authoritative history accepted by all Christians of the spiritual kingdom.”⁶⁸ By chapter six (“The Land of Four Dimensions in Relation to Ours of Three”), Schofield’s metaphysical intentions had fully emerged. Clearly, in his view, psychic activity had some form of spiritual, perhaps even spatial, extension in the fourth dimension. But how did Schofield specifically use the fourth dimension to support his belief in “internal eyesight,” the means by which humans could perceive the spiritual truths of this world?

As far back as chapter one, Schofield began seeding his readers’ minds with the idea of an ‘inside voice’ in ‘the land of one dimension,’ the world of Lineland. Schofield

⁶⁶ Ibid., 65.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 76.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 66-67.

suggested that his readers might benefit from the use “of pencils or matches” to physically model the mental picture to be drawn, and thereby improve their “grasp [of] the phenomena of such a world.” He then proceeded to evocatively design in his reader’s mind the image of a world of one dimension, a straight line, with inhabitants unaware of the two-dimensional space, the plane, in which their limited Lineland lay.⁶⁹ These linear beings would also have no material notion of a two-dimensional being, say, a square, dwelling in that higher space and possessing ‘higher’ faculties relative to those possessed by linear beings:

Let my reader, then, now retire into his inner consciousness, and proceed to imagine a kingdom or world...consisting of an infinite number of inhabitants, each one being a shorter or longer straight line, and all arranged in one and the same straight line....If one end of these creatures or lines be furnished with an eye, it is obvious they will each see the end of the line next in front of them, which will be a simple point....Let the mind now proceed to picture a being of two dimensions, such as a square (illustrating it ...by a piece of cardboard), furnished with an eye at one of its angles, approaching ...Lineland (Slide the cardboard square along the table towards the long line of pencils or matches, etc.).⁷⁰

At this point, Schofield availed himself of *Flatland*’s prior excavation of this land, instructing his readers to “listen to the remarks from our unknown author [Abbott]. The square speaks:”

I saw before me a vast multitude of lines...moving to and fro in...the same straight line....Approaching the largest, I accosted it (Here bring the square close to the match), but received no answer. Losing patience at what appeared to me intolerable rudeness, I brought my mouth into a position full in front of it (Here slide a corner of the square into the line in front of the match), and repeated my question. ‘What signifies this monotonous motion to and fro in one and the same straight line?’ ‘I am the Monarch of the World,’ replied the small line. ‘But thou, whence intrudest thou into my realm of Lineland?’⁷¹

⁶⁹ Ibid., 12.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 13-14.

⁷¹ Ibid., 14-15.

The square came to realize that the “poor ignorant monarch” knew nothing of higher, two-dimensional space, conceived of nothing beyond his limited world of one dimension, thinking Lineland, his kingdom, to be “the whole of space.”⁷² In fact, the monarch had even heard the square’s first attempt at verbal communication, but found the initial experience of hearing this voice with no visual source “so contrary to his own experience,” that rather than reply to it, he assumed that he was “hearing a voice...from his own inside.”⁷³ As soon as the square had positioned his mouth in front of the monarch, and become visible as a point within Lineland as well as a voice within that world, the monarch felt compelled to reply to a presence he perceived as a stranger to his realm. The square could do nothing at all to illustrate convincingly to the monarch the existence of the higher space that he, himself, dwelled in, always surrounding Lineland and viewing that linear world in toto, but never being fully apprehended by any linear being in return. The square could see the “inside” of a line, that portion which falls between a line segment’s two endpoints, while a linear being, confined by his own perceived space, could not see the “inside” of himself nor the “inside” of any other linear being, able to see only the endpoint of his or any other being; nor could he fathom the idea of a directional line moving perpendicular to his sole line of motion, thus, transcending his space.⁷⁴ A planar world lay outside of the linear monarch’s natural knowledge, and he was obstinately incredulous of any explanation of phenomena that violated uniform laws within Lineland. Having deposited his idea of an “inside voice,” as

⁷² Ibid., 15.

⁷³ Ibid., 15-16.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 17. Schofield left the following footnote to describe the line’s “inside:” “* A line having no breadth, its outsides (so to speak) are its two extremities, that which lies between being the inside of the line.”

well as “the general conditions of life, prospects, and intelligence in a world of one dimension,” Schofield proceeded to “move a step higher,” entreating his readers to “attentively view life in a world of two dimensions,” otherwise known as Flatland.⁷⁵

Once again, Schofield quoted extensively from Abbott’s earlier work, “tax[ing] the imagination of [his] readers” as they mentally depicted “a country of *two dimensions*” from his verbal descriptions of it.⁷⁶ In this geometric terrain, “our narrator” and “old friend, the animated square,” was joined by other-shaped beings—triangles, squares, polygons, circles—but through analogy, the reader was led by Schofield to learn that these beings could not distinguish each other in these recognizable terms, as they could only see straight lines from their visual vantage point in a two-dimensional world:

Our readers will see the strict analogy here: that just as those in *one dimension* could only see *points, not lines*—so those in *two dimensions* can only see *lines, not squares*, etc. If the eye is placed on a level (that is, in the same world) with the edge of one of the cardboard figures, whatever its shape, only a straight line will be seen; for it is only as we rise above or go below it—that is, enter the third dimension—that we see the shape of the figure.⁷⁷

In this vein, Schofield led his readers through similar mathematical analogies, drawn between Lineland and Flatland, between Flatland and Spaceland (of three-dimensional solids), and between Spaceland and the land of Four Dimensions, until, at last, he drew his final analogy between the fourth dimension and the spiritual world as described in the Bible. But as he worked his way through the dimensional scaffold of analogues, dimension by dimension, his argument continually contained allusions to an “internal eye,” or to a voice from one’s “inner consciousness,” even to a “Thoughtland”

⁷⁵ Ibid., 20-21.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 22.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 23-24.

experienced subjectively by the individual beings in each n -dimensioned world, but accessible only to other beings if they were from a space at least one dimension higher. From here on, Schofield carefully chose tracts of *Flatland* containing vague conceptual support for his early (still incoherent) conception of psychic activity that lay beyond the field of conscious thought, and that accommodated an underlying, even interposing, spiritual force.

Thoughtland and the Fourth Dimension

When a sphere from Spaceland entered Flatland and “revealed” himself to a square there, the square remained incredulous of all that the sphere related to him of a higher space. The sphere could, by moving in a direction perpendicular to the square’s planar world, make himself change shape before the square’s eye. From a view above the plane, in three-space, the sphere, passing through the plane, would appear to produce a series of cross-sectional slices, a succession of circles gradually changing in size over the course of time—but what the square actually saw from his perspective within the plane was a large line gradually shrinking in size to a split-second point that all at once vanished from his sight, while he “still heard the intruder’s voice.”⁷⁸ Still, the square could not grasp the idea that this stranger came and went from a direction *upward* or *downward* in relation to Flatland, a direction that the square could only discern if he had an eye in his side, or, rather, in his *inside*, if considered from the self-perspective of a planar being.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 35.

[Square:] ‘Would your lordship indicate or explain to me in what direction is the third dimension?’

[Sphere:] ‘I came from it. It is up above and down below.’

[Square:] ‘My lord means, seemingly, that it is northward and southward.’

[Sphere:] ‘I mean nothing of the kind. I mean a direction in which you cannot look, because you have no eye in your side.’

[Square:] ‘Pardon me, my lord; a moment’s inspection will convince your lordship that I have a perfect luminary at the junction of my two sides’...

[Sphere:] ‘Yes; but in order to see into space [of three dimensions] you ought to have an eye, not in your border, but in your side—that is, what you would probably call your inside; but we in Spaceland call it your side.’

[Square:] ‘An eye in my inside! An eye in my stomach!! Your lordship jests.’

Unable to convince the square by verbal arguments, but still hoping to find in him “a fit apostle for the gospel of three dimensions,” the sphere “as a last resource lifted our poor square right up out of Flatland...into our world of space of three dimensions.”⁷⁹

Once in Spaceland and able to view the interiority of his own flat world for the first time, as well as the exterior aspect of Spaceland’s contents (though his eye be unconditioned, at first, to accurately perceive its depth), the square responded elatedly to his new powers of perception: “the matter is now so clear to me, the nature of real space so palpable, that methinks I could make a child understand it. Permit me but to descend at this moment and enlighten them.”⁸⁰ But Flatland had recently “been troubled by divers and ill-intentioned persons pretending to have received revelations from another world;” as a result, authorities in that realm were arresting and examining “such misguided persons.”⁸¹ So the square tarried longer in Spaceland, developing his sense perception more fully, to better understand the nature of solid space. Finally, his thirst “for yet deeper knowledge” led him to make the analogical leap of asserting the existence of yet

⁷⁹ Ibid., 35, 37.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 40.

⁸¹ Ibid.

another dimension beyond that of the third; until he brazenly entreated his spherical host: “...vouchsafe thy servant a sight of thine interior....Grant me but one glimpse of thine interior.”⁸² Then it was the sphere’s turn to pronounce the limits of knowledge, and play the incredulous, and offended, party:

[Sphere:] ‘My what? ...Whence this ill-timed, impertinent request?’

[Square:] ‘...just as there *was* close at hand, touching my frame, the land of three dimensions, though I, blind and senseless wretch, had no power to touch it, no eye in my interior to discern it; so, of a surety, there is a fourth dimension, which my lord perceives with the inner eye of thought....I ask, therefore, is it, or is it not, a fact that ere now *your* countrymen also have witnessed the descent of beings of a higher order than their own, entering closed rooms, even as your lordship entered mine, without the opening of doors or windows, and appearing and vanishing at will?...

[Sphere:] ‘It is reported so. But men are divided in opinion as to the facts....most people say these visions arose from the brain.’

[Square:] ‘Say they so? Oh! I believe them not; or if indeed it be so, that this other space is really Thoughtland, then take me to that blessed region where....’⁸³

The square’s last words were cut off “by a crash,” as suddenly he felt himself “impelled” by some force downward, back to Flatland.⁸⁴ Following a few concluding comments about the ensuing fate of “our square friend” upon his return home, Schofield “bid [him] a final adieu,” along with *Flatland*, “the little book in which his story is enshrined,” and “consider[ed] further the laws of a fourth dimension.”⁸⁵

Connecting the Fourth Dimension with the Unconscious Mind

In chapter five, Schofield outlined “some of the probable laws deducible by analogy from...the foregoing chapters” (see Figure 2) specifically on “the relations of a

⁸² Ibid., 43, 45.

⁸³ Ibid., 44, 46-48.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 48.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 53.

SOME OF THE RELATIONS OF A BEING IN ONE DIMENSION, WITH THE DIMENSION BELOW HIM AND THE BEINGS IN IT, *e.g.*, A BEING IN A FOURTH DIMENSION WITH THE THIRD (OUR WORLD) AND THOSE IN IT, ARE:—

1. He can enter or leave the world below him, that is, appear and disappear at will, and that without changing his form (pp. 14, 33).
2. However near to the world below him, he remains invisible till actually in it.
3. He can be in closest proximity with the beings in the world below, and yet outside that world altogether, and therefore invisible.
4. From his dimension he can see the inside of every living being and thing in the world below him.
5. When he enters the world below, he can never be wholly seen, and that part of him that is seen is always in the form of the world below him which he enters.
6. His voice, while still in his own dimension, would be heard (if hearing were possible) by a being of the world below as an internal voice from his own inside (p. 16).
7. His appearance and disappearance in the world below are not caused by any change of form or substance, but by his entering or leaving that world.
8. A world and beings of any dimension include all the shapes and characters of those below them, adding to them that further shape and character peculiar to the added dimension.

THE RELATIONS OF A BEING IN ONE DIMENSION WITH THAT ABOVE HIM AND ITS INHABITANTS, *e.g.*, ONE IN THE THIRD (OUR WORLD) WITH THE FOURTH.

1. All conception of a higher dimension is impossible, though capable of mathematical demonstration.
2. However vast and populous the dimension, to him it is absolutely and necessarily non-existent.
3. If he could hear such beings [of a higher dimension], the sound would appear to come from his inner consciousness, and not from his own world without.
4. If such beings enter his world, he can only see and comprehend that part of them that enters it.
5. And to him such part *always appears in the likeness of an inhabitant of his world* (the inhabitants of one world being always a partial likeness, or the likeness of a part, of those in the world above them).
6. He can never, by his own power, leave his own dimension or world.
7. While in his world, he can never see the true appearance or shape of any being in it, but only its exterior.
8. If raised into the dimension above, he at once perceives the true dimension and shape of every being in his own world.
9. The beings of the dimension into which he is raised, at first present the same appearance as the beings (now first truly seen) in his own dimension.
10. By close inspection and careful comparison the real difference can be discerned.
11. Even if the dimension above be visited and understood, it is impossible to describe it in the language, or to draw it in the figures, of his own dimension.
12. All such attempts are necessarily unintelligible, and sound foolish and irrational.
13. All attempts to understand or grasp the dimension above, without having entered it, are futile.
14. An eye in one's inside would, according to analogy, look in the direction of the dimension above.
15. Each dimension adds one new direction of size, space, capacity, and form to the one below.
16. The visibility of a being *does not depend on physical properties*, but on its position inside or outside of the world below him.

Figure 2 – The Laws of the Fourth Dimension
Another World; or The Fourth Dimension (1897 edition)

being in one dimension with that above him and its inhabitants.” In this way, he set up his discussion that followed in chapters six and seven, where he drew metaphysical conclusions from the assumed existence of *Another World, or The Fourth Dimension*.⁸⁶ We find at least two ideas about the nature of mind, in chrysalis here, that correspond to later concepts developed by Schofield in *The Unconscious Mind*, especially in relation to the spiritual nature of man.

First, Schofield implied both a distinction and a connection between mind and matter in *Another World*, and implicated a third party, spirit, as a component of mental phenomena that enabled an individual’s personality or essence to persist in some form after physical death. Man’s potential connection with a higher, spiritual dimension was implicit in Schofield’s concept of the fourth dimension, though this dimension remained incomprehensible to man in his three-dimensional material frame; nevertheless, Schofield insisted that it was real and discernible by man, in part, if not in whole—and *unconsciously*, if not altogether consciously. Schofield even employed an interesting, if simplistic, algebraic illustration for “the general belief that man has a spiritual nature—something beyond and above the highest ganglion cell in his brain, something that leaves the body at death, but abides in it through life:”⁸⁷

Let...the body, material and solid, be represented fairly enough by x^3 [the volume of a three-dimensional solid], and the spirit, higher and possessing an unknown power, by x^4 [the four-dimensional analogue to three-dimensional volume]. * Then $(x^3 + x^4)$ represents the man in life, while $(x^3 + x^4) - x^4$ represents the departure of the spirit (x^4) at death, which returns to its own dimension, while the body (x^3), which is left, returns to the earth to which it belongs.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 58, 60.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 68.

* In taking x^4 here to represent spirits and hereafter the spirit world, it must be remembered that we are absolutely ignorant of what is really involved by this formula. As far as we know, the ‘material’ is strictly limited to three dimensions....It must therefore be distinctly understood that we firmly believe that God is a spirit, and the other world a spiritual one, and that we have no wish or intention of materializing it in enforcing the truth of some of its laws by means of analogies drawn from a supposed fourth dimension.⁸⁸

Here, Schofield qualified his conceptualization of the fourth dimension as a non-material realm, pointing out that matter, as man recognized it, may very well be limited to the three dimensions of experience. What he was likely attempting to establish with this illustration was the line of difference between his fourth dimensional arguments for the spiritual world and those of spiritualists, who actually tried to materialize spirits from the world beyond. Open to all kinds of spiritual experiences, Schofield had been present at many séances and spiritualist gatherings, including the one which “Mr. [William] Stead... declared...the most wonderful ever held in London.”⁸⁹ Though Schofield found some isolated instances of spiritualist activity credible and likely to be grounded in true supernatural agency—albeit dubious or even evil in nature, he added—on this occasion of the ‘great séance of London,’ he felt certain fraudulent activity was involved, having spied “some luminous paint and a small roll of gauze...carried into the cabinet” out of which the apparition materialized.⁹⁰ In *Another World*, Schofield repeatedly asserted that beings from the spiritual world initiated and directed communication with beings in the physical world, not the other way around. He tended to be cautionary against what he considered to be dangerous dalliances with potentially evil spirits.⁹¹

⁸⁸ Ibid., 68-69.

⁸⁹ ———, *Behind the Brass Plate: Life's Little Stories*, 303.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 305.

⁹¹ Ibid.

Schofield explored the question of the “distance and connection between mind and matter” more explicitly in *The Unconscious Mind*. By this time (1898), he was still wrestling with how and where to “seat” the mind. While integrating his thoughts with those of other men of medicine and science, of psychology and philosophy, Schofield appeared to have altered his previous interpretation of the fourth dimension, or even set it aside, as one uncommitted to “wild” speculation:

...the abysmal distance between mind and matter is shown in that, while ‘physical phenomena are phenomena in space, psychical phenomena are phenomena in time only [James Sully],’ for it is a fundamental thought to grasp that mind cannot have a ‘seat,’ as it has no extension in space, having no relation with it that we know of. It does not cover a surface or fill a volume. It is only related to time. In this we follow, of course, the popular assumption that time and space are essentially different, neglecting certain wild speculations as to time being, after all, a spatial extension (in a fourth dimension).⁹²

Still, the belief that mental phenomena somehow transcend the material world remained present in his conception of mind:

The extent of the connection between mind and matter is indeed still unknown....[As] Schopenhauer...says: ‘The materialists endeavour to show that all mental phenomena are physical, and rightly so, only they do not see that, on the other hand, every [thing] physical is at the same time metaphysical.’⁹³

A second implication that Schofield made about ‘mind’ in *Another World* had to do with man’s ability to “receive and understand [the] mysteries” of this higher world, the “possibility of communion with it even now.”⁹⁴ Regarding transcendental knowledge, he asserted that man has an instinctual recognition of a higher, spiritual dimension, “a part breathed into us by the Divine breath,” as well as a deeper recognition of the spiritual world, gained when once “introduced by the power of God into this new world,” and

⁹² ———, *The Unconscious Mind*, 4-5.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 5.

⁹⁴ ———, *Another World; or, The Fourth Dimension*, 69.

known also as “[c]onversion, the new birth, salvation, or whatever the entrance of the light of Christianity into the heart of man [be] called.”⁹⁵ In *Another World*, Schofield used the deduced laws of the fourth dimension to support these ideas, relating them to the “inside voice,” the “eye of understanding,” and the notion of “Thoughtland,” as featured in the *Flatland* narrative.

Later, in *The Unconscious Mind*, Schofield used arguments of a more physiological nature to support the idea of ‘divinely breathed instinct’ behind man’s spiritual longings, as well as behind the moral nature of man as seen through human conscience. Furthermore, he argued strongly in this work that “instinct is unconscious psychic activity,” summoning support for the acceptance of this “broad statement” from the judgments made by other scientific men in their researches.⁹⁶ This definition tended to fall somewhere between the physiologists’ reduction of instinct to biological mechanism, though they often admitted a presence of psychic activity, and the introspective psychologists’ denial that instinct even involved psychic activity. As we shall see, when it came to choosing between two concepts of mind that he saw as both rigid and flawed—one held by Britain’s traditional psychologists and the other by the new psycho-physiologists—Schofield would have it *neither way*; rather, he paved his own way in recognizing the unconscious mind in his practice of medicine and his experience of religion.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 84.

⁹⁶ ———, *The Unconscious Mind*, 23. “Hartmann defines instinct as ‘Purposive action without consciousness of purpose.’” “‘As in human ideation,’ says Kirchener, ‘we find in instinct the same action, unconscious and yet purposive, whose consequence is indeed much more certain than that of human ideation.’”

Over the next decade, Schofield relegated the fourth dimension to a more suppositional role in his evolving theory on the scope of mind, preferring to expound on elements of that theory more germane to his medical expertise. The work he was about to undertake already carried the taint of association with psychical research; it did not need the additional stain of spiritualist connections to hinder its acceptance by scientific minds in England. Thus, Schofield safely separated the two topics from this time forward. Schofield's hyperspace apologetic, then, occupied an ephemeral but meaningful moment within the etiology of his theory on mind. In the late 1880s, it offered adherents to transcendent forms of Christianity a supernatural rendering of the fourth dimension safely set apart from that of spiritualists and other unorthodox individuals—Schofield would likely have described his version as “Bowdlerized,” made suitable for his religiously orthodox audience. In his hands, hyperspace became a psychic ‘portal’ to understanding the spirit-based experience that confirmed his faith, and, as he believed, the faiths of many like-minded Christians. Supernatural agency found a friendly if speculative space in the fourth dimension of Schofield's *Another World*, as Schofield used this space to contest the mediating efforts of liberal Christians who were naturalizing religion, scientific authorities who were secularizing science, and heterodox thinkers who were testing the outermost bounds of orthodoxy in both realms. Throughout the 1890s, Schofield continued to incorporate metaphysical concerns into his medical work and diverse writings. Applying yet another psychological device in mediating between scientific and religious commitments, he aimed his efforts broadly, promoting a science of therapeutics within medicine, a theory of unconscious education within child training,

and a larger scope for the concept of mind within psychology, philosophy, and metaphysics. All of these projects revolved around his research on the unconscious mind.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Unconscious Mind and The Science of Mental Therapeutics

Establishing 'The Unconscious Mind:' Setting the Broad Agenda

Schofield's crusade for the recognition of the *vis medicatrix naturae*—the powers of the unconscious mind over the body—within the medical profession and its sanctioned curriculum secured him the status of a retrograde rebel when, in fact, he could be interpreted as a progressive pioneer of an early dynamic psychiatry.⁹⁷ His relegation reflected the physicalist tradition, well-entrenched in British medicine of this period; the introduction of a metaphysical position on mind and body interaction would have been considered a reversion to medieval medicine. At most meetings of the British Association during the 1890s, Schofield considered himself, for all practical purposes, *persona non grata*. His promotion of a naturalized version of faith healing, akin to quackery in the minds of many of his colleagues, was well-intended enough: he sought to bring the phenomena of mental healing safely within the jurisdiction of medical professionals.⁹⁸

⁹⁷ Crabtree, "'Automatism' And the Emergence of Dynamic Psychiatry," 51. Crabtree uses Ellenberger's definition of an early dynamic psychiatry, here: "an approach to treatment of mental disorders that accepts the reality of an unconscious dynamic of the psyche"; A. T. Schofield, *The Force of Mind; or, the Mental Factor in Medicine* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls company, 1908), 21. Note Schofield's defensive posture and bold assertiveness in this later work, as he extended his arguments from *The Unconscious Mind* and aimed them specifically at fellow medical professionals: "I utterly refuse to regard the definite recognition of the 'mental factor in medicine' as a retrogression. It is, on the contrary, ... a great step, in advance; for the day is past when a physician can bound his knowledge or his practice by the physical."

⁹⁸ Schofield, *The Force of Mind; or, the Mental Factor in Medicine*, 18. Here, Schofield noted how the medical profession unwittingly created the alarming profusion of quackery that it was presently trying to rein in: "There can be no doubt that, had the mental factor in medicine been recognized and studied by the profession, quackery would never have attained the position it has in our day. The more the range of influence of the mind on the body in health and disease is ignored or narrowed, the more charlatanism flourishes and credits itself with cures really due to the mental factor for which we plead." Schofield aligned himself with British psychiatrist, Dr. Hack Tuke, who called for "medical men, ... in active

Far from conceding authority to “the large army of irregulars” thriving off the power of mental suggestion, Schofield sought to countervail the unregulated practice of the quacks, charlatans, and pseudo-religious healers whose association with the subject caused physicians to “fear for their reputation if they touch[ed] it.”⁹⁹ But the medical profession, in the midst of consolidating normative criteria for its exclusive membership and securing public trust in its institutional claim to be the true repository of scientific medical knowledge, was hesitant to incorporate this contested concept into its curricular content, clinical practices, or experimental purview. Besides carrying the taint of quackery, treatment by mental suggestion lacked tangibility, in contrast to other therapeutic regimens (in particular, the expanding pharmacopoeia for the treatment of functional disorders). Furthermore, the metaphysical implications inherent in mental healing—in the assumption that altered mental states could bring about organic changes in the body—stood squarely in opposition to the naturalist doctrine of psychophysical parallelism.

Schofield’s literary syntheses of continental, American, and unconventional British sciences of mind produced the opposite effect upon certain religious audiences. They considered him a mental healing specialist, as did his patient population, and he gradually gained popular renown with religious lay audiences. His careful construction of authority in composing these works may have helped procure this sector of public credibility, to some degree. In religious circles, he was lauded as a reliable authority in matters of mind and body, respected for his wary, reverent, and scientific discernment of natural versus supernatural agency in cases of faith healing. Later, his purported expertise

practice, to utilize this force, ...[to rescue] it from the eccentric orbits of quackery, [and] to force it to tread with measured step the orderly paths of legitimate medicine.”

⁹⁹ ———, *The Unconscious Mind*, 337-38.

would expand to include the phenomena of religious revivals, of speaking in tongues, and of spiritualist and occult activity, in addition to the highly public concerns of moral education and mental hygiene.

This broad range of applications related to Schofield's theory of the unconscious stretched beyond therapeutic concerns. Schofield developed a plan of action throughout the early- to mid-1890s, and the applied scope of his work was fairly well defined in his writings by the first publication of *The Unconscious Mind* in 1898. At the end of that work, Schofield assessed the value of establishing the unconscious mind, "the fact that mental phenomena belong to mind equally, whether [they occur] within or without the sphere of consciousness."¹⁰⁰ Here, he clearly indicated how extensively he hoped to apply this expanded scope of mind. He spoke at length on "its capital importance in *philosophy, metaphysics, and psychology*;" "the value of [its] truth in *Christianity and ethics*;" its illumination of "*hypnotism* and the increasing range of spirit manifestation;" its usefulness "to the *biologist*, comparative physiologist, and animal apologist;" "its value to *parents and teachers*" in child-training and education; and its inestimable worth "to the *individual*—his body" and spirit, soul and character.¹⁰¹ While Schofield ended this discussion by reiterating his urgent call to fellow physicians, to heed the mental factor in medicine, his concern for the moral dimension of man, as seen through his search for scientific evidence of the higher faculties of conscience and spiritual discernment, never strayed far from the center of his argument.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 405.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 409-14.

To further this end, Schofield liberally borrowed and adapted the theories of Eduard von Hartmann, a German biopsychologist connected with Wilhelm Wundt and other German scientists whose work reflected a vitalist viewpoint within evolutionary biopsychology. The important distinction to notice in Schofield's advocacy of the unconscious, however, is his explicitly Christian interpretation of Hartmann's unifying, purposive, vitalistic, and mystical unconscious. When Hartmann described the beneficial effects of the unconscious upon man's consciousness, he tended to leave the explication in terms that are vague, holistic, and mystical: "The unconscious furthers the conscious process of thought by its inspirations in small as in great matters, and in mysticism guides mankind to the presentiment of higher, supersensible unities."¹⁰² Schofield's modified descriptions of infusions or incursions from the unconscious may have been equally vague and indefinite, but he left no doubt about his interpretive framework, his moral and religious commitments. He hoped that the discovery of the unconscious would "throw great light on the foundations of ethics, and [on] humanity in the Christian soul."¹⁰³

Schofield pondered the possibilities of a spectrum of 'mind' that contained *supraconscious* and *subconscious* faculties, referring to the dual purposes of the unconscious as "the home of the highest spirit-life" and as "the directing power of the lowest body functions." He took heart that perhaps man had found "the key...to the doctrine of the two natures," that scientific study of the unconscious mind may elucidate "the conflict between the good and evil within."¹⁰⁴ But the moral implications that Schofield emphasized most consistently when discussing the unconscious had to do with

¹⁰² Ibid., 414.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 406.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

“the doctrines of Christianity, of a new birth and nature, of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and even of conscience,” central issues to man’s higher spirit-life that had long been believed to transcend “the sphere of consciousness.”¹⁰⁵ If psychologists, philosophers, physiologists, and professionals in all fields relevant to the science of mind would simply pursue their subjects armed with this broader scope of mind, Schofield felt certain that they would not only “discover the natural laws within which unconscious psychic powers have their action and sphere,” but they would also lend scientific credibility to a sacred “territory in man’s soul...whence proceeds the voice of conscience, and shall we say ‘of God’?” And what of “the basis of ethics and all morality?” Had man not instinctively identified “a voice and judgment that speaks to [him] from the unknown within, however much its tones and words may be modified by circumstances and teaching derived from consciousness?”¹⁰⁶ For Schofield, Hartmann’s conception of the unconscious—a psychic force that “protects us like a fairy,” the “fruit of [its actions like] a gift of the gods”—scientifically sustained both the tenets of his faith and the authenticity of his transcendental experiences.¹⁰⁷ So he stumped for its recognition as a conduit from heaven as religiously as he promoted its healing properties among the skeptics of his profession.

In examining the theoretical and practical commitments of Schofield throughout the 1890s and the early nineteenth century, a lively interchange between medical and religious knowledge can be clearly discerned from his written works and public activities. It appears that Schofield’s conception of unconscious psychism received as much of an

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 414.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 415.

early impetus from his religious engagements as from his professional life. Furthermore, as one who presumed to speak on behalf of a broad Protestant consensus, Schofield often revealed, unknowingly, the fine shades of difference that existed between the varied positions staked out by Anglican hierarchy and adherents as well as a broad range of dissenting Protestants reacting to popular religious movements of the day. Among the many social and cultural factors that influenced a religious group's selective approval of certain kinds of transcendental experience, the cultural authority of science weighed in heavily, evidenced by the unique allure scientific explanation held for Schofield's literate and morally conscious audiences; and yet blurry lines of demarcation persisted between a variety of sources of medical expertise, to the great consternation of the medical "authorities" pursuing professional consolidation. Overtly theistic readings of natural explanation may have been eschewed within the medical community in fin-de-siecle Britain, but they often commanded the attention of a wide lay audience that resisted the notion of a disenchanted world, and perhaps even more, of a mechanistic 'self.'

Constructing Authority on 'The Unconscious Mind'

Schofield was passionate about defying the prevailing science of the mind in Britain, believing that it hindered the legitimacy he sought for the development of new methods of treatment in the "science of therapeutics."¹⁰⁸ Specialists in mental disorders at this time inevitably encountered ambiguities within a medical specialty just finding its professional feet, struggling to define protocols of practice while caught between physiological and spiritual interpretations of mental disease. Schofield was both a

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., xiv.

committed man of faith, with firm ideas about the interconnectedness of mind and body, and a physician well read in recent psycho-physiological research, as well as other psychical literature considered more marginal. Thus, he was acutely aware of the hazy line that separated the diagnosis of organic disease from that of functional disorder, and of medical cases in which mental therapeutics resolved nervous disorders that appeared to manifest organically.¹⁰⁹ The opposition or ambivalence that mental therapeutics faced when it came up against prevailing professional norms reflected the uncertain institutional culture of the time, an underlying indecision of whether to weigh in securely with the biological sciences or stay open to more traditional psychological approaches, with spiritual and moralistic ties. Schofield referred to this situation within medical psychology at the time as a consequence of “the switchback method of progress common to human science.” He felt that “the reaction [of men of science against] the ancient metaphysical view of medicine...[had now been] carried too far.”¹¹⁰

For his part, Schofield tended to fuse ideas from popular forms of biblical psychology (a spiritual and moralistic tradition increasingly decried in the academic literature of the time) with new theories and recent discoveries from neurophysiology. He formulated his psychotherapeutic theories, self-admittedly metaphysical, upon a tripartite construction of the brain in terms of its mental functionality, a model he fashioned while under the mentorship of Hughlings Jackson (known as the father of English neurology) at

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 338. Schofield makes the following assertion regarding the powers of mind to both cause and cure *organic diseases*: “We have seen that the powers of the conscious mind are well-nigh immeasurable; and knowing, as we now do, that our old division into functional and organic diseases is merely the expression of our ignorance, ...that all diseases, even hysterical, involve organic disturbance somewhere, we are prepared to believe that faith and other unorthodox cures, putting into operation such a powerful agent as the unconscious mind, ...are not necessarily limited to so-called functional diseases at all.”

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 374.

the London Hospital. Jackson, according to several of his biographers, nearly followed a philosophical and literary pathway, perhaps hoping to produce “grand scientific syntheses” along the lines of Spencer, whose works had “enthralled” him during his medical training.¹¹¹ However, his friend, Jonathan Hutchinson, dissuaded him from pursuing his philosophical leanings, urging him instead to apply his fine mind to pure scientific medical research. Thus, he weighed in with the biological sciences and became well known as a scientific theorist in neurophysiology, one who “specifically rejected metaphysics and materialism,” even constructing his mechanical view of the nervous system purposely “to avoid metaphysical neurophysiology.”¹¹²

It would likely have surprised Jackson, then, that one of his pupils had amended his mechanistic model, applying a metaphysical interpretation. Schofield claimed to be...

...much fascinated by the extraordinary personality of Hughlings Jackson. He taught me everything I know of the brain, especially with regard to its three broad divisions of the Upper or Cortex, the Middle, and the Lower Brain or the medulla oblongata: the three corresponding roughly to the functions of spirit, soul, and body.¹¹³ (See Figure 3 for a “Diagram of Sensori-Motor Arcs,” Schofield’s provisional model of the brain illustrated in *The Unconscious Mind*).

This tripartite construction of mind derived from a Pauline conception of self that was grafted onto a Jacksonian model of neurological anatomy. Later, around 1910, demonological literature began to incorporate this model in suggesting a physiological mechanism for demon possession. Rhodri Hayward surveyed this literature in his article on the relations between the demonological community and the medical community in early twentieth-century Britain. As Hayward implies in his study, it is likely that

¹¹¹ George K. York and David A. Steinberg, “The Philosophy of Hughlings Jackson,” *J R Soc Med* 95, no. 6 (2002): 315-17.

¹¹² Ibid.: 315.

¹¹³ Schofield, *Behind the Brass Plate: Life’s Little Stories*, 94.




Figure 3 – Schofield's Provisional Model of the Brain
The Unconscious Mind (1908 edition)

Schofield was one of the medical experts who colluded with amateurs to produce this popular scientific literature—“heterodox” knowledge that has since been placed in a discrete category, its connections to early psychiatry obscured.

It was not unusual for Schofield to include in his scientific syntheses discussions on spiritual and religious exercise in relation to his theories on ‘spirit, soul, and body,’ especially in works like *The Unconscious Mind*, written for a dual audience, both popular and professional. In these passages, Schofield tended to link his theories of mind to his lifelong preoccupation with ‘the spirit life in man,’ that is, the capacity and means by which man receives transcendental knowledge from the Creator. In exploring these issues that crossed over into theology and metaphysical speculation, he often called upon the insights of eminent men of letters and religion, like Charles Kingsley, or upon Christian teachers like the Scottish missionary, Andrew Murray, who wrote within the popular genre of biblical psychology:

The larger and more potent part of our spiritual, as of our physical life, is behind the veil of our normal consciousness, and beyond our highest intellectual capacity. Kingsley says: ‘It leads to the mistaking [of] conscious emotions for the workings of the Spirit, which must be above consciousness.’ A well-known Christian teacher, the Rev. Dr. Andrew Murray, writes: ‘Deeper down than where the soul with its consciousness can enter, there is spirit matter linking man with God; and deeper down than the mind and feelings or will—in the unseen depths of the hidden life—there dwells the Spirit of God.’¹¹⁴

Despite Schofield’s constant search for “spirit truths” in his scientific endeavors, the campaign that preoccupied his professional life in the 1890s and, in part, led him to write his first work on *The Unconscious Mind* in 1898, was also driven by his firm belief that the ‘mental factor’ must be recognized in medicine and acknowledged in its

¹¹⁴ ———, *The Unconscious Mind*, 93.

curriculum and clinical education. In a preface to the 1965 revised edition of Schofield's *Christian Sanity* (originally published in 1905), J. Stafford Wright mentioned two of Schofield's works, one of these being *The Unconscious Mind*, and placed them relative to the physician's unpopular campaign waged in favor of mental therapeutics before the Annual Meetings of the British Medical Association (throughout the 1890s):

After being shouted down for reading a paper before a learned society on the subject of the unconscious mind, [Schofield] wrote a book with this title in 1898, which he claimed was the first book on this subject written and published in English. Similarly he wrote *The Mental Factor in Medicine* (1902) in answer to a challenge by the British Medical Journal to produce evidence for the effect of the unconscious on the cause and cure of disease, an idea that is commonplace today.¹¹⁵

In his memoirs, Schofield spoke of attending the Annual Meetings “for many years with the sole object of advocating in the psychological section the instruction of every medical student in the powers of the mind over the body[,]...in the value of mental therapeutics,” only to be dismayed by the lack of interest in “the relation of the sane mind to cure or cause [of] disease.”¹¹⁶ Previous to this time, he canvassed for the curricular inclusion of mental therapeutics in “every medical school in England, Ireland, and Scotland,” but discovered that only the *insane* mind was given serious consideration in the standard curriculum, save for one exceptional case.¹¹⁷ Perhaps Schofield strategically re-tooled his tactics and redirected his aim, to include popular audiences, in crafting *The Unconscious Mind*.

Since the publication of *Another World* in 1888, Schofield had mainly been writing a series of hygiene manuals on “Health at Home” for the religious tract society,

¹¹⁵ A. T. Schofield, *Christian Sanity*, 1965 ed. (London: Oliphants, 1965), 7.

¹¹⁶ Schofield, *Behind the Brass Plate: Life's Little Stories*, 123.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*

so he had gained plenty of practice putting science into service for religion in the popular press. Schofield's tendency to include spiritual and religious questions in *The Unconscious Mind* has already been noted. A look at his expanded repertoire of writings in the early 1900s reveals more focused works (specifically written for physicians, i.e. *The Personality of the Physician* and *The Mental Factor in Medicine*; or for lay religious audiences, i.e. *Christian Sanity* and *The Springs of Character*) written for two separate and distinct audiences; whereas this first foundational work on *The Unconscious Mind*, containing Schofield's broad and not merely medical agenda for the application of the unconscious, is clearly written for a mixed audience.

When Schofield assumed the role of scientific or medical commentator to general reading audiences and professional colleagues alike, he often used a strategy of forwarding his distinctively spiritual viewpoint on a specific subject through a multitude of expert voices holding varied and contradictory views on the matter. In a sense, he shrouded his own metaphysical interpretation of science safely within a matrix of competing scientific voices of authority, rather than speaking candidly to his audience as to his own views on these matters of "spirit truths" (to use a vague term that he applies often).¹¹⁸ This strategy strongly suggested the ambiguous nature of 'authoritative science' at that time; and it constructed, for Schofield, the appearance of impartiality and of a humble demeanor, ideal qualities for an expositor mingling scientific voices from the outskirts of the discipline with those from the recognized center, subtly privileging the former in an attempt to redefine the latter. For example, in Schofield's introductory statements to *The Unconscious Mind*, he defended his undertaking of this multivalent

¹¹⁸ ———, *The Unconscious Mind*, 419-23.

subject—that informed so many overlapping disciplines—by explaining why a physician, such as himself, braved censure from his colleagues to bring order to the chaos he discerned in this peripheral area of medicine. Certainly, other professionals ought to tap into these powerful, curative forces presently ignored in established science.

The last question that will be asked is why a medical man undertakes all this. The importance of this question will sink to insignificance when once the book is read, for it will then be seen how laboriously it has been sought to establish every point and every statement on the authority of others, with the effect that the book well nigh appears to be little more than a collection of extracts. The writer himself claims no authority. He has been but the agent to collect and arrange the facts here given in an intelligible sequence, and he has been driven to this task from the simple fact that, being a physician in constant contact with nerve diseases and mental phenomena, he saw, for many years, the manifestation of unconscious powers he was forced to recognize as mental, and yet frequently he found the statement that they were so was received with doubt and ridicule. He was driven, therefore, to the further study of the phenomena of unconscious mind and also of writers in psychology and kindred sciences, with the result that he found the whole subject in chaos, vigorously denied and scouted on the one hand, gravely asserted and, as it appeared to him, proved upon the other.¹¹⁹

Consider more closely Schofield's construction of authority, here, in what he declared to be his "crude attempt" to stimulate "the production of some scientific work on the subject by a more competent hand" than his own.¹²⁰ The way in which he temporarily displaced himself from the role of subject, described through first person account, to that of second person, narrator, reinforced his claim to be simply "the agent," bringing the work of silenced scientific authorities out into the open and arranging the "facts...in an intelligible sequence" for others to see and judge at last. Moreover, Schofield emphasized how the agent had been "driven" to explore this topic, taboo in British medicine, by compelling evidence repeatedly impressed upon him in the midst of caring for patients;

¹¹⁹ Ibid., xvi-xvii.

¹²⁰ Ibid., xvii.

as if to assert, he had no personal agenda, only relevant and professional medical expertise to offer. In fact, he had been “forced to recognize,” through daily experience, what other men of science, especially psychologists, refused to allow within their experimental framework, though these “high priests of the religion of mind” may chance “‘a sly glance’ at the forbidden fruit” of unconscious mental powers.¹²¹

The tensions between the British psychologists, who fled from the “forbidden fruit” of the unconscious mind, and the new psycho-physiologists, whose biological emphasis helped bring the idea to fruition, may have caused the early institutionalization of the discipline to falter in Britain; yet psychology, as an academic discipline, was eventually rescued by its application to medicine, education, and industry.¹²² Near the end of Schofield’s decade-long (1890s) campaign promoting mental therapeutics within the Medical Association and across the British Isles, the unconscious message that found the most eager public interest appeared to be the educational application of Schofield’s expansive scope of mind: recognizing and utilizing the effect of environment on the unconscious education of youths. Schofield insistently argued before philosophical societies and fellow school board members that children “can be moulded unconsciously with far greater ease than through their consciousness.”¹²³ Even though his professional peers seemed to be growing more responsive to psychotherapeutic measures by the end of the decade, Schofield’s most receptive audiences still appeared to be non-medical, either with an interest in applying his ideas to education or in explaining—with an eye toward regulating—the *healing Spirit* within Christian communities.

¹²¹ Ibid., xiv.

¹²² Daston, "British Responses to Psycho-Physiology, 1860-1900," 208.

¹²³ Anonymous, "The Scope of Mind," *The Bristol Times and Mirror* Apr 14, 1897, 7.

***‘The Unconscious’ Versus Divine Agency:
The Fine Line Between Faith-Healing and Fraud***

In the early 1890s, home officers from England’s prominent missionary societies engaged Schofield to investigate a situation that “much perturbed” them. It seems that “in trying their hand at healing” abroad, many missionaries “were clearly beaten by the native witch-doctors” they encountered in foreign mission fields.¹²⁴ Schofield, himself, had gradually struggled through a troubling realization, reached after hearing his brother’s earlier accounts of Chinese temples “full of rejected crutches, splints, and bandages, left as thank-offerings by those who had been healed:” if the power behind such healing lay in the *object* of faith, then Schofield and his faithful friends would “have to attribute the same power to idols as to God.”¹²⁵ Three long years of investigation uncovered innumerable cases of inexplicable healing that led Schofield to credit the miraculous cures he observed to “the power of the *faith* itself,” physical healing stimulated by suggestion. Schofield was taken aback at a Christian faith-healing centre in Zurich, Switzerland where he witnessed an astounding range of cures effected through prayer services; but he was positively aghast after learning from the minister that the same phenomena could be witnessed at the other end of the lake, where “the devil heal[ed] just as many” people as their own ministry cured. There he found individuals healed by “writing their diseases on parchment, and putting it inside the bark of a famous

¹²⁴ Schofield, *Behind the Brass Plate: Life’s Little Stories*, 218.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 218-19.

oak-tree, followed by dances and incantations.”¹²⁶ In his own words: “...it was gradually forced upon me *against my wish* that *physical* healing was effected by the power of the faith itself, and *not by that of the object on which it rested*.”¹²⁷ Thus, Schofield’s close study of faith-healing, undertaken for his religious community, played a role in shaping his conception of the unconscious as a psychic force lying within the scope of ‘mind’ and influencing states and diseases of the body.

Despite the transference of miraculous agency from external deity to internal autonomic response to mental suggestion, Schofield could, and did, still infuse his natural explanation of unconscious psychism with Christian meaning and spiritual import. In fact, one of his follow-up works to *The Unconscious Mind* specifically speculated upon the psycho-physiological origins of Christian character. *The Springs of Character* (1900, 1901, 1905) fleshed out for the public just how essential it was, for individual as well as social and cultural progress, to tap into this nebulous power of the mind and to apply scientific methodology to discern its laws, as designed by the Creator. Like many pre-Freudian theories of the unconscious that circulated in the late-nineteenth century, Schofield’s expanded scope of mind lent itself to the conflation of natural and supernatural explanation. This kind of Christian reception of popular psychology could result in both heterodox and orthodox readings of man’s psycho-physiological nature in relation to the Divine. By now, it should be clear in Schofield’s case, at least, that the line between natural and supernatural knowledge was not always clearly defined in his medical and religious writings. He might be seen as holding more closely to orthodoxy in

¹²⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 219.

religious matters than in his medical career, at least insofar as the professional norms of the day were concerned.

It is difficult to say which activity—examining patients with nervous disorders or investigating faith-healing centres for the missionary societies—first prompted his researches into continental views of the unconscious. But his dual crusade during the 1890s, to naturalize faith-healing for his wary religious community and to normalize it for his skeptical profession, anticipated the popular onslaught of faith-healing movements that began to gain media attention in the early 1900s, as well as the notice of Anglican leadership and medical professionals. By the turn of the century, both Anglican clerics and medical professionals had jumped into the faith-healing fray, a fire of controversy stoked particularly by the importation of Christian science, and its liberal Protestant countervailing force, the Emmanuel movement, into England from America. Faith-healing was no longer a taboo subject in these institutions of orthodoxy: the proliferation of popular faith-healing was spreading heterodox science *and* religion, as well as undermining the public authority of both the Church and the medical profession. Schofield had been a prophetic voice in warning his profession about the expanding nonprofessional corps that would soon vie for therapeutic authority, but he played no direct role in the physician-bishop alliance that was forming in the early years of the century. This transforming situation called for the consolidation of two societal forces, the Anglican Church and the medical profession, to extract the precise nature of the truths underlying the popular success of these insurgent movements of faith and to make the public aware of their partnered role as the arbiter of truth where mystery and science

mingled so closely. Essentially, bishops and physicians sought to counteract the popular healing movements and, thereby, shore up their own authority.

Bishops and Physicians Cautiously Get on Board

Throughout the decade of Schofield's "unconscious campaign" and into the early years of the century, the 'Controverted Question of the time' that Huxley drew attention to in the early 1890s (to what extent, and to what effect, would natural knowledge continue to marginalize the supernatural?) played out along the lines of popular and elite culture, heightening the interplay between heterodoxy and orthodoxy, amateurs and adepts. The proliferation of popular healing movements—accompanying the importation of Reverend Mary Baker Eddy's "queer American cult" of Christian science into England—brought about a very public clash between an amateur faith-healer and several "would-be" adepts, (meaning in this case, medical students) in October of 1900.¹²⁸ Scottish émigré, Dr. John Alexander Dowie, had returned to Great Britain to speak after gaining fame as a faith-healer in the free religious marketplace of America. His recent outspokenness against London physicians had incited a surly crowd to gather outside the hall where he was to speak; from this crowd emerged eight young men, mostly medical students, who hissed and rushed at Dr. Dowie, despite the constabulary wall of protection hedged around him. A considerable brawl ensued with the authorities, ending in the arrest

¹²⁸ Anonymous, "The First Week in October Will See the Church," *The London Times* Sep 26, 1905, Issue 37822, Col D.

of the young men. The incident gained popular press as the “Faith-Healing Disturbances at St. Martin’s Hall” (see Figure 4).¹²⁹

This event signaled the inkling of a change in perception toward psychotherapeutics within British medicine. For the purposes of defending their turf and stamping out charlatanry—what Schofield had been crusading for over the past decade—the medical profession at last assumed a more public posture of defense against what it deemed the “positive revival of a hysterical form of occultism, a jumble of pseudo-science and irreligion.”¹³⁰ Recent literature has suggested that, in America, physicians took a belated second look at psychotherapeutics at this same point in time under the pressure of similar mass religious movements capitalizing on the reception of popular psychology; some physicians even formed a coalition with Mainline Protestant leaders to produce their own countervailing movement (for example, Worcester’s and McComb’s Emmanuel movement, originating with Boston elites in the early 1900s).¹³¹ In Britain, the bishops and physicians similarly merged in 1909 and continued to work out the issue jointly, well into the 1920s. The Medical Session registered their complaint independently and publicly in 1901, chastising “all [such] forms of medical heterodoxy” and reasserting their hard-fought separation from “the priest-doctor” of the past: “Religion and theology had nothing whatever to do with the investigation and treatment of disease.”¹³² By 1909, physicians were relaxing the rule on the *total* separation of medical practice and religious concerns, but in a way that safeguarded against the return

¹²⁹ ———, “The Disturbances at St. Martin’s Town-Hall,” *The London Times* Oct 24, 1900, Issue 36281, col F.

¹³⁰ ———, “The Medical Session - St. Mary’s Hospital,” *The London Times* Oct 2, 1901, Issue 36575, col D.

¹³¹ Cunningham, “The Emmanuel Movement: A Variety of American Religious Experience.”

¹³² Anonymous, “The Medical Session - St. Mary’s Hospital.”

THE DISTURBANCES AT ST. MARTIN'S TOWN-HALL.

Yesterday, LEONARD CRASKE, 22, medical student, Albert-bridge-road, Battersea-park; DAVID SMITH, 21, Civil Service student, Lower Belgrave-street; LYTRON MAITLAND, 20, medical student, Thurloe-place, South Kensington; and GEORGE BENKICK EDWARDS, 19, medical student, Winham-street, Clapham, were charged before Mr. Fenwick, at Marlborough-street Police-court, with unlawfully and riotously assembling to commit a breach of the peace at St. Martin's Town-hall. Smith and Maitland were further charged with assaulting Inspector James Smith, of the C Division, while in the execution of his duty, and Maitland was further charged with assaulting Ezekiah Jarvis. Edwards was also charged with attempting to rescue Maitland from lawful custody and with assaulting Constable Love, 60 C. Craske was further charged with behaving in a disorderly way and with obstructing Constable 29 CR in the execution of his duty.

Inspector Smith stated that about 20 minutes past 4 o'clock on Thursday afternoon he was on duty outside St. Martin's Town-hall, where a meeting was being held. After receiving certain information he entered the hall with other police-officers and found great disorder, chairs being thrown about, and other disturbances going on. Maitland was standing on a chair shouting, "Come on medicos, go for the piano." He requested him to leave the hall. Maitland and Smith then caught witness by the collar and pulled him over some chairs, throwing him on his back. Other officers arrested them, and an attempt was made to get them out of the building. On reaching the top of the main staircase witness got separated from the rest of the police and received a kick on the leg. He was then lifted up by a number of students and deliberately thrown down a flight of stairs, falling on his back. None of the defendants were concerned in that assault. The accused were got to Vine-street Police Station and charged. Smith, Maitland, and Edwards were three of the ringleaders.

Cross-examined by Craske.—He (Craske) was arrested inside the hall and afterwards rearrested outside. By Smith.—He was sure he (Smith) and Maitland were among the ringleaders. By Maitland.—He (Maitland) was not holding up a hat and asking for its owner.

Mr. FENWICK.—What was the meeting about?
Inspector Smith.—It was a meeting of Dr. Dowie's on "Faith Healing," and there were about 400 medical students present.

Ezekiah Jarvis, the hall-keeper, said that the students made a tremendous noise with trumpets and jumped on the chairs, breaking many of the cane bottoms through. He was sent by the vestry clerk to keep order, but did not succeed. Craske and Maitland were the first to make for the platform. He tried to prevent them, as there were a number of cripples present at the meeting, but Maitland struck him and knocked him over several chairs. He did not see the others do anything.

Cross-examined.—He thought Craske was going to the platform, but he was also going in the direction of one of the exits. He (Craske) did have some questions written on paper to be answered from the platform and up to the point mentioned was quiet enough.

Sergeant Stewart, 35 CR, deposed to taking Maitland into custody, and to seeing Edwards kick Constable Love on the shin. The sergeant corroborated Inspector Smith's evidence as to the assault on him.

Constable Love said he saw the inspector pulled across the chairs and observed Sergeant Stewart arrest Maitland. He went to their assistance, but was picked up bodily by Edwards and others and thrown down among the chairs. He managed to get up, and the defendants were then outside. In the street Edwards caught hold of the inspector, and Maitland exclaimed, "Leave go of him." Edwards then kicked him on the shin.

Edwards.—Not one of the words he has said against me is true. I should like to ask him how he can tell so many falsehoods after taking the oath.

Constable Street, 29 CR, said he saw Craske flourishing a stick with about 200 more in the street. He asked him to go away twice, but he refused and threatened "to take his number." He was then taken into custody.

Cross-examined.—He did not push Craske downstairs. Someone in the crowd hustled the witness against Craske, who was shouting "Come along boys."

Mr. John Alexander Dowie, living at the Hotel Russell, said he was delivering a lecture at St. Martin's Town-hall on the afternoon in question. He heard a disturbance before he commenced, and, after consultation with the vestry clerk, began his lecture a few minutes late. He was incessantly interrupted all through the lecture, which lasted an hour and a quarter. All that the other witnesses had spoken to happened after he was in his brougham outside.

William Kingsbury, a medical student of Theydon Bois, who was called for the defence said that he was with Craske the whole afternoon. Craske did his utmost to keep the others quiet. When Dr. Dowie had finished there was a general rush for the platform, but he did not know why.

John Wells, a medical student of West Kensington, also said that Craske behaved himself properly. He saw a constable push him across the pavement. He saw no flourishing of a stick, he heard nothing of the cry "Come on boys."

Craske, who was called by Smith as a witness, said that Smith was not a ringleader. In his own defence, Craske said he behaved quietly all the time and tried to keep the others quiet instead of urging them on. He also assisted some ladies to leave the hall. Outside the hall, a constable said he was a ringleader, and he was arrested. He had threatened to report the constable for pushing him, and he assumed he was arrested for that reason.

Smith said the police must have made a mistake in arresting him, for he did nothing.

Maitland said he was merely going to throw a hat to a comrade who had lost it.

Edwards said it looked, from the evidence, as if they had a grudge against the police, but he and his fellow-students, on the contrary, looked upon them as very decent fellows generally. (Laughter.) In the *mêlée* he slipped, and was caught by a constable. He thought he was only going to be "chucked out." He did not kick the officer.

Mr. Leopold Smith said that the defendant Smith, who was no relation of his, was a most peaceable young man. He was astonished at his being arrested.

Mr. FENWICK said the defendants had behaved in a foolish and disgraceful manner. They ought to have left the hall instead of acting as they did. Edwards and Maitland seemed to have been the chief ringleaders and would have to pay £3 each or go to prison for a month. Smith would be fined 20s. with the alternative of 14 days' imprisonment, and Craske would be bound over in his own recognizances in £10 to be of good behaviour for six months.

Figure 4 – The Disturbances at St Martin's Town-Hall
The London Times – 20 October 1900

of “the priest-doctor.”

The relationship forged between bishop and physician in the context of a 1909 sub-committee, formed to report on “spiritual healing,” may be interpreted as two professional classes collaborating in a way that protected their respective spheres of authority—for the most part separate and not overlapping—while they jointly asserted their authority over popular healers lacking professional credentials. The summary of their joint conclusions included five main points:

- 1) There exists no difference between “spiritual healing,” “faith-healing,” “mental,” or “psychic healing;”
- 2) “[T]he essential factor in all...psychic healing is mental suggestion,” used from remote times but explained more fully by modern psychology;
- 3) Plenty of evidence exists for the efficacy of mental suggestion in treating functional disorders, but no known evidence supports such a cure in the case of organic disease;
- 4) Hypnotic or waking suggestion can be performed by qualified medical practitioners, trained to distinguish between cases amenable to this method or in need of other medical or surgical methods;
- 5) “[F]or the protection of the public the diagnosis and treatment of disease are best left in the hands of those whose training has fitted them best for that calling, any formal cooperation of clergymen and medical practitioners in the treatment of disease is to be deprecated. All the benefits which may undoubtedly accrue from the assistance given to sick persons by the ministrations of the clergy in suitable cases may be obtained in a way which will not give rise to dangerous misunderstandings on the part of the public.”¹³³

Importantly, Schofield’s independent investigation into the essence of faith-healing (mid-1890s), undertaken at the request of Christian missions organizations, occurred previous to the inquiries of medical commissions and of Anglican ecclesiastical commissions, church congresses, and conferences; and notably, he abstained from participating in the medical or Church inquiries of that next decade. He mentions in his

¹³³ ———, “Spiritual Healing - Medical Committee's Report,” *The London Times* Jul 14, 1911, Issue 39637, col G.

memoirs a similar joint commission appointed in the mid-1920s that reached largely the same conclusions, although the Church by this time was seriously considering the renewal of a spiritual healing ministry of prayer and anointing with oil, though not in a form meant to interfere with the priority of medical treatment at the hands of a trained professional.

When Schofield published a follow-up book to *The Unconscious Mind* in 1902, he celebrated the fact that *The Force of Mind; or, The Mental Factor in Medicine*, a text intended for physicians, was kindly “received by the medical profession” and that a second edition was even called for that same year.¹³⁴ His crusade was finally paying off. Had the physicians or bishops read his initial work on the *The Unconscious Mind* (1898), they may have been surprised to see evidence of the already prolific and popular centres of faith-healing in Great Britain detailed in the pages of that text. Schofield thought it likely that the average physician would not have been familiar with some of the information he had to share on faith-healers, particularly those healers, like himself, who held orthodox religious beliefs. First, he had pointed out a dispersed and varied movement of healers, categorized by him along a continuum from ‘fraudulent’ to ‘faithful,’ with ‘pseudo-religious healers’ and ignorant ‘quacks’ falling between the two extremes. Then, he gave an overview of a small legion of “orthodox and mostly evangelical” Christians: he cited the figure of “some 120 faith-healing centres in this kingdom alone...hav[ing] nothing to do with the Christian scientists on the one hand or the pseudo-fraudulent faith-healers on the other.” In fact, around two thousand faith-

¹³⁴ Schofield, *The Force of Mind; or, the Mental Factor in Medicine*, preface to the second edition.

healers from these centres gathered for a conference in the Agricultural Hall just a few years before *The Unconscious Mind* went to press:

Amongst a list of 250 published cases of disease cured we find five consumption, one diseased hip, five abscess, three dyspepsia, four internal complaint, two throat ulcer, seven nervous debility, nine rheumatism, five diseased heart, two withered arm, four bronchitis, three cancer, two paralysed arm, three weak eyes, one ruptured spine (?), five pains in the head. And these are the results in one year at one small chapel in the north of London! The list causes amusement and perhaps surprise; and impatience may be felt that such puerile details should be given. Pace! my scientific and learned friend; to the poor sufferers it was anything but puerile to be cured, or at any rate relieved, from diseases from which they suffered, or at any rate imagined they suffered, free of all charge; for none of these are money-making agencies, whatever else they may be.¹³⁵

During Schofield's years of inquiry, pre-1900, he had formed his own opinion as to the proper role of *both* laymen and clerics in carrying out healing ministries on the grounds of psychic or spiritual principles. When it came to an *applied* science of the mind, he clearly favored a scientific voice of authority vested in medical professionals and "kindred sciences," but on the condition that these authorities remained open, willing to consider and test the borderland questions that attracted so many charlatans and fraudulent speculators as well as honest and earnest people of faith. He had taken this route, himself, and believed that he could not only protect and promote medical science but his Christian faith as well. After sleuthing long and hard for authentic cases of faith-healing by Divine intervention—even following famous cases, from Bayswater's Blind Martha to Everson's empty eye sockets—he reluctantly declared most of the mystery cases 'unresolved,' still unsure whether natural agency might after all turn out to be the undetected curative. This way, he avoided the risk of profaning the Almighty's name and

¹³⁵ ———, *The Unconscious Mind*, 332-33.

doing more harm than good to the Faith, down the road. In his own words, long after the events,

The reluctance to call these ‘miracles’ must not be put down altogether to dislike to acknowledge the supernatural, but largely to a wish not to take the name of God in vain; and to account as done by Divine power what, after all, may be due to natural causes.¹³⁶

By the time Schofield’s colleagues closed ranks against the popular faith-healers, he had already moved on to another field of investigation that related psychology and religion—and body, soul, and spirit. Once again, the stimulus of this project appears to have been a call to research and write a book for his lay religious community:

As some of my family had joined another movement of ‘Speaking with Tongues’ so rife in America, and I was writing a book on Christian Sanity, with which it seemed so seriously to clash, I determined to investigate it.¹³⁷

Yet another popular religious movement had made a Trans-Atlantic crossing, supplying the “unconventional” Doctor with new phenomena to observe, analyze, draw scientific conclusions from, and at last, put into writing—so long as he could find “Spirit truths.”

Schofield’s application of the unconscious mind to medicine and to faith, in this case, had brought about an important change in the way he and fellow Protestants perceived ‘the miracle’ of faith healing. No longer did they assume that the inexplicable cure was effected by the *object* of the faith—by *direct divine intervention*—but rather by the faith itself, through natural means brought about by mental suggestion; though this would still be interpreted by many Protestants as divine action working through a *natural process*. Schofield’s theory of unconscious psychism—the *vis medicatrix naturae*—

¹³⁶ ———, *Behind the Brass Plate: Life’s Little Stories*, 223.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 248.

contributed to a significant reorientation of his faith and theology as well as to his medical practice.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion

The Re-enchantment of Science ~The Relocation of Miracles

We must understand that the eye of consciousness can see only a portion of our mental thoughts, emotions, and actions, and that a vast district of instincts, emotions, and thoughts, remain hidden from us in unconsciousness. It is indeed here in the unconscious mind that we find the seat of the character, of the personality, of the ego; and here also is the seat of the new life, the sphere of the new birth, the dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit. The presence of the Spirit is not the subject of direct consciousness, but visions, meditations, prayers, and dreams have been undoubtedly occasions of spiritual revelations.¹³⁸

A. T. Schofield directed these words to a Protestant lay audience in a 1908 discussion of *Christian Sanity*. His professional medical knowledge merged, here, with the popular and religious study of biblical psychology—as well as with his personal religious experiences. This synthesis resulted in something a little different from psychiatry as well as from traditional biblical psychology, which had originated in German religious thought and migrated to England in the mid-century. Exactly where this new tradition belonged—as it drew from theology, psychology/psychiatry, physiology, and popular religious culture—remains uncertain. In terms of practical developments, it influenced many religious movements of the day, from faith healing and speaking in tongues, to spirited revivals and demonological studies. I want to suggest that this synthetic and popular tradition—which found no welcome home in orthodox Anglicanism nor within an early psychiatry dominated by neurological science—signaled

¹³⁸ ———, *Christian Sanity*, 60.

a shift in the way many Protestants perceived the miraculous and marks a transformation deserving further study.

This relocation of miracles from the external natural world to the internal psycho-physiological world of man tended to blur the lines between the natural and the supernatural. This consequence was latent in the term, “psycho-physiology,” especially for Protestants who held that the ‘mind’ (psyche) had three constituent parts: body (brain and central and sympathetic nervous systems), soul, and spirit. From this viewpoint, some psychic phenomena, it seemed, could be explained by “direct divine action (primary cause)” or, perhaps more accurately, by “divine action working through natural processes (secondary causation).”¹³⁹ And, then, demonic spirits could also act on humans in similar fashion, counterfeiting “the work of the Spirit.”

The development of this line of thought within lay religious circles did not escape the watchful interest of T. H. Huxley and other prominent naturalistic advocates who promoted the “new” psycho-physiology and defended its naturalistic philosophical basis; especially since professional men of science, like Schofield, were actively engaged in the making of this new field of popular “scientific” knowledge.¹⁴⁰ The transgression of this theoretical boundary that supposedly separated lay people from professionals, religious knowledge from secularized scientific knowledge, has been obscured in the histories that were written about the defining processes of early psychiatry. Recovering Schofield’s record of these events, and re-telling them from his unique and precarious position, straddling two traditions tendentiously, and tensely, related, has been the central concern

¹³⁹ Taves, “Reviewed Work: Miracles and the Modern Religious Imagination, by Robert Bruce Mullin,” 439.

¹⁴⁰ Daston, “British Responses to Psycho-Physiology, 1860-1900.”

of this paper. Though he promoted an early form of dynamic psychiatry in Britain through ‘mental therapeutics,’ Schofield’s early advocacy for it was ignored, even rebuffed, by physicians influenced by the naturalistic authority associated with the flourishing field of neurological science. Ironically, the broad range of healing movements he encountered in his investigations on faith healing—evidence that figured prominently in his writings on the unconscious mind—eventually provoked both religious and medical professionals to collective action against such heterodox threats. Unruly usurpation of the unconscious mind also provoked the recognition of mental healing therapies as a potentially viable medical science. A. T. Schofield’s crusade won out in the end.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Anonymous. "Our Book Shelf." Review of *Another World; or, The Fourth Dimension*, by A. T. Schofield, M. D. (London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1888). *Nature* 38 (August 16, 1888): 363.
- . "Spiritual Healing - Medical Committee's Report." *The London Times* Jul 14, 1911; Issue 39637; col G, pg. 6.
- . "The Disturbances at St. Martin's Town-Hall." *The London Times* Oct 24, 1900; Issue 36281; col F, pg. 14.
- . "The First Week in October Will See the Church." *The London Times* Sep 26, 1905, Issue 37822, Col D, pg. 7.
- . "The Medical Session - St. Mary's Hospital." *The London Times* Oct 2, 1901; Issue 36575; col D, pg. 12.
- . "The Scope of Mind." *The Bristol Times and Mirror* Apr 14, 1897, pg. 7.
- Ballard, Marvin H. "The Life and Thought of Charles Howard Hinton." Thesis, M. A., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1980.
- Bork, Alfred M. "The Fourth Dimension in Nineteenth-Century Physics." *Isis* 55, no. 3 (1964): 326-38.
- Cajori, Florian. "Origins of Fourth Dimension Concepts." *The American Mathematical Monthly* 33, no. 8 (1926): 397-406.
- Crabtree, A. "'Automatism' And the Emergence of Dynamic Psychiatry." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 39, no. 1 (2003): 51-70.
- Crary, Jonathan. *Suspensions of Perception: Attention, Spectacle, and Modern Culture*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1999.
- . *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1990.
- Croce, Paul Jerome. *Science and Religion in the Era of William James*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.
- Cunningham, Raymond J. "The Emmanuel Movement: A Variety of American Religious Experience." *American Quarterly* 14, no. 1 (1962): 48-63.
- Daston, Lorraine J. "British Responses to Psycho-Physiology, 1860-1900." *Isis* 69, no. 2 (1978): 192-208.
- Ellenberger, Henri F. *The Discovery of the Unconscious; the History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry*. New York: Basic Books, 1970.
- Hayward, Rhodri. "Demonology, Neurology, and Medicine in Edwardian Britain." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 78, no. 1 (2004): 37-58.
- Henderson, Linda Dalrymple. *The Fourth Dimension and Non-Euclidean Geometry in Modern Art*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Hilts, Victor L. "A Guide to Francis Galton's English Men of Science." *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 65, no. 5 (1975): 1-85.
- Hinshelwood, R. D. "Psychodynamic Psychiatry before World War I." In *150 Years of British Psychiatry - Volume I I: The Aftermath*, edited by G. E. Berrios and Hugh L. Freeman, 197-205. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Athlone, 1996.
- Huxley, Thomas Henry. *Science and Christian Tradition*, Collected Essays by T.H. Huxley, Vol.V;. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1898.

- Hyslop, James H. "The Fourth Dimension of Space." *The Philosophical Review* 5, no. 4 (1896): 352-70.
- Jann, Rosemary. "Abbott's 'Flatland' : Scientific Imagination And "Natural Christianity"." *Victorian studies* 28, no. 3 (Spring 1985): 473-90
- Johnson, Dale. "Popular Apologetics in Late Victorian England: The Work of the Christian Evidence Society." *Journal of Religious History* 11, no. 4 (1981): 558-77.
- Kline, Morris. *Mathematical Thought from Ancient to Modern Times*. Vol. 3. New York: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Lightman, Bernard V. "'the Voices of Nature': Popularizing Victorian Science." In *Victorian Science in Context*, edited by Bernard V. Lightman, 187-211. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- MacDonald, George. *The Miracles of Our Lord*. New York: G. Routledge, 1871.
- Macdonald, Greville. *George Macdonald and His Wife*. New York,: Johnson Reprint Corp., 1971.
- Parshall, Karen Hunger. *James Joseph Sylvester: Life and Work in Letters*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Pickering, Hy. *Chief Men among the Brethren*. Neptune, N.J.: Loizeaux Bros., 1986.
- Plarr, Victor G. *Men and Women of the Time: A Dictionary of Contemporaries*. 15th ed. London: Routledge, 1899.
- Porter, Roy. "Two Cheers for Psychiatry! The Social History of Mental Disorder in Twentieth Century Britain." In *150 Years of British Psychiatry - Volume I I: The Aftermath*, edited by G. E. Berrios and Hugh L. Freeman, 383-406. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Athlone, 1996.
- Richards, Joan L. *Mathematical Visions: The Pursuit of Geometry in Victorian England*. Boston: Academic Press, 1988.
- . "Projective Geometry and Mathematical Progress in Mid-Victorian Britain." *Stud. Hist. Phil. Sci.* 17, no. 3 (1986): 297-325.
- Richards, Robert John. *Darwin and the Emergence of Evolutionary Theories of Mind and Behavior*, Science and Its Conceptual Foundations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Schofield, A. T. *Another World; or, The Fourth Dimension*. 2nd ed. London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1897.
- . *Another World: or, The Fourth Dimension*. 3rd ed. London: S. Sonnenschein, 1905.
- . *Behind the Brass Plate: Life's Little Stories*. London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co., 1928.
- . *Christian Sanity*. 1965 ed. London: Oliphants, 1965.
- . *The Force of Mind; or, the Mental Factor in Medicine*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls company, 1908.
- . *The Knowledge of God: Its Meaning and Its Power*. Glasgow: Pickering & Inglis, 1905.
- . *The Unconscious Mind*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1901.
- Schubert, Hermann. "The Fourth Dimension. Mathematical and Spiritualistic." *The Monist* 3, no. 3 (April 1893): 402-49.

- Shuttleworth, Sally, and G. N. Cantor. *Science Serialized : Representation of the Sciences in Nineteenth-Century Periodicals*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2004.
- Smith, Jonathan. *Fact and Feeling : Baconian Science and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*, Science and Literature. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994.
- Smith, Jonathan, Lawrence I. Berkove, and Gerald A. Baker. "A Grammar of Dissent: *Flatland*, Newman, and the Theology of Probability." *Victorian Studies* 39 (1996): 129-50.
- Sutton, Michael A. . "Gladstone, John Hall (1827-1902)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33418> (July 19, 2006).
- Symondson, Anthony, and Robert M. Young. *The Victorian Crisis of Faith: Six Lectures*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1970.
- T.E.T. "Obituary Notices of Fellows Deceased." *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London* 75 (1904-1905): 188-92.
- Taves, Ann. *Fits, Trances, & Visions : Experiencing Religion and Explaining Experience from Wesley to James*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- . "From Religious History to the Cultural History of Religion." *J Am Acad Relig* 71, no. 4 (2003): 885-93.
- . "Reviewed Work: *Miracles and the Modern Religious Imagination*, by Robert Bruce Mullin." *The Journal of Religion* 78, no. 3 (1998): 438-40.
- Valente, K. G. "Transgression and Transcendence: *Flatland* as a Response To "A New Philosophy"." *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 26, no. 1 (March 2004): 61-77.
- W. "London Letter." *Science* 9, no. 210 (Feb. 11, 1887): 126-27.
- Winter, Alison. *Mesmerized: Powers of Mind in Victorian Britain*. Chicago, Ill. : University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- York, George K., and David A. Steinberg. "The Philosophy of Hughlings Jackson." *J R Soc Med* 95, no. 6 (2002): 314-18.

VITA

Kara Fromke was born in Minneapolis, MN. She received a Bachelor of Science degree in Mathematics from Wheaton College in 1993, a Master of Arts degree in Secondary Mathematics Education from the University of St. Thomas in 1998, and her Master of Arts degree in History from the University of Tennessee in 2007. She taught high school mathematics for ten years at Christ Presbyterian Academy in Nashville, TN before returning to graduate work, this time in the field of History. She will be attending the University of Notre Dame in the fall of 2007 to pursue a doctoral degree in the History and Philosophy of Science.