

showed a marked difference as to imitation. One showed scarcely any tendency of imitation until after the age of two years and a half ; the other began to show vocal imitation when a little over two months and continued in the ordinary path. The former reached his results largely by his own experimentation and refused to imitate directly.

The chapter on ' Sociability and Personal Ideas ' makes a vigorous statement of the fact that society is fundamentally a subjective reality. " In order to have society it is evidently necessary that persons should get together somewhere ; and they get together only as personal ideas in the mind." " Persons and society must, then, be studied primarily in the imagination." " The imaginations which people have of each other are the *solid facts* of society." It seems to the reviewer that the emphasis upon the function of imagination, both in this and the following chapter, is one of the best features of the book. The chapters on the social self may be regarded as in part a supplementation of Professor James' chapter on the self.

The author has a special criticism in several passages upon the popular antithesis between egoism and altruism. It may be readily granted that the phrases as ordinarily employed are liable to criticism in so far as they seem to imply mutually exclusive alternatives. But common life knows perfectly well what it means by selfishness, and no amount of psychological criticism on the terminology will alter the fact that one man has a ' self ' which does not recognize the equal or superior claims of others, while another man has a self which does recognize the claims of others to be treated always ' as an end, never as merely a means.' Now, from the individual standpoint one of these selves may be as ' harmonious,' as ' stable ' as the other. But they have very different ethical values. I query whether, in his desire to correct a current misuse of terms, the author has done justice to the real ethical difference implied in the terms. Other queries as to details will naturally suggest themselves to the reader, but the book is a decidedly welcome contribution to social psychology.

J. H. TUFTS.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

NATURE OF CONSCIOUSNESS.

The Psychology of Mental Arrangement. I. MADISON BENTLEY.
Am. Journ. Psychol., Vol. XIII., No. 2.

" We may say, in general, that any structure made up of heterogeneous elements — if it be anything more than a mere collection or heap — implies arrangement, plan, pattern, and not simply addition of

abstracts units." The question is whether this arrangement or principle of synthesis is to be found without or within the sum of the units. The problem of mental arrangement is, in the last analysis, the problem of interpreting our psychological abstractions in terms of the steps by which these abstractions were first made and have since been elaborated. In the associational and faculty psychology this, only too obviously, never was done. Is it done in the recent psychology which discusses the problem?

This paper aims 'to bring together the various recent contributions to the subject * * * by the Austrian school of psychologists' (Ehrenfels, Meinong, Cornelius, Witasek, Schumann and others). Ehrenfels insists that over and above the elements into which a mental complex can be analyzed there is a factor of arrangement which he calls the form-quality (*Gestaltqualität*). Meinong uses the term funded-contents (*fundierte Inhalte*). Cornelius, on the other hand, starts with 'a big, unanalyzed, undissected mass' (*Gesamtein-druck*). Schumann, Stumpf and Stout represent intermediate positions.

The real problem here involved is the fundamental one: When is experience one, and when is it many? Under what conditions do we view consciousness as a unity, and when do we distinguish various aspects or elements? It is essentially the same as the question when mind is to be viewed statically as a thing or entity and when dynamically as a process, a stream, or movement. These are questions concerning consciousness which can be answered only by a functional analysis from within, never by a survey from without. It must be an internal rather than an external type of analysis. The whole discussion shows "how misleading is such a rubrication as 'sense' and 'intellect.' Mind is not so simple as that one can say of a mental formation, 'this is either a sensation that has found its way into mind or a sheer spiritual creation that mind has evolved.'" It is true 'that a complete descriptive account of a mental complex demands more than an enumeration of its constituent elements,' but on the other hand, in these discussions, "where a 'funded' factor has been found necessary, the true nature of psychological elements has not, as a rule, been kept in view," and the concept of 'mental activity,' here as elsewhere, is ambiguous.

One phase of the discussion is the insistence by certain writers on the existence of distinct elements of relation, a consciousness of 'togetherness.' "Is the 'fourness' in the perception of four objects, or the 'squareness' of the square itself, an element?" Is 'liquidity'

something more than pressure + temperature? Does the 'fifthness' of the fifth remain the same though the elements be changed? It appears so. Stout says that 'togetherness' or, as he calls it, 'the apprehension of form,' is a distinct kind of consciousness, a 'constituent of consciousness comparable * * * with the perception of red or blue.'

The solution of this problem is to be found in an examination and criticism of our methods of psychological analysis and abstraction. If our method yields us an abstract particular, psychological atoms, then, to offset this, we are compelled to postulate some synthetic principle, some abstract identity. This is the fallacy underlying the uncritical use of such terms as 'mental activity,' 'attention,' and the various phrases by which this Austrian school of psychologists express the important idea of mental arrangement as over against the mental units which result from the analysis of any concrete experience.

H. HEATH BAWDEN.

VASSAR COLLEGE.

The Unity of Process in Consciousness. HENRY RUTGERS MARSHALL. Mind, New Series, Volume XI., pp. 470-502.

Looking at the world of living organisms, from the standpoint of an outside observer, one 'cannot but be impressed with the evidence that a unity of process exists through all the apparent diversity which he at first observes in the forms of living bodies.' Thus it appears, at least, to the biological investigator whom we may conceive to view this process as "a 'spirit,' if we may use the term, with such full capacity for scientific observation and analysis as man displays, but without any thought that his observations or analyses are aught else than interesting modifications of his consciousness; without any knowledge that his consciousness is related to any human body; and with no notion whatever that any form of consciousness has any connection with animal activities."

'Our spirit' observes that if any bit of matter, whether lifeless or alive, receives a stimulus, it reacts upon this stimulus and becomes a different thing. In the case of living matter, there is, apparently, the capacity to become again what it was before its reaction to the stimulus. But a closer inspection shows that this capacity is never exactly regained. Reaction to a stimulus never leaves the body exactly what it was before the reaction. In the case of the complex organism and environment this is called 'learning by experience.' Probably it is characteristic of all living matter, but escapes observation in the sim-