

character which underlies the French phrases about *le doux Jésus*. Jesus was, as Mr. Temple says, no sentimentalist; no man ever made higher claims or exacted more from His followers. But Mr. Temple, as I think, goes to an unjustifiable extent in the other direction. When he depicts Jesus as a person to whom none of His followers could venture to offer advice without being withered to earth for their audacity, he seems to me to be ascribing to Him the quality of a *poseur* and charlatan. I do not for a moment believe that He was a stickler for His "dignity". And in the case to which Mr. Temple refers, St. Peter was rebuked not so much for offering advice as for the quality of the advice he offered.

I might also suggest a doubt whether the conception of the *λόγος* has anything to do with the Old Testament prophetic expression "the word of the Lord," which, as Mr. Temple of course knows, is in Greek always *ῥῆμα κυρίου*.

And at page 365, where Mr. Temple is essaying the dangerous task of explaining the doctrine of the Trinity, I cannot help suspecting that his explanation is hardly orthodox. Is it really sound Christian theology to say that the activity of the Father is in Eternity but that of the Son and Spirit in Time? I am sure at least that Mr. Temple unconsciously perverts the meaning of the passage he quotes from St. Thomas. St. Thomas says, as Mr. Temple will see on looking up the context, that "if the Holy Spirit did not proceed from the Son, He could not be personally distinguishable from the Son". This is an argument against the Greek doctrine of the "single procession," and the point is that we know *antecedently* that the Spirit is personally distinguishable from the Son, and as this could not be, but for the relation of "procession," we may conclude that the Spirit proceeds from the Son. The "personal distinction" is one of the *premises* of St. Thomas's syllogism; Mr. Temple makes it the conclusion, "the Spirit is only distinguishable from the Son because of His proceeding from Him". He converts what in St. Thomas is a *ratio cognoscendi* into a *ratio essendi*.

A. E. TAYLOR.

---

*Problems of the Self: an Essay based on the Shaw Lectures given in the University of Edinburgh, March, 1914.* JOHN LAIRD. Macmillan & Co. Pp. xiii + 375.

THE substance of this acute and learned work was delivered shortly before the war, and its publication only increases one's longing to return as soon as possible from the present madness to the sensible employments of those days.

I shall endeavour to give a synopsis of Prof. Laird's book and then to criticise certain points which seem to me both important and doubtful.

To inquire into the nature of the self we must begin by discussing experiences; it is only when we have done this that we can tell whether they and their relations suffice to constitute a self or whether some further constituent be essential. Experiences are the subject-matter of psychology, and, in the second chapter certain fundamental problems in the latter science are discussed. Among these are (i) the distinction between cognitive acts, universals, sense-data and physical objects. Of these the first are certainly experiences, the second and fourth are certainly not, whilst the third—though they are objects and not experiences—may be partly mind dependent. (ii) The nature and possibility of introspection are next discussed. The arguments against its possibility and trustworthiness are rejected on grounds which seem to me perfectly conclusive, and it is suggested that we may have direct knowledge of other men's minds. (iii) Introspection tells us that cognitive acts are acts of reference to objects and that they may differ in 'quality,' in the sense in which doubt differs from belief or supposition. (iv) The tripartite division is next discussed. As offered it seems to lack any definite *fundamentum divisionis*. Prof. Laird takes the view that all experiences refer to objects (though he admits to a slight doubt about feelings). He then divides these acts of reference into dynamic and adynamic. The latter are cognitions. The former are divisible into those in which the object is affected (Conations) and those in which the object affects the subject (Feelings). We may say that 'endeavour is *guided* by cognition and *prompted* by feeling'.

In the third chapter Prof. Laird discusses whether the body can be considered to be in any sense part of the self. He decides that it cannot, and tries to explain why it should seem plausible to hold that it is. In his view organic sensations are cognitive acts which tell us about certain states of our bodies. These states are objects and not experiences. Hence they are not parts of the self; but they have certain characteristics which make them easily confused with true feelings which are parts of the self. Our bodies may be essential to ourselves and they are our own in a special way, but this does not make them *parts* of ourselves.

In the next five chapters Prof. Laird discusses in turn the alleged primacy (a) of feeling, (b) of conation, and (c) of cognition over the other factors in mental life. His conclusion is that all are essential and none prior to the others. If feeling be a reference to an object it is no more private than any other experience. Nor is it relevant, even if true, to say that the self has developed out of a mass of feeling. This would only amount to a priority of feeling to the self, not to a priority of feeling *within* the self. And it is only plausible to say that the self develops out of mere feeling when you define feeling as that state of mind which is too vague to be classified under any other head. With this sense of feeling the priority of feeling is unimportant.

The fifth chapter begins with an analysis of activity. Prof. Laird concludes that it consists in initiation and novelty, which are not, however, independent of the past or of present conditions. There is no reason to deny that activity is a part cause of changes, but no reason to think that it is the only kind of cause in the world or even in the self. Chapter vi., which deals with the psychical and the purposive, discusses the arguments of neovitalists. Purpose is supposed to be a mark of life, hence of the self, hence to be the primary factor in the self. This is, as Prof. Laird points out, at best a *non sequitur*. Purpose too is most ambiguous. It may mean (a) conscious volition, or (b) explanation in terms of a system, or (c) value. The reason why the same name is applied to three such different things is that conscious volition leads to a system of means and ends which cannot be externally distinguished, and that such systems have value. It is impossible to prove that mechanism (in which Prof. Laird appears to include physics and chemistry) will not explain the phenomena of life. Even if it will not there is little reason to think that there is much conscious purpose even at the level of instinctive processes, and therefore still less to assume it in processes of growth and reproduction. All that is really needed to explain the facts is to suppose that some wholes are such that their parts act very differently when removed from them and placed in different surroundings. Hence there is no reason to see a psychical principle, still less a conational one, in the phenomena studied by the anatomist and physiologist.

The discussion of the alleged primacy of the will is concluded in a long chapter (vii.) where Kant's Practical Reason, Fichte's Ich an Sich, Schopenhauer's Will to Live, and Bergson's Élan Vital are described and criticised. Prof. Laird has naturally little difficulty in finding confusions in Schopenhauer; and his sympathetic treatment of Fichte, accompanied with long quotations, only persuades me more than ever that Fichte is as negligible as he was disagreeable. Whatever it be that Bergson takes as primitive it is too primitive, Prof. Laird holds, to be identified with conation rather than with any other side of developed mental life. As to Prof. Laird's views on Kant I shall have something to say of these later.

Chapter viii., on the Self as Knower, can hardly be said to deal with the alleged primacy of Cognition. This, Prof. Laird thinks, has been sufficiently refuted by the arguments of those who attempted (though vainly) to prove the primacy of feeling or conation. He therefore devotes the chapter to some problems connected with cognition. Experiences are parts of the self, and not qualities; for they are particulars and not universals. Moreover they are neither parts nor qualities of the body. The components of the self, on Prof. Laird's view, are thus acts, their 'qualities,' and their 'content,' but never their objects, even if these be mind-dependent. To the objection that this makes the self but a poor

thing, Prof. Laird replies (a) that this is the conclusion to which reflexion on the facts forces us, and (b) that 'contents'—in the sense of differences in acts correlated with differences in their objects—are probably necessary to explain association. They do supply a good deal of variety within the self, though they are not capable of being studied introspectively.

Lastly, there is nothing about *individual* cognitive acts to force us to assume a pure ego as knower. Lotze's arguments only suffice to refute presentationism, whilst Russell's much milder contention that, to understand the proposition I am aware of *x*, I must be acquainted with that of which *I* is the proper name, rests on a false analysis of cognition. My awareness of *x* is not a relation between me and *x*; the only relation is between my awareness and *x*. There is also nothing in the fact of self-cognition to show that any factor in the self is always doomed to be a subject and not an object.

Prof. Laird therefore concludes that *single* experiences will not force us to assume any factor in the self which is not an experience; it is possible, however, that the unity and continuity among our *various* experiences may require some new factor for its explanation. In chapter ix. he therefore discusses the Unity and Continuity of the Self. He holds that the unity of cognition varies *pari passu* with that of the cognised object and that corresponding unities of feeling and conation exist. But isolated strands of our mental life have much more internal unity than the self as a whole. Indeed, now that mere presentationism has been refuted, we can afford to admit that the unity of mental life tends to be exaggerated. Such unity as there is is doubtless in part dependent on external objects and on bodily sensations, but these are *conditions* not *component parts* of the unity.

The next question then is: What are the ontological conditions of the amount of unity that we find? This question is discussed, mainly with reference to retentiveness, in chapter x. Prof. Laird holds that it is improbable that retentiveness can depend solely on the brain. He accepts the view that we must grant the existence of subconsciousness, though he thinks that most of the arguments for it are weak and declines to extend its range very far or to expect it to perform miracles. Stumpf's argument he criticises on physiological grounds.

Chapter xi. contains an interesting discussion on three problems connected with multiple personality: (i) Do selves dissociate? (ii) Are the dissociated parts ever different selves? (iii) If so, are several selves ever coexistent in one body? He argues that, on any criterion of personal identity that we apply in ordinary life, (i) and (ii) must be answered in the affirmative, and that the same is probably true of (iii).

Chapter xii. contains a long, and to my mind, rather needless discussion of the history of the notion of substance since Descartes. In the thirteenth and last chapter we have Prof. Laird's own views

as to the sense in which the facts force us to consider the self a substance. A substance is a term which can be a subject, but not a predicate. But this is not sufficient. It must be a particular existent. A characteristic of existents (though not a definition) is that our knowledge of them involves sensation. An existent involves two factors, stuff and form. These are not capable of separate existence, and you cannot identify a substance with the former in abstraction from the latter. The unity and continuity of a substance are then discussed and it is argued that what counts as *one* substance varies according to the criterion used. This does not, however, render the notion arbitrary or subjective, because the fact that it is more convenient for one purpose to count a certain system as one and for another purpose to count it as many depends on the nature of the system and the sort of the universe and not on our subjective caprice. The self is a substance (and, in general, *one* substance) *par excellence*, if by this you mean a complex particular existent which for practically all purposes has to be treated as one and as inexplicable in terms of anything else. It differs from the body, but this does not prove that it can survive the body, still less that it is indestructible. Survival and immortality are possible, but the continued existence of a substance can only be established through the evidence of the senses, which is necessarily lacking in the case of a disembodied self.

This is the gist of Prof. Laird's book. Before going on to criticise certain points I must say that I am in hearty agreement with the greater part of it; that it is much the best book on the subjects treated in it that I have met; and that it would be difficult to praise too highly the skilful way in which the author has managed to deal with a huge mass of problems without ever obscuring the main trend of the argument.

The first question which I want to raise deals with the position of feeling and with the tripartite division. All experiences, according to the author, are references to objects. He is a little less certain with regard to feeling than with regard to cognition and conation, but he thinks that, when the confusion between true feelings and bodily sensation is removed, it will be clear that true feelings are acts of reference. Now of course this is clear enough with regard to anger *with* someone, joy *at* some news, and so on. But are all true feelings of this type? Are they all *directed* feelings? On the other hand, is it not possible that a directed feeling is in a certain sense analysable into a feeling and a cognition? It is noteworthy that Prof. Laird admits (what is undoubtedly true) that the direction of feeling and conation to objects is always to objects *as cognised*, though the cognition may be very vague. Again there seem to me to be undirected feelings such as general depression. We may have the experience of feeling ill-tempered and looking about for an object of our ill-temper. Now I suggest very diffidently that perhaps the tripartite division in general, and feeling in particular should be treated in a very different way from

Prof. Laird's. It seems to me that the one act that essentially refers to an object is cognition. I suggest that feelings are states of mind not analysable into act and object at all. But upon cognitions and feelings may be *founded* (in Meinong's sense) acts of a higher order in which there is a specific kind of relation between a feeling and a cognised object. These complex acts, built upon but not totally analysable into true feelings and cognitions, may be called directed feelings, or, as I should prefer to say, emotions. *E.g.*, the undirected feeling of ill-temper would normally be called a feeling and not an emotion; but the state of anger with Smith, built upon this feeling and a cognition of certain propositions about Smith, would be called an emotion directed towards Smith.

I am much inclined to think too that conations are acts of a higher order founded upon cognitions and a special class of feelings (in my sense), and that the characteristic of these acts is that a special kind of relation unites these feelings with the cognised object. If this be true there will be a primacy of cognition in a sense which Prof. Laird does not discuss. It will not be primary in the sense that other states of mind can be deduced from it, but in the sense that all states of mind that have objects and are not themselves cognitions are acts of a higher order founded upon cognitions.

I think Prof. Laird assumes too hastily that all states of mind must be analysable into act and object. Doubtless it is obvious enough that a sensation of red means a sensation whose *object is red*, and not a red sensation. This is because there seems a clear incompatibility between the subject—sensation—and the quality—red—which involves extension, shape, etc., in its subject. But there is no obvious incompatibility in saying that a sensation of toothache means a 'toothachy' sensation, and not a sensation whose object is toothache. Again, suppose that all sensations be analysable into act and sense-datum. It still remains possible that sense-data, which are admitted to be probably in part mind-dependent, may be states of mind of the nature of feelings. This, I understand to be Prof. Stout's view, and I should have been willing to forego a good deal of the discussion about people of the calibre of poor dear Fichte to have it fully criticised. Personally I find it almost as difficult to believe that a feeling can be red as that a sensation can be red; yet this difficulty does not seem to affect Stout, and I must admit that I cannot see clearly that *all* so-called sensations (*e.g.*, those of headache) *must* be or even *are* analysable into act and object. It seems to me quite possible that, when we describe sensations as states due to the stimulation of a nerve, we describe two different classes of mental states: (i) True sensations, *i.e.*, acts whose objects are sense-data, *e.g.*, sensation of red and (ii) Bodily feelings, *i.e.*, states not analysable with act and object, such as feeling of headache. And in addition the question would remain whether sense-data be themselves of the nature of bodily feelings.

It is to be noticed that even if bodily feelings be not true sensations there will remain a distinction between them and what Prof. Laird calls psychical feelings. The difference is that headache and toothache do not seem capable of entering into directed feelings; you cannot have an emotion of toothache towards Smith; whereas anger and fear can be and generally are constituents in emotions felt towards cognised objects.

Prof. Laird's view, however, is that bodily feelings are genuine sensations, that they are the awareness of special sense-data peculiarly connected with the states of our own bodies. This view seems to me possible, though from what has gone before it will be clear that I do not think that it is necessary or even highly probable. There really is a very important difference between toothache, if this be regarded as a sense-datum by means of which we perceive a state of our tooth, and a red sense-datum by means of which we perceive the colour of a physical object. Prof. Laird says that *all* sense-data are probably in part subjective; this is doubtless true, but it is believed that by their sensations of somewhat similar red sense-data different people perceive the *common* redness of a *common* physical object. But my sensation of toothache, however like my toothache may be to yours, only enables me to perceive the state of *my* tooth, whilst yours only enables you to perceive the state of your tooth. Thus, if toothaches be sense-data, they not only have in themselves the subjectivity of an ordinary sense-datum, but also, unlike other sense-data, they do not lead various people to the cognition of a neutral physical object and its qualities. The argument that doctors can learn as much about the states of our bodies from knowing our organic sensations as from looking at our tongues is irrelevant to prove that a headache is a sense-datum, for the doctor's conclusion from what we tell him is inferential, whilst the relation between judgments of perception and the sense-data on which they are founded is certainly not inferential, whatever it may be.

Lastly, even if a toothache or a headache be objects and not states of mind, I should suppose that their painfulness is mental and not bodily. Pleasure and pain seem to me not to be states of mind or of body but qualities of states of mind. If toothache and headache be feelings then they are mental and their painfulness is a quality of these feelings. If you divide the experience of toothache into an act and a sense-datum, then I should suppose that the painfulness must be a quality of the act and not of the object.

To pass to a different point. Mr. Laird makes the self to be a complex whose components are entirely acts, their qualities, and their content, but not their objects. And he says that the self is a substance and *one* substance *par excellence*. But surely a psychical act is a mere abstraction apart from an object. I do not merely mean by this that it is *causally* dependent on an object in the sense in which mind might be causally dependent



on brain, but that an act without an object is inconceivable. Now does not this make a self, which is conceived as a complex of acts, the merest abstraction and the very last thing to be regarded as a particular existent substance and the ideal example of substance?

Again I cannot see that Prof. Laird has produced the least evidence for his view that we have direct knowledge of other minds. The argument that we do not first notice that anger in us is accompanied by frowning and then infer that frowning in others is accompanied by anger seems to me true but irrelevant. No doubt we no more establish the existence and states of other minds by inference from their bodily actions than we establish the existence and properties of bodies in ordinary perception by inference from our sense-data. I should suppose that we start with an instinctive belief both in minds and bodies, and in general pass immediately from perceived gestures to judgments about states of mind, as we pass immediately from the awareness of sense-data to judgments about physical objects. It is only when someone questions our right to do this that we excogitate arguments based on analogy in the one case and on causation in the other. If then the absence of inference does not prove that we are directly aware of physical objects it will not prove that we are directly aware of other minds. I do not know exactly what Prof. Laird means to maintain when he says that we are directly aware of other minds. He might mean (a) that some of the states of other minds are direct objects of our own in the same way in which sense-data are and in a way in which physical objects and their qualities are probably not; or (b) that we have a special kind of sensations and that by means of the sense-data cognised in these we pass directly to judgments about the existence and qualities of other minds, just as we pass to judgments about the existence and qualities of physical objects directly from sense-data of sight, touch, etc. If the analogy with introspection is to hold he presumably means (a). Now either of these views is possible; but personally I cannot detect in myself a direct awareness of other men's states of mind or an awareness of a special kind of sense-datum through which I perceive other men's states of mind. I have thus no direct evidence in favour of Prof. Laird's view, and he does not suggest that he has any. And the facts do not, as I have tried to show, necessitate his view. I think it would be probably fair to say that we often perceive other men's states of mind, if by this you merely mean that our beliefs about them are not *reached* by inference, though possibly *defensible* by inference. But if you mean that they are direct objects of some of our cognitive acts, or that there is a special kind of sensation on which a perception of them is founded, then I should consider the statement baseless and probably false.

To turn to another question. I do not accept Russell's argument to prove that we must be acquainted with at least momentary selves, but I also do not accept Prof. Laird's refutation of it. The



fact admitted is that we understand such propositions as I am acquainted with  $x$ . Russell makes this a relational proposition of the form (I) (am acquainted with) ( $x$ ). Laird makes it into (This acquaintance of mine) (is with) ( $x$ ). At least this is how I understand him. On one analysis I must be acquainted with that whose proper name is  $I$ , on the other with that whose proper name is *This acquaintance of mine*. Russell's argument fails because it is mere dogmatism to assert that his is the right analysis, but Laird's counter-argument is merely the counter-dogmatism that acquaintance is not a relation.

I will now say something about Prof. Laird's statements as to practical and speculative reason. The question is: In what sense does reason determine a right act. Prof. Laird's argument on page 159 seems to come to this: Rightness of act = rationality of act; therefore being determined by its rightness = being determined by its rationality; and this = being determined by reason. The last step in this argument seems to be a *non sequitur*. It appears to me that three factors are involved: (i) the rationality of the act, which is a quality of it and would exist whether we had reason or not; (ii) reason, *i.e.*, the faculty of our minds by which we recognise rationality in acts, coherence in arguments, and so on; (iii) the desire to do those acts which we judge rational and to believe those propositions which we judge to be true. Any of these factors might exist without the other two and it cannot be said that any one of them determines our act or our belief more than the rest. The truth is that we are not determined by reason in such acts in any more important sense than we are determined by sight in avoiding a puddle. In the latter case it would be far more in accord with ordinary language to say that we are determined by the wetness of the puddle, or by our dislike of getting wet. And in the former it would be more in accordance with ordinary language to say that we are determined by the rationality of the act, or by our desire to do what is rational. The truth of course is, as Prof. Laird admits, that there is no primacy of practical over speculative reason. Indeed the whole terminology is ridiculously misleading. There is a desire to do what is believed to be right, and this is operative in moral choice; and there is a desire to believe only what is seen to be coherent, and this is operative in speculation. There is also a power of recognising the formal characteristics of rightness and of logical coherence. This faculty may, if you like, be called reason. The two desires may be called a desire about practice and a desire about speculation. Reason, accompanied by the former, is practical reason; accompanied by the latter, speculative. There is clearly no question of priority between them; and, if there were, it would have no bearing on the primacy of conation over cognition, since *both* involve conation and cognition in precisely the same relation to each other.

Lastly, I must say a few words about the subconscious and

Laird's criticisms of Stumpf's argument. In discussing these subjects there are, I think, a number of distinctions which Prof. Laird might with advantage have drawn. (i) The distinction between dispositions (*e.g.*, badness of temper, etc.) and traces (the supposed permanent effects left by past experience). The former can hardly be called states of mind, they are qualities of the mind as explosiveness is a quality of dynamite. They may, of course, be dependent on some permanent state or structural peculiarity. But I cannot see the least reason to think that they are states in the same sense as a particular exhibition of temper is a state of mind. (ii) The question whether you can be aware of a sense-datum without at the same time being aware of all its parts, and the question whether you can be aware of it without being aware of all its qualities and relations. If a sense-datum be not counted as a state of mind then Stumpf's argument seems to have no bearing on the question of subconscious states of mind, for it deals with sense-data. If it be counted a state of mind then its parts will presumably be states of mind, but its qualities and relations will not. Now Stumpf's argument deals with the relation of identity and diversity between qualities of sense-data. Hence, whether the argument be true or false, and whether sense-data be or be not states of mind, it has no bearing on the question of subconscious states of mind.

Now I think that Stumpf's argument can be stated without the slightest reference either to physics or to physiology. There are series of sensations  $s_1, s_2, s_3$  such that, if  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$  be the corresponding sense-data,  $\sigma_1$  is judged to be qualitatively identical with  $\sigma_2$ ,  $\sigma_2$  with  $\sigma_3$ , and  $\sigma_1$  is judged to be qualitatively different from  $\sigma_3$ . As a mere matter of logic these three judgments cannot all be true. Hence we must either be judging qualitative identity when there is qualitative difference or conversely. Now the former is much the more probable error. Hence sense-data almost certainly may differ when we judge them to be identical in quality.<sup>1</sup>

I must bring this long review to a close. It has been a delight to read a book occupied with psychological problems which avoids the 'havering' so characteristic of most psychological writings, and maintains a steady argument at the level which we expect in a good treatise on logic or the natural sciences. Prof. Laird maintains a standard almost as high as that which he seems to consider normal in maiden aunts, whose 'usual accomplishments,' he says on page 260, include the power 'to knit, to read a novel, and to engage in conversation simultaneously'.

<sup>1</sup> In fact there is nothing to prevent Stumpf from employing his argument in heaven to the angels, even if they have no bodies, provided only that they have sensations.