



T.
... ..
... ..

STATE NORMAL SCHOOL
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

PSYCHOLOGY

AND THE

PSYCHOSIS

5078

INTELLECT.

BY

DENTON J. SNIDER.

ST. LOUIS:
SIGMA PUBLISHING CO.,
210 Pine St.

(For sale by A. C. McClurg & Co., Booksellers, Chicago, Ill.)

Copyright by D. J. SNIDER, 1896.

BF
121
S67

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	5
INTELLECT	49
I. Sense-perception	56
1. Sensation	60
External Factor	62
Mean Factor	70
Internal Factor	90
2. Perception	118
Impression	126
Attention	130
Retention	151
3. Apperception	161
Simple Integration	167
Selective Integration	181
Redintegration	195

	PAGE
II. Representation	222
1. Memory	231
Spontaneous Memory	238
Voluntary Memory	247
Systematic Memory	256
2. Imagination	281
The Natural Symbol	288
The Artistic Symbol	297
The Rational Symbol (Sign)	343
3. Memorization	385
The Symbol-learning Ego	392
The Symbol-employing Ego	404
Communication	410
III. Thought	425
1. The Understanding	438
Apprehension	442
Distinction	445
Classification	454
2. Ratiocination	470
Conception	478
Judgment	498
Reasoning	507
3. Reason	513
Intuition	520
The Dialectic	536
The Psychosis	548

E. S.

6/14/99.

INTRODUCTION.

The central fact in Psychology is the *Ego*. This fact may also be called the Self, or the Person. The science of Psychology shows the unfolding of the Self, and in this aspect we may name it the science of the Person.

4/3-24-03 At the heart of our science, therefore, we place Personality, which is truly the heart of all things. The universe without Person at its center would be not only meaningless, but impossible. Upon the infinite worth of the Person all education, all advancement of civilized society, the whole institutional world repose. Now, the Person is essentially self-unfolding, or rather is the unfolding of Self; it has an order, and hence there is a science of it, which is this order duly formulated.

The first thing which the student is to grasp in Psychology, is himself, or his Self. And if he obtain the best return for his study, he will get not merely some curious information about his mind, but will develop into a completer selfhood. Undoubtedly the knowledge of the mental activities has worth for every rational being; herein is Psychology of great use. But the real function of our science is to help the individual unfold into his true Self, to become an actual Person, and not merely remain an undeveloped, potential one. Psychology has an important theoretical side which is, in general, to impart knowledge of the Ego, but it has also an intensely practical side, which is that the Ego come into full possession of its heritage, namely, a complete Personality.

The central fact in Psychology, which is the Ego, is also called Mind, Consciousness, and sometimes Soul, and sometimes Spirit. The science of Psychology shows the unfolding of the Ego into consciousness, or into the knowledge of its own activities, and in this aspect it is often named the science of Mind.

In the present work we shall cling pretty closely to the word *Ego* to express the central fact out of which our science develops. The Ego is Person, which puts stress upon the element of the

will, or self-activity; the Ego is Mind, which puts stress upon the side of intellect or self-consciousness. Still both sides are one totality, the Ego, and each side has no existence without the other. In every act of intellection there is some phase of volition, and in every volition there is some phase of intellection. The highest philosophy reaches up to the insight that Will and Intellect are one in the Divine; but the humblest act of mind is a reflection of the same unity.

Objections have been raised to the use of the Latin word *Ego* in Psychology. Its English equivalent can not well be tolerated on account of the ambiguity in sound with the organ of vision — *I* and *eye*. Some form of the term must be employed, and the Latin word has the advantage of being a technical term in Psychology. Its English flavor is, however, said sometimes to be unpleasant, on account of its connection with egotism and selfishness on the one hand and its suggestion of brooding and excessive self-occupation on the other. Undoubtedly in using it the reader may have to lay aside some of his preconceptions.

A great philosopher has shown that the idea of the Ego itself is chargeable with ambiguity, since it has two quite opposite strands: it is the most individual thing in the universe, being the very essence of individuality, and it is the most universal thing in the universe, being the essence

of universality. But this ambiguity or twofoldness is really the chief recommendation of the term; the Ego must have just these two opposite poles in order to be the theme of Psychology. It is the most comprehensive word that can be used, and at the same time the most definite.

We should also note that Psychology, as the Evolution of the Ego, means not the unfolding of the latter in time, but its movement into an ordered totality. The activities of the child's Ego develop coterminously as well as in succession; the scientific order is not always the chronological. But the science of Psychology shows the Ego ordering itself according to its own highest activity, namely, Thought. The principle of psychological procedure is not to be taken from the outside, is not to be picked up from physical science, say, and clapped on externally, to the movement of Mind; that is the most alien, artificial and jejune of all methods. On the contrary the Ego must order the Ego, being just the self-orderer in its highest potency.

Already the question concerning the definition of the Ego has arisen. To define it formally, from the outside, through something else besides itself, is clearly impossible. Any such definition would have to leave out the main fact, and so would be partial or indeed meaningless. Let us, however, give a fresh, and, if possible, deeper glance into the matter.

The Ego is, first, Self, Person; the Ego is, secondly, the conscious, the knowing; the Ego is, thirdly, the self-conscious, the self-knowing, uniting thus both its sides into one process. From the standpoint of definition, the Ego is Self, is the definer, and is the Self-definer.

Is this to define the Ego? Or, to put the question in a little different shape, Can the Ego define the Ego? Some psychologists say that, inasmuch as the Ego must define everything, it cannot define itself. But this statement is really a contradiction, and hence self-annulling. The Ego does define all and itself too; or, rather, since it is included in the all, which it defines, it cannot be left outside of its own definition. The Ego is, accordingly, self-defined, not defined through anything else but itself. Indeed its fundamental characteristic is to be self-definition.

Thus we touch the peculiarity of Psychology: the very thing to be observed, ordered, and defined, is just the thing observing, ordering, and defining; the central sun which reveals the whole universe, cannot fail of revealing itself at the same time. The Ego is the witness and the fact witnessed, the spectator and the spectacle; double in its action, yet single; ground of all difference, yet of all unity as well; divided within itself, yet individual (note the force of *in*,

which is negative). It is often said that Psychology has to do with "the facts of consciousness only," or with "the phenomena of mind;" but who or what is the getter of the fact? The getter of the fact is also the fact gotten, the producer of the phenomenon is the phenomenon produced, the ordering principle is just what is ordered.

This reflexive movement of the Ego is the essence of it, is indeed the Ego defining itself as self-active, and still further, as self-knowing. The learner in Psychology must wrestle with the conception of his science just here; this double action of the Ego is the primal fact of it, as yet quite abstract and empty, but which is to fill itself with all the riches of concrete psychical life.

The Ego is often called the conscious subject, and the fact just set forth is designated as consciousness. These terms we shall also use by the way. When I feel, or know, or wish, I am conscious that I feel, know, wish; the Ego knows itself as feeling, knowing, wishing; it can recognize itself in every mental activity; still further it recognizes itself to be just that which recognizes itself, in which fact lies its definition, or indeed its self-definition.

The beginner may have already wearied of his first lesson in Psychology; the matter surely is not easy, especially at the start. But let him take courage, and have another grapple not only

with the definition of the Ego, but with the very idea of definition. The Ego is not to be defined by anything outside of itself, not by any major term for subsuming it, not by any middle term for mediating it, since all major terms and all middle terms are simply its own creatures. The Ego must define itself, and it is just that thing in this universe of ours which is capable of defining itself. All definition goes back to self-definition as its ground; there could be no definition of anything unless there was a self-definer to give it. The Ego is supremely the self-definer, and as such defines itself; that is, the Ego defines itself to be just that which defines itself.

The student is not to forget himself in this study of Psychology, he also is in the psychical sweep and must not be left out. Not only must he confirm each statement by introspection, but must make actual the fact that he too is Ego by taking himself up into its movement. Thus when he defines the Ego as self-definer, what is he but the Ego defining itself just in that way?

Very easy is it to dismiss all this as dialectical subtlety; such it is, but it cannot be evaded, since it is the subtle dialectic of consciousness itself, and lies at the root of the whole psychological process. Not simply the fleeting, changeful, contradictory phenomena of mind do we wish to know, but also what is in it abiding and eternal.

I.

We shall now seek to grasp the process of the Ego as it primarily unfolds within itself, and as it essentially remains through all its activities. One may say that it is the author's Ego trying to project itself into an act of self-definition, and to formulate the same; still further, that it is the student's Ego trying to re-think that act and to identify the same with his own. In both cases it is manifestly the Ego defining itself, which is the movement of all Psychology, and which we shall find to be the principle lurking in many another science. Now, having said that the Ego was self-definition, let it proceed to define itself, for when I am defining my Ego, and you yours, it is merely the Ego defining the Ego.

The Ego unfolds within itself through three stages:—

First, it is simple, undivided, in immediate unity with itself. In this stage the Ego cannot yet know itself, it is unconscious, yet full of the possibility of consciousness.

We may call such a stage the infantile, for the infant has an Ego, quiescent, slumbering, sunk in the wrappage of nature. The child is the potential man, and is always giving out intimations of his coming destiny; he is continually anticipating manhood. These anticipations of

children are a mighty instrument of development in the hands of the skillful educator; it is the great merit of Froebel that he grasped their import and organized them in his kindergarden.

In sleep also the Ego is in an unconscious, immediate condition, unseparated within itself, the sport of its environment. Likewise in waking states of the mature mind there are many degrees of unconsciousness, yet always with an impulse toward consciousness; indeed the Ego is forever hovering between the unconscious and the conscious, or between the less and the more conscious activity, having an inner force or motion to burst from the bud into the flower. Still in the present stage the Ego is, has being, though not yet thinking and self-relating; it is blank identity of Self, without difference realized, though always impelled inwardly toward self-differentiation.

Secondly, the Ego is the divided, the different; it separates itself within itself and makes itself its own object. Now it is awake, and distinguishes itself from the world; it has become conscious, the dualism has entered, and man can know.

This twofoldness of the Ego is the matter to be grasped in the present stage. Look inwardly, you behold yourself; you are your own *other*,

you have *othered* yourself; that is, you have made yourself the *object* of yourself, you being still the *subject*. These two words, subject and object, coming to light at this point will henceforth never drop out of our psychological vocabulary. Their birth-place is just here, they are sprung of the self-separation of the Ego, twins, Siamese twins, distinct individuals, yet everlastingly bound together. Historically, these two terms, originating with the Schoolmen, have descended into modern thought and have colored its entire course. They express the fundamental dualism of consciousness, and form the real starting-point of the psychology of our epoch. According to Hamilton, the term consciousness was unknown to ancient Plato and Aristotle, and was first employed by Des Cartes, the precursor of modern philosophy.

If the previous stage was that of infancy and of paradisaical innocence, this second stage is the eating of the tree of knowledge, whereby dualism (dence, devil) enters and separates man from his primeval condition of simple unity with himself and with nature. Thus the start is made, according to the Hebrew account; Greek legend has many similar statements. Both the Iliad and the Odyssey spring from mighty breaches in the Hellenic soul, grand separations of the spirit, especially the separation of Occident from Orient, in whose throes Greece was born.

The Ego is in itself the different, and hence the source of all notions of difference. I could not say that yonder house was different from the tree which stands before it, unless the fact lay in me. I could not think myself as different from you, if my Ego did not have difference within itself. I could not know an external world, I could not separate myself from this book, unless I had separation in me. Without this differentiation of the Self, there would be for me no multiplicity of nature, no shifting landscape, no variety of any kind; I could not distinguish, could not analyze, could not know.

Hence this second stage of the Ego will be found in every psychological process, small and great; we shall note it in each act of the Ego, which, in order to act, must separate itself.

Thirdly, the Ego is the return out of separation into unity with itself. This unity is distinct from the unity of the first stage; that was immediate, this is mediated, mediated by passing through the stage of difference. This unity, therefore, has the separation behind it, present but overcome; the opposite of itself is now united and reconciled within itself.

The Ego has now gone through the last stage of the process, which gives to it completeness. The cycle of the Ego we may name it, inasmuch

as it, like a circular movement, has returned into itself. It is, however, as yet only the inner or subjective cycle, whose destiny is to make itself external (to *outer* or utter itself) in many forms throughout Psychology.

It also gives the thought of restoration after estrangement; it shows the nature of the return out of alienation, out of the fall, hinting the grand recovery of man, which is likewise his progressive movement. It is, in fact, the germinal process of the deepest spiritual experiences, and gives the basis of that inner harmony which comes from the resolution of the sharp discords of life.

The story of Eden, which may, from one point of view, be regarded as the story of the development of the first human consciousness, has also its return in later legend; Paradise is lost through the grand estrangement, but this is overcome and Paradise is regained, and man comes back to his Eden. Especially in the great poem of Dante is this last form of the old Semitic legend wrought over and transfigured into a new spiritual utterance for the race. But the same movement and essentially the same thought are found in the Greek Mythus, notably in Homer, whose two poems, parts of one whole, may be respectively designated as the Separation and the Return. Undisguisedly the *Odyssey* is called by the poet himself a Return; it is the story of

- the return of the hero Ulysses from war, estrangement, negation. It is a very shallow view of the poem, which sees only the hero's external voyage back to his home, with some strange adventures thrown in by the way. In fact, the Iliad and the Odyssey together exhibit the purest movement of the Ego found in literature, clothed of course in the events of a world-historical epoch; in Homer the infant Occident awakes and separates itself from the Orient. It may seem a very remote relationship, but really it is a very near one when we say that what Homer did for the child-man of his age, Froebel has done for the actual child of our time: through play and song and story he has helped to lead it out of its unconscious state, and gradually to take possession of the culture of its race, and thus to become the heir of the future.

We must, accordingly, seize the movement of the Ego as essentially the movement of Mythology, of History, of Literature. These are all products of mind seeking to utter itself and to become real in the world; they all must bear the mind's impress. There is, accordingly, an objective psychology which is the best illustration of the subjective one, veritably its necessary counterpart.

Let us, however, turn back to the three stages above given; they must be grasped as a process,

always separating yet always uniting. The Ego is not a crystallized thing, nor is it capable of being forever fixed in a category, so that it may be handled in an external way. The Ego must always be re-thought, that is, re-created; it cannot simply be remembered or be represented. However successful its formulation in words, it cannot thus live and move, for all speech is crystallization, while the Ego in its very nature is the process. Still the words we must have, just to transcend them; speech is a ladder by which the spirit climbs to its treasure-house beyond the ladder.

II.

The process of the Ego as just given is the germinal movement of Psychology, unfolding into all its distinctions, and yet uniting these distinctions into the one principle, which is just this process of the Ego. For designating it from somewhat different points of view, we shall employ in the main four terms or categories, of which we shall give a brief exposition. These terms are *subject-object*, *limit-transcending*, *infinite*, *psychosis*.

More terms might be added, but these will suffice to show the purpose and the usage of nomenclature in general. Psychology has to speak its own language; least of all, can it borrow its vocabulary from Physiology without shooting into chaos.

But the student must not imagine that all he has to do is to write these terms down in a notebook, or to store them up in his memory. They must be generated anew every time they are employed, if they are to have any life. The Ego is not a dead thing, it can be grasped only in the living movement of itself.

Hence the above analysis of the Ego must be followed at once by synthesis, which is not an external putting together, but a more than vital process, nay a thinking process. The second stage of the Ego is the analytic, separative, differentiating, which has to find its higher truth in the return to unity. The terms Thesis, Antithesis, Synthesis, have been used a good deal in some systems of philosophy; they must at last obtain their justification in the movement of the Ego, and not in any separated, fixated condition. In Psychology there has to be life, more than life, there must be the self-active Thought.

The Ego has been described by a number of thinkers as *subject-object*, which, when genetically thought out, is the true definition of it. Here is the division within itself; the Ego separates itself from itself, holds itself up before itself, and looks at itself; then it sees that the two sides are one. Consider again your Ego; you project it before you as object and regard it; yet the object is the subject, is also the Ego regarding,

both are one. The twain have been put together and called subject-object, an awkward but very useful term, in whose outward form we see division, and in the division we see unity. Or, to state the same thing as a process: the inner Ego throws itself outward and is external to itself, while still within. The hyphen is important, since it cancels the difference between the two sides, yet indicates it also as present, though overcome, ideated, ideal.

A valuable point in regard to the term subject-object is, that it persists in remaining meaningless unless we go through the Ego's complete process in thinking it. The triple movement lurking in it must be seized, if it is to have any life or intelligent purpose.

Another important predicate of the Ego is *limit-transcending*. The Ego reaches out beyond its bounds, it bursts its barriers, it cannot rest satisfied in limits, even its own limits. We saw that it would not remain in mere identity, but passed to difference; just as little could it remain in difference. Limit-transcending is the Ego; if it posits a limit, straightway it must in some way assert itself as beyond the same, being the free, unbounded spirit.

This characteristic is taken for granted in every form of education; ignorance is a limit which can be transcended, unless all learning be a mistake. The child goes to school under the

supposition that mind is limit-transcending; you are now reading this book of mine buoyed with the hope (which may be vain) of removing certain limits of yours in Psychology.

Upon the same characteristic rests the moral nature of man. Vice is a limit of which the Ego must be able to liberate itself, if we are to be held accountable. The Christian world holds that the worst sinner can repent, that the deepest and darkest limitation of the Ego this Ego can wipe out and become free again. Here we are suddenly brought face to face with what is often called the infinitude of man.

Mind, Spirit, Ego, is designated as *infinite*. Not that it knows every particular object in the universe, not that it stretches itself externally and extends beyond the sun and stars, filling all space, but that it can rise above its own finitude, and can assert its infinite and eternal nature.

Undoubtedly, there has been much vague talk about the infinite spirit of man. Such talk, if not attaining quite the infinite, certainly reaches the indefinite with supreme success. But what is here meant by the infinite nature of the mind can be made definite by the process of thinking. The Ego has its bound, is finite, finds its limit on many sides in error, sin, ignorance. But it is also aware that it can pass its bound, that its limit is in reality no limit, is not fixed against it from the outside.

Employing these terms still further, we may say that the Ego is both infinite and finite; its very finitude is self-canceling; its movement is the movement of the Finite, which, to be true to itself, has to put an end to itself, and become infinite. To use other terms, the limit is negation, but negation when fully thought negates itself and becomes positive.

The process of the Ego through its three stages is the *Psychosis*. Here we introduce a word which will remain with us to the end of the present book, a word which expresses the active, unitary principle in all our science. As the Psyche is the soul of man, so the Psychosis is the soul of Psychology.

It is a fundamental mistake to suppose that Psychology deals merely in difference and distinction, that it is a dividing of the mind into faculties and activities, as if these were the rooms of a huge apartment house. The Ego has unquestionably division as one of its phases, but its process is to get out of division and distinction, and return to unity. A psychological treatise which gives only distinctions, contradicts therein the Ego itself, which must also cancel distinctions, even its own distinctions. The Ego cannot be held fast in a state of separation, else it were not itself, at least not its whole living self, but merely some dead fragment of itself. Thus analysis the acutest can never reach the

total Ego, though analysis is certainly one phase of its process, which has, however, to cancel analysis in order to be the process.

The Psychosis is, therefore, always to come after distinction the most minute and classification the most sweeping, after the smallest and largest divisions of Psychology, in order that the dislocated and anatomized Ego be restored to unity. To be sure all this will require mental effort, especially will it demand the limit-transcending act which has been mentioned. Language often stands in the way of the Psychosis, yet the latter has to be formulated in words in order to be imparted. Words are always in danger of getting fixed, crystallized, and so destroy the very process which they are designed to express. Language is essentially the uttered, the externalized, the separated; it is the product of the second stage of the Ego and must be transcended by the spirit. If I am sunk in the mere forms of speech, I cannot employ them aright, I am their slave, the Ego loses its free movement which is just the thing to be uttered. The writer who fills and overfills language is really the master of it; he compels it to express the Psychosis. This is true of literary composition, far truer of psychological writing, which too often slays the soul in trying to tell of it.

Accordingly we shall endeavor to lay the Psychosis under the spell of words, well knowing

the difficulty, and also well knowing that the most successful formulation will be dead to the reader, till he creates it anew, that is, re-thinks it by an immediate act of his own Ego. Nothing can be more lifeless than the corpse of Psychology cut up into innumerable distinctions without the Psychosis; the dead human body is hardly so repugnant. There must be the new life, nay the new genesis, which makes whole; still we must not forget that distinction has its place in the process of the Ego.

We have now mentioned four terms which may reasonably be employed in mental science — subject-object, limit-transcending, infinite, the Psychosis. It is to be noted that all these terms are to be understood in substantially the same sense, yet they exhibit their contents in different ways. They are points on the circumference of a circle which have the one common center, though each has a separate direction toward that center. Each requires a special act of thought to reduce it to unity. The Ego has to go through its process in order to find itself in these terms; there has, in each case, to be a Psychosis in order to identify the Psychosis. No definition of terms is this in the ordinary sense; it is the Ego revealing itself under different forms as its own single process.

To mark the distinction in these terms just a little in passing: *subject-object* indicates more

the Ego with division present but overcome — ideality; *limit-transcending* indicates more the Ego as reaching over its bound — aspiration; *infinite* indicates more the Ego as coming to its true Self in thus reaching over its bound — attainment; *Psychosis* insists upon the unification of these distinctions, however minute or however colossal, in the one process of the Ego. For if the Ego be order and not chaos, it must have a plan; this plan must be its own, its very Self, and recognizable by itself. Underneath these distinctions, accordingly, and indeed underneath all distinction whatever, lies the Psychosis.

Historical. The previous view of the Ego is by no means a new doctrine; it is substantially the way in which man has looked at himself from the beginning, that is, since he began to regard himself as a self-conscious being. The poetry of the race gives many a glimpse of this view. Mythology is much occupied with it also. Especially have the religions of the world taken hold of it and incorporated it into their systems of belief; under diverse shapes the Divine Ego is held to be threefold, and thus to manifest itself to man. Hence comes the sacred nature of the number three among so many peoples, it is God's number, the quantitative form of Spirit. In philosophy the same tendency can be observed, particularly among those philosophers who hold

to a spiritual view of the world. Ancient Plato is famous for his trichotomy, or threefold movement of mind; modern Hegel organizes his vast system on the same lines. Superstition has undoubtedly misapplied the number three, and fancy has capriciously played with it, so that it has been at times discredited; moreover it can be used in the most external fashion and clapped on anywhere to anything. Still it has also its deeply internal principle which cannot be ignored.

Modern philosophy moves about the development of the *Ego* as the center, or self-consciousness. Thinking and Being are the two opposites which are to be reconciled by a philosophic view of the world. *Cogito, ergo sum* is the key-note, or rather short overture, out of which all succeeding harmonies and discords are unfolded. Hence it is that modern philosophy is occupied with the psychological problem, while ancient philosophy was occupied with the ontological, as has often been observed.

The culmination of the modern movement took place in Germany and called forth the remarkable line of thinkers from Kant to Hegel. Among these it was Fichte who developed the doctrine of the *Ego* to its highest subjective potency, and brought into use much of its terminology. Fichte, therefore, represents a most important phase of the psychological advance of our age.

But against this movement, strongly idealistic, a reaction has arisen, especially in Germany. As Psychology is at present in the midst of this reaction, we may give a little account of it. The chief of the reactionary influences has entered pedagogy and springs from Herbart, who in his work on Psychology denies explicitly the third stage of the Ego, or the return into Self. That is, Herbart sees in the process of the subject-object only an infinite series, not a circular movement, or a process self-returning. His method of refutation is by substituting object for subject and subject for object in the definition of the Ego as subject-object, and thereby producing an empty but endless bandying of words from one side to the other. It is manifest that Herbart gets only one stage of the process of the Ego, namely, difference; he holds that the Ego, having posited difference is compelled to stick to it, and that the return can only be a new separation. Thus no complete identification is possible after difference; but that the different by its very nature must differ from itself and therein cancel itself into a new unity by its own inner movement, is something that Herbart does not see or ignores.

Still the self-identity of the Ego is too patent a fact to be wholly cast away. So, according to Herbart, the Ego must know itself not as other but simply as itself, or must know self as simple

identity, which can have no object in itself. The Ego is not subject-object, but subject only; so difference is excluded from within, and abstract identity is asserted of the Ego.

Difference has, accordingly, to come from the outside, from the world, and to determine the Ego, which is thus not the self-determined, and thereby the determiner of the external world, but is itself the externally determined. Herbart denies self-activity to the Ego, which has simply the power of self-preservation against the impinging masses of sensations and percepts. These incoming materials meet the Ego with its total mass, and have a collision, the result of which is a settling down into order, as two streams of water coming together show conflict at first and then adjust themselves according to mechanics and statics. The mind also has its science of mechanics and statics; the Ego is the reservoir of all former percepts which may be considered to be in a state of equilibrium till a new percept arrives and disturbs the equilibrium.

There can be no doubt that Herbart, just through his one-sided stress, has called the stronger attention to the ordering of percepts by the help of the percepts already making up the content of the Ego. Herein lies the great value of his doctrine of Apperception, which is a substantial addition both to Psychology and to Education. Yet even in Apperception it is the mind

observing mind, standing back and looking at itself, as it were, thus showing the return into self, which is the very process of the Ego. Thus Herbart in spite of his refutation will often be found unconsciously taking for granted the Ego as subject-object or as self-activity.

Hence in the proper place we shall introduce Apperception into the grand total movement of Psychology, and do justice to Herbart's important contribution, though we have to think that his doctrine of the Ego is a mistake. Physiological Psychology is also a reaction against the earlier German philosophy; but as it looks at the Ego purely from the physiological side, it never gets to the heart of the problem, though it gives many important hints in reference to the physical antecedents and consequences of mental activity, and makes many interesting measurements of the quantitative element, which also belongs to mind. From a hygienic point of view physiological Psychology has made most valuable contributions to education; in this regard, we may say it is epoch-making.

III.

Already we have seen the pure movement of the Ego within itself, as subject-object. Now it will pass to a new phase: it will posit the non-Ego or the external world; this it will first recognize as different from itself, and then

recognize as its own, which is the act of knowledge. Still further, the individual Ego, through this cognition of the external object, rises into a recognition of the Universal, Creative Ego. At this point, however, Psychology begins to pass out of its sphere, and reveals its connection with another science, usually called Ontology. Recognition is a fundamental thought in Psychology, assuming three different forms, all of which we shall consider.

The Ego as simple subject-object is the return to Self, which is consciousness. Again the Ego is one with itself, it has passed from subjective difference into unity with itself, which we designated as the third stage of the Ego. This unity, accordingly, opposes itself to difference and thus asserts the same; it could not be the opposite of difference unless the latter were in it and at work; unity is just as different from difference as difference is different from unity. Thus the conscious Ego projects into existence a new object separated from itself, which is the non-Ego.

The new difference is not that of the second stage above described, not the subjective, internal one; it is not the difference within Self but outside of Self. The object is not now the one in subject-object, but is the complete negation of subject-object or Ego; that is, the object is now non-Ego.

So the Ego, having reached consciousness of itself in its first process, posits an objective world outside of itself, the opposite of itself. The difference, previously internal, is now projected out of the Ego and made external. A realm of externality thus arises, which we shall hereafter find to be not merely external to the Ego, but external to itself.

We may trace a little further the new object. It, as already stated, is the product of the difference from subject-object, it is the other of the Ego. Yet it is also the object of the same, it is the thing looked at, the fact or the phenomenon which the Ego holds up before itself. In spite of the difference, therefore, the Ego identifies the new object with its own process as subject-object; it preserves the difference ideally by overcoming it and making the new object its own, recognizing the same as its own object.

A step further we may carry the movement: the process of the object will show the same three stages as the process of the subject — simple, separated, unified. First, the object will show itself in simple, unrelated unity with itself, as any isolated thing in the world of sense; secondly, it will hold itself distinct from the subject, maintaining its difference therefrom, as in a conscious act of perception; thirdly, the object will show itself as one with the subject, unified with subject-object, as in the completed act

of knowledge. The destiny of the object as non-Ego or the external world is to be known, that is, to be identified through and with the process of the Ego.

Herewith we come upon a fundamental thought. All knowing is the seeing of this process of the Ego as the essential fact of the object. The Ego beholds the world as itself, then it knows the same, and is identical with it, having canceled the difference between Ego and non-Ego. For the Ego is subject-object, such is the mold into which it pours the universe. The knowing Ego, therefore, identifies the world with itself, or, we may also say, it recognizes the external object to be one with itself. Still this external object remains, it is not annihilated by being known, rather is it ideally preserved. The difference still holds, even when the non-Ego is turned back and translated into the Ego, as it has to be, if it reach its true inner significance. Such we may call, in general, cognition; the Ego cancels the difference between itself and the world, beholding in the latter its own process.

In order, however, to go to the bottom of this matter, we must observe that the cognitive act here unfolded, is really recognitive; that is, the Ego recognizes itself in the external object, it identifies the other as its own. If I am to know the world, I am to find it in my own Ego, for I have nothing else to know with; without such an in-

strument, the world is alien to me and unattainable, since I cannot get that which I have no means of getting. All cognition is essentially recognition.

But may we not conjecture that there is something in the world which lies outside of all possible forms of the Ego, something which is indeed unknowable? There is no means of proving any such fact, or indeed of perceiving it, for what else have we to perceive with but the Ego? There cannot be even a sensation without the activity of self; you have only your knower to know with. Still such an unknowable something has crept into modern philosophy, where it creates vast confusion, for is it not the contradiction of all thought? When you say that this matter is unknowable, you must know something very important about it in order to be able to make the statement. The world must be penetrable by thought. Why? Because it is a thought.

All cognition is recognition. But, though I may know the world, I am aware that I did not make it; I find it before me, and identify it, I recognize it; my relation to it thus is theoretical. But when the Ego identifies it as Ego, we know it as not our own Ego; for this reason we once called it the realm of the non-Ego. The world is object, still not the object found in our subject-object. It is, however, object, and must have a

subject to correspond; the question then is, what is that Ego of which the external universe is the true object? We are compelled to posit a World-Ego, which is also subject-object. Thus we have an Ego whose object is the world, including me, including my particular Ego recognizing such an universal Ego.

The complete development of Psychology carries us up to the Divine Ego which created the world, or whose difference, otherness, outer-ness is the external presence of nature in which man is placed, and which he has to know, that is, recognize as Ego. Not so much man as man's Ego is the highest of creation, being God's image, that is, the image of His Ego. God is also subject-object, His objective element being the universe, which His Ego created by its own inner necessity, and which the human Ego recognizes as Ego, and so comes to knowledge.

In this connection it may be remarked that the difference, separation, otherness of the Divine Ego is actual, is a posited distinction, and has immediate reality as object; that is, God's thinking and willing are one, thought is deed with Him. Man's stage of separation, however, is subjective, ideal, in his Ego, which he has to make real through his will; he finds his objective world already made, which he has to make over and thus objectify himself. We may conceive of the thought in this fashion: God plans and His

plan is the universe; man plans, and his plan has to transform through volition some part of the universe already existent. It was the great insight of the Schoolmen that Intellect and Will become one in God.

Very remote all this probably appears, but it is intimately bound up with our science. When my Ego knows the external object, that knowledge rests upon the fact of a World-Ego, the Divine, the Universal Person; it recognizes the same as essentially one with itself. Every act of my knowing pre-supposes the Divine as existent, as object not only to me but also to itself. Really that is just what I know — nothing more, nothing less. From this height of outlook we can see that our Ego acts with the Divine Ego in knowing, co-operates, as it were, with God, doing over again what deity does. Thus is man truly godlike in knowing, the image of the Creator. The noble Malebranche must have had some such thought in mind when he uttered his famous statement that “we see all things in God.”

The great point to which we always come back in the present discussion, is this: How does the Ego as simple subject-object pass to the external world which is non-Ego? Note again: the world is object, and hence corresponds to object in the simple Ego (or subject-object); but the world is also object to its own

Ego or subject, just as the object in my Ego has its subject. So we transfer the conception of our Ego with its subject-object to a World-Ego with *its* subject-object. The fact of the world being objective necessitates its having a subject also, an Ego which is the counterpart of it — the Universal, the Divine. Simply to know the external object is cognition, which deepens into recognition when we know the same object as Ego.

I observe the rain, the descent of the stream, each seems to be falling all the time. But I next observe evaporation, the rise of water from the earth into the cloud, which is borne by the winds to the upper air or mountain tops, where it is condensed and falls again. Now I have the explanation, I see the total meteorological process of nature, which is an external image of the process of my Ego; previously I was not satisfied, I could not rest content with a part of the cycle, which in me was whole. When I can bring any phase of nature into its cycle, I understand it, I explain it; I make it correspond to the process of my Ego. Still I do not make the process of nature, there is another will in it — Whose? A different Ego from mine has this entire outward world as its object, namely the Divine, which I have ultimately to recognize as the complement and fulfillment of all my knowledge.

Thus a theistic (not theologic) strand runs through all Psychology, much against the com-

mon view of the matter. To-day this science of the soul is often said to have no soul; but our Psychology has not only a soul but a God. As little can Homer do without his deities as Psychology can do without its divine element.

It will be well to look back and to summarize what we have learned. We began with the conscious Ego, which recognized itself as its own immediate object, and this object as itself; thus the recognition is subjective. Then in the cognition of the external object we found the Ego recognizing the non-Ego or the world as itself, which we may name the objective recognition. Still further, the Ego recognizes the non-Ego to be not only itself, but also to be the object of the Divine Ego, through the world rising to deity, who is now recognized by the individual Ego as its other or opposite, that is, as absolute Ego. For the true non-Ego is found to be not merely the external world, but an Ego which is the opposite or the negation of the individual or finite Ego, which cancels within itself all difference, separation, finitude. Such is absolute recognition or the recognition of the Absolute as Ego, as Divine Personality.

We have now unfolded the three Recognitions, which we shall briefly put together, that the reader may make his own the complete movement of the Ego before proceeding to the more detailed development of Psychology.

1. Subjective Recognition.—The Ego divides itself within itself into subject and object, and recognizes the latter as itself — the individual Ego as conscious.

2. Objective Recognition.—The Ego separates the non-Ego (the world) from itself, and then proceeds to recognize the same as its own or as Ego — cognition, the knowing of the object. Thus the Ego makes over the world into itself, so that it knows the same.

3. Absolute Recognition.—The Ego recognizes the world as the object or expression of an Ego whose thought is reality, who knows himself as object, and creates the world as his other.

The total process as above set forth may be grasped as follows: The individual Ego, through knowing the objective world, mediates itself with the Divine Ego. Psychology, as the science of the evolution of the Ego, has to give the account of this process, and therein takes its true place.

Also a mighty Psychosis moves through the three Recognitions and joins them into one process, in which the human Ego rises up and interlinks with the Divine, in which man-consciousness by its own inner necessity is seen to find its fulfillment in God-consciousness.

Historical. It was the work of Des Cartes to bring into modern philosophy the significance of the self-conscious Ego. In his famous doctrine, *I think, therefore I am*, he makes thinking the

ground of being. By his *I think* he means the Ego thinking itself or self-consciousness, as is shown by his answer to Gassendi's objections. *I walk, therefore I am*, will not do, there has to be the self-thinking Ego in the proposition before being can be predicated. *I think* is the center of my being, and thought is the fountain of existence.

This identity of thinking and being — “the most interesting idea of modern times,” according to Hegel — was not developed by Des Cartes, he did not unfold the Ego in its process with the non-Ego. Still he saw what it involved; a dim intimation he had that the self-knowing Ego of man had its necessary complement in the Divine Ego. Hence springs his effort to prove the existence of God. The two extremes he saw, and he felt their connection, but he did not supply the mediating thought, which is indeed the development of philosophy since his time. Still he turned on the waters and gave direction to the stream; the problem, however, remains and has to be solved by every person in his own fashion or stay unsolved.

Des Cartes' Thinking and Being have unfolded into subject and object, Ego and non-Ego, self-consciousness and externality. Then he has sought to bring into view the divine counterpart to human thinking by his argument for the existence of God.

Let us recapitulate in this connection the foregoing movement once more before leaving it. My Ego seizes the world as external object, subjects it, makes it subject, knows it. But the knowledge or identification of the world is not completed by my identifying it with my subject; the world must also be taken as the object of its own Ego (or subject-object), for I am aware that it is not the created object of my Ego; I may know the world, but I did not make it. So I rise to the Divine Ego (or subject-object), of which the world is the true object, as supplementary to and involved in every act of my cognition.

Des Cartes has the two sides, the theistic and the egoistic (or subjective), but he by no means unites them. His theistic side first unfolded, and called forth Malebranche, who saw all things in God, and Spinoza who saw God in all things, and thereby jeopardated the existence of the individual.

The egoistic side of Des Cartes (his *cogito*) developed later, its legitimate child being Fichte with his doctrine of the Ego and non-Ego. To Hegel belongs the distinction of having made what appears to be the final synthesis of the dualism which started so emphatically with Des Cartes, and which since the latter's time has determined the general character of philosophy. It is plain that this character is largely psycho-

logical, and the attempt to banish all philosophy out of psychology in recent years is on the face of it futile and absurd.

IV.

The Ego having mastered the non-Ego or objective world, and identified the same with itself (which is the knowing of the same), proceeds to know itself as this knowing of the objective world, formulates and orders such knowledge, which is its own process of knowing. This gives the Science of the Ego, constructed, of course, by the Ego itself.

We have seen the principle of the Ego's activity — its threefold movement, which it must manifest if it act at all. We are now to pass to the science of the Ego, which is the Ego grasping its own order throughout all its phenomena, and thus setting forth the system of itself. Such a science differs from all other sciences; the latter are ordered from without by the Ego, while this science is ordered from within, the Ego being the thing ordered and the orderer. It always runs double, yet in unity with itself. If we say that Psychology is the science of the facts of the Ego, we must not conceive of the Ego as simply a mass of facts which are to be arranged by some power outside of themselves, as is the case with the facts of Natural Science. The mind knows the object, then it knows itself knowing the

object; this second knowledge ordered gives the science of knowledge.

Or, to give a little different turn to the matter: the Ego is the knower, is the known, and, chiefly, is the knower knowing himself as the knower of the known.

The Ego, as the science of itself and of its own phenomena, will unfold through three stages.

I. It is the immediate psychical act — *Psyche* — as a unit; the single, complete, mental thrust or discharge, before all division and classification, of which this act is the source and the material. It must always be remembered, and hereafter it will often be enforced, that each psychical act requires the whole mind, and involves implicitly all psychical acts, which might be shown by a sharp analysis. Still the psychical act is also special, has its individual character and relation; so it has to be ordered, or rather orders itself, in reference to other psychical acts. This brings us to the next.

II. It is Psychology, which is the science of the Ego in all its divisions. This is the sphere of separation, which gives us the so-called faculties, the special activities of the Ego. Formerly the science of mind dealt chiefly in division and classification, and this element is not to be dispensed with at any time. Still the Ego must not stop with mere division, which is but one stage

of its threefold movement. The fundamental divisions of Psychology are Feeling, Will, Intellect, which are seen to correspond to the three stages of the Ego.

III. It is the Psychosis. Already we have emphasized the significance of this term and shall often do so again. After the divisions of Psychology must always come the unification of the Psychosis; we are never to rest content with laying out the mind into so many faculties and defining them. The mind is a whole in every one of its special acts, even the smallest, and the science of mind must in some way express just this total process of it amid its finest sub-divisions. We are inclined to affirm that the chief problem of Psychology at present is to get a method, which, while giving the distinctions of the science their full validity, will at the same time preserve the unity of the mind and preserve it alive. Nothing is more certain than that the mere analyzing and arranging of the mental activities one after the other leaves us with a dead science, which is verily "Psychology without a soul."

Our age is called often the analytic age, and it must divide and sub-divide and go on refining to a microscopic minuteness in all things. Undoubtedly most books on Psychology are in the habit of protesting that "the mind is one" while its activities are varied; still they give us always the division, and very seldom the unity, especially

the living unity, which is the process of the Ego. The Psychosis is the return out of separation to the oneness of mind, yet the separation is not lost but taken along as ideal or as a moment. Our science is not a row of dried sticks, each one apart, repellent, lifeless; on the contrary each activity is itself and the total movement of the Ego likewise. Very subtle is the Psychosis, not to be grasped merely as some abstract conception, still less as an image: it presupposes an Ego identifying the process of the Ego with itself; it is your Ego seizing its own movement in any psychical act and identifying the same.

The relation between Psychology and the Psychosis may be illustrated by the relation between Theology and Religion. The one is the expression of the conception of the Divine in formula, proposition, dogma — a necessary expression, by the way; the other is the soul's unity with God in worship. Theology is largely a matter of definition, so is Psychology; through definition Theology becomes separative, becomes many Theologies. Religion, on the other hand, lays stress on the unity, feels the one spirit in all religious belief, from the humblest to the highest. So the Psychosis is the Ego unifying all the distinctions of Psychology; it is the one active soul in all the manifold psychical activities. What Religion is to Theology, what Justice is to Jurisprudence, what the Spirit is to the Letter,

is the Psychosis to Psychology. Even this last distinction the Psychosis annuls — the distinction between itself and Psychology, and takes up the latter into the one grand process with itself.

The threefold division of the science of Psychology will be seen to be fundamental, springing from the nature of the Ego, whose activity is threefold. This triple movement the Ego imprints itself upon all processes of knowledge, or rather beholds itself in them, since all knowing is the seeing such a movement in the object, which, till it be thus seen and ordered, is chaotic or unknown. We have no other instrument of cognition but the Ego, which must work after its own nature, and unfold its material according to its own law. Hence the triplicity running through the manifold distinctions of Psychology, all of them bearing the impress of the Ego as simple, as divided, as unified.

There are, however, difficulties in such a procedure. As it seems to put the free spirit into limits, into fetters if you choose to say so, the latter protests and begins to assert its limit-transcending nature. This protest has its validity and must always be met not with dogmatic assertion, but with reconciling thought. If the above process were a scheme external to the Ego, and if the latter were forced into it from the outside, the whole thing would have to be cast away, not only as useless but as spirit-destroying.

Yet spirit has an order, of all things in the universe it is just the orderer, and of itself too. It rises above limits, but this rise is its principle and not its chaos. If it has a scheme, that scheme is its own, and is self-imposed. If it has a law, that law has been enacted by itself, is, in fact, just itself. The Ego, like man, is free, not because it is ungoverned but because it is self-governed. It must, in its science, combine development with order, going perpetually beyond itself, yet just therein coming to itself. The Ego must have in its system both liberty and law, excluding inner caprice and outer chaos.

The empirical method has the habit of catching up an isolated fact, analyzing it, and placing it under some rubric in an external fashion. Such a procedure may have to pass for a time in physical science, but it will not do in mental science, in which the observed fact is just the observer observing, in which the object is one with the subject. Psychology has too often been constructed from without, division after division is introduced according to the caprice of the psychologist without any inner unfolding. The science is not free, not true till it construct itself according to its own internal principle.

Psychology must always be supplemented by the Psychosis. If the former be handed over merely to arbitrary analysis, or to unbridled experimentation, it shows itself chaotic, or at

most put together in an external order, more or less alien to its true nature. It must have analysis and division, but it must also have the return to unity, and this unity must not be defunct, something abstract and finished, but living and moving, yea, self-active in its own process.

Looked at from the present point of view, "the old Psychology" was in the main divisive, a so-called faculty-Psychology, though it always protested that the mind was one. In the main "the new Psychology" is hostile to the faculty principle; but, in breaking down the old order, it leads us only too often into chaos instead of the new order, which we are all hoping for. We must have the specialization, the faculties, if you please; we must also have the unification, not as an abstract *caput mortuum*, but as the active principle in all division.

Let us grasp in a brief statement the main sweep of the present Introduction. First is set forth the inner movement of the Ego as subject-object. Secondly, the Ego posits the different, the non-Ego, and then proceeds to recognize it as one with itself, which act is the fundamental act of knowing, and which manifests itself in the three Recognitions. Thirdly, this act of knowing becomes science when the Ego grasps the same as its own movement, formulating and ordering itself in the process of knowing the

outer and inner worlds. The science of the Ego will manifest itself in three forms, the psychical, the psychological, and the psychosis — distinct, yet as one.

This science is what we are next to consider in its detailed movement.

INTELLECT.

The act of the Ego preliminary to the movement of Intellect is the separative one, which act is the division into itself and the external world, or into Ego and non-Ego.

This dualism shows, in general, the chasm which the mind is to bridge by cognition. Intellect starts with the external object as something apart, separate, wholly outside ; the process of the latter is the getting rid of such an external condition, and the becoming internal or known. The object is alien to the Ego at the beginning, is unknown, or rather is known as unknown. Such is the preparatory stage which is to be transcended.

The general movement of the Ego in Intellect is to overcome the separation between itself and

the world, and to identify the latter with itself, whereby it cognizes the world as its own.

In this manner the Ego masters the alienation of the external object from itself and recognizes the same to be itself through all separation and difference. Again we must note that cognition is fundamentally recognition. When I know this house, I recognize the Ego in it, the idea of the builder. Suppose that we, by some process, could deftly jerk this idea out of the house, what would it become? It would fall to pieces, it would suddenly lapse into chaos. That which makes this house, then, is the idea, not the brick and mortar, wood, iron, glass. It is the idea which supports the ceiling above our heads, the idea, to be sure, controlling the materials of structure. Now if I am to know this house, I must get hold of its idea, and identify it, and so make it one with my Ego. There is nothing else here for me to know; the Ego which brought forth the product I must commune with, and see its movement in its work. Then I know the work and not till then. The Ego cognizes the thing, and therein recognizes itself in the thing.

The Ego in Intellect starts with the object which it translates into itself; the Ego in Will starts with itself which it translates into the object. Knowledge identifies the object with Self, Volition identifies Self with the object.

Intellect utters itself in a cognition, Will utters itself in a deed; the one is often called theoretical, the other practical.

To complete the process of the Ego in this sphere, we must add Feeling, which is the immediate stage of the Ego before it becomes conscious of its separation from the bodily organism; still it acts in undivided unity with the same. Then the Ego separating itself within itself and uttering (outring) itself as object is Will. Finally, the Ego internalizing the object and making the same itself is the Intellect. These three — Feeling, Will, Intellect — constitute the fundamental division of Psychology. Yet they are the one process of the Ego, they are at the same time the Psychosis.

This threefold division of the science has been often assailed by psychologists, still it keeps its place, and cannot well be superseded. It originated from a true insight into the movement of the Ego, and is vouched for by a long line of sages, thinkers, and poets. One may find it suggested by ancient Homer, though in an imaginative, mythical form; it is explicitly announced by Plato in his trichotomy; it is employed by Kant and Hegel. It has taken deep hold on the religious mind both in the Orient and Occident, which embodies it in many a symbol.

It should be observed that this primary dis-

tion of the mind carries with it all further distinction. If the Ego be threefold in itself, then every activity of it must manifest the same triplicity. It must think in its own way, according to its own scheme, if it think at all. The result will be that the divisions of the science will not be capricious but ordered; they can not be made from the outside, the psychologist cannot drag them in as he pleases, increase or diminish their number according to momentary whim or insight. The science must develop according to its law, whatever be the psychologist's caprices; only when he follows and utters this law, is he truly scientific.

The objection will often be heard that such an ordered movement of the Ego is limiting, cramps the spirit's full activity, destroys its freedom by forcing it into a predetermined cast-iron system. No more than to obey the law of the land destroys the civil freedom of the citizen. Indeed without the law there would be no true freedom, but only caprice of the individual and with it utter disorder and final anarchy. Government there must be; it should not, however, come from without, for that is political subjection, if not servitude; it must come from within, that is, it must be self-government, in which we all believe.

Now this proposed ordering of the Ego is its own, its law is made by itself for itself, it is self-legislative. A famous statement concerning free

government declared that it was of the people by the people for the people. The free movement of the Ego must not be made anarchic, it too must be an ordering of itself by itself for itself.

Still further we may assert the freedom of the Ego when its full process is rightly grasped. The very scheme of it makes it limit-transcending; it posits difference, limitation, restraint, but it also posits the return out of these to unity. The Psychosis is the canceling of all bounds of the Ego and the revealing of it as the unbounded, as that which can transcend its own bound. Freedom thus is the very law of the Ego, the necessity lurking in its process.

In the present book, accordingly, we shall see the Ego ordered and arranged in its manifold distinctions, but this order must be its own, and must proceed according to the inherent nature of the Ego. Nothing is to be imported into its movement from the outside, nothing inside of it is to be left out of its movement.

Accordingly we shall try to avoid two opposite, yet equally objectionable methods. The metaphysical method starts out with some foregone system of Philosophy which it applies more or less externally to the free movement of the Ego. The method of Natural Science takes the procedure derived from the physical sciences and applies the same more or less externally to

the free movement of the Ego. Each method, proceeding from directly opposite standpoints, commits the same mistake in regard to Psychology. Yet each method in its proper limits has a genuine contribution for Psychology. We cannot wholly eliminate metaphysical concepts from our science, such as *law, science, concept*, though we banish any pre-ordained metaphysical system. Likewise we call to our aid the method of physical science in treating of physics and physiology as conditions of the psychical process. Still the method of the Ego must be its own, self-derived, not taken from Philosophy on the one hand, or from Natural Science on the other. Method it must have from the start, and apply the same strictly, but this method must be generated out of itself and imposed upon itself by itself.

The movement, therefore, of the Ego in Intellect is the overcoming the difference between Ego and non-Ego by cognizing the latter as itself. The intellectual act is the mind finding itself in the world, or identifying the world with itself. The movement will be threefold, bearing the impress of the Ego.

1. *Sense-perception* is the Ego getting possession of the *external object* and uniting the same with itself — the object being always present to the senses.

2. *Representation* is the Ego separating the

image of the external object from itself, elaborating and getting possession of the same in all its variations, and then uniting it with itself—the image always being present to the Ego.

3. *Thinking* is the Ego penetrating the object and recognizing the Ego as creating the same. Thus the Ego in Thought identifies itself as the creative principle in the Universe, as the genus, or the generic, that which generates.

The whole constitutes the Psychosis of the Ego as Intellect, as the process of making the external object internal, of identifying it with the Ego, which latter finally recognizes itself as generative energy of the objective world.

CHAPTER FIRST.—SENSE-PERCEPTION.

Sense-perception is the process of the Ego in knowing the external object through the senses. This object is present always in Sense-perception, and is seized upon separately by Attention, and is incorporated into the Ego with its stores by Apperception. The general sweep is from the outer sensing to the inner ordering of the object, but the knowledge of it remains immediate, or the knowledge of the real object. The image of the thing is not yet distinguished from the thing, both image and thing are in an unconscious unity, not to be broken till Representation enters.

In a general way we shall state beforehand the stages through which Sense-perception moves in order to know the external object. Three Sections: —

I. *Sensation* is the act of the Ego uniting the

external world immediately with itself through the Senses;

II. *Perception* is the act of the Ego seizing some particular object given by Sensation, separating the same, and making it a percept;

III. *Apperception* is the act of the Ego ordering the particular percept through and with the previous stores of the Ego.

These three terms have been employed by psychologists in a great variety of significations. Nearly every original writer has his own usage of the terms Sensation, Perception and Apperception. Of these, Apperception has hardly yet come into universal employment, still it has already acquired many different shades of meaning. The only thing to be done under such circumstances is to follow the general trend of usage, which we shall try to do.

There is an advantage in bringing together as far as possible the various derivations of the verb *perceive*. The Ego is *the percipient* in this sphere, its content is a *percept*, the special act is a *perception*, which name is also given to the thing perceived. *Apperception*, the third stage, expresses the relation to *Perception* as the second stage; *Sense-perception* couples *Sensation* and *Perception*, and thus overarches the whole sphere.

A word should be said in regard to the definitions which we have sent on in advance of the

special treatment of the provinces defined. They are merely provisional, supposed aids for the student who wishes to take a brief outlook in the direction whither he is going. They are, therefore, temporary makeshifts, to be laid aside when the real edifice is built. For the true definition is not thus picked up from the outside, but must generate itself out of what goes before. The definition of the Self must be self-defined or violate its own inherent nature. The special definition of Apperception, for instance, must proceed of its own accord out of Perception, its antecedent stage, and in like manner that of Perception out of Sensation. These terms are not to be caught up at any point and have a definition clapped on them in a merely external fashion. Again we affirm that the psychological definition must be genetic, self-unfolded, showing itself as a phase of the process of the Ego.

In Sense-perception the external object is always present to the senses, and is in the process of being taken up and made internal by the Ego. Hence this sphere is often called Presentation, in contrast to Representation. The external object has extension, has three dimensions usually, but when it is sensed, its extension is taken away, its geometrical form is canceled by passing through the Ego, which, after such cancellation, reproduces the extended object. Yonder door I perceive ; its extension I take up

into my Ego which has no extension, which is just the annulling of extension. Now the strange fact occurs that this annulling of the object by the Ego is its fresh reproduction. Really I can only perceive an object by first destroying it and then recreating it. Yonder door must pass through the zero-point of my Ego, and have its three dimensions pressed to nothing, before I can see it yonder, the product of my own activity. The Ego has to focus all externality into itself and then generate it anew out of itself. We shall first note this fact in Sensation.

SECTION FIRST.—SENSATION.

Sensation is the Ego uniting the object with itself through the senses. There must be an external physical object, there must be the bodily organism with its senses, there must be the Ego. The act of Sensation requires the presence and co-operation of all three elements; the object must be presented to the organism, which then conveys the presented object to the Ego, which last must accept this presentation, reach back and take up into itself the object. This is the cycle of sensation, starting from the presented object and returning to the same, which cycle in its totality thus becomes the possession of the Ego.

We can also say, in a general manner, that Sensation is the Ego starting to make internal the external object by means of the senses. The

Ego in Sensation annuls the outer into the inner, then projects the latter into the world. Sensation may also be considered as the first getting a knowledge of the material realm, which knowledge is to be followed up and deepened by later processes of mind.

Sometimes the word Sensation is applied to that which is simply an affection of the organism without any object, or which is purely imaginary. These phases we shall leave out of account at present.

In studying Sensation, accordingly, there are three factors which must be carefully held apart and examined.

First, the external factor of Sensation, the physical world which is to be taken up and internalized by the Ego, the realm of nature environing the man, the mundane element.

Second, the mean factor of Sensation, the living body with its nervous system, the middle term between mind and matter, the physiological or corporeal element, the bridge of life out of nature to the soul.

Third, the internal factor of Sensation, the Ego with its self-separating and self-uniting process, the psychical or spiritual element of Sensation, which is at the same time the total cycle of Sensation.

From the preceding divisions the entire sweep of Sensation can be discerned in outline. It is

the mind's process of transforming the external world into the mind, the Ego's movement to know externality. The object being at hand, that is, being in the horizon of the senses, the Ego must present the same to itself, it must make such object internal.

Sensation, however, does not yet distinguish the single thing from its continuity in Space or its succession in Time; whatever flows in upon us through the great stream of objects, has to be sensed.

I. THE EXTERNAL FACTOR OF SENSATION.

We consider first that portion of the natural world which lies outside of the human organism, the extra-organic. This is the primordial material of Sensation, is that which has to be *sensed*, or to be made internal.

This natural world itself is in a perpetual process, which the Ego must finally identify with its own. Of the process of nature we distinguish three stages: the mechanical, the chemical, and the physical. The first shows the relations of the outward form of matter, the second the relations of the inner constitution of matter, the third shows matter in a state of vibration, which is the process itself in material form.

The material object has extension, the Ego is not extensive, but intensive; that is, it negates

the object as extended, then negates this negation, and posits the object anew, as its own. Thus it is that the external factor of Sensation has to be re-created by the Ego before there can be a Sensation.

We shall now take a few glances at the external factor of Sensation, which has to do with nature. It is nature or the physical world which is to be taken up by the senses and united with the Ego. Now this external nature has a variety of phases, or an order within itself; it has also its principle or fundamental thought, which may be stated to be externality, outsideness, otherness.

Moreover nature is in a movement, in a process of overcoming its externality; it longs, so to speak, to get inside of itself; hence every material body gravitates toward the center of the earth, which if it reached, it would no longer be outside; it could then be only inside of itself. Really it would there attain selfhood.

The various stages of this movement of nature toward internality we have distinguished as the mechanical, the chemical, the physical. Each of these stages has one or more senses to take it up into the Ego, which is seeking to make it internal in itself, that is, in the Ego.

We may now see that Nature and the Ego have an intimate correspondence. Nature moves toward internality or selfhood, even in the act of

gravitation; but the Ego picks up Nature on her way to the goal, in one of her stages, and internalizes the same, primarily in an act of Sensation.

I. The mechanical stage shows the purest form of externality in the universe. The external body acts upon the external body in an external way, whereby the outward force is imparted and continues till overcome. The so-called mechanical powers show various ways in which external bodies act upon external bodies. Every kind of machinery rests essentially upon the same principle.

All space is filled with material bodies standing in mechanical relation to one another. From the remotest speck of stellar dust to the terrestrial objects just around us, we are environed with a world of mechanism, which in one way or other we have to meet. Our body is simply one of these mechanical objects in the first place; it is subject to contact, to motion, to all the incidents of this grand environment of mechanism.

But the human body not only passively receives the mechanical impulse and imparts the same outwardly, like a piece of lifeless matter; it takes up the same inwardly, and imparts it to the Ego, through the senses, specially through the sense of Touch. Thus, externality in its most external manifestation is caught up from the outer world and hurried off to the inner

world of the Ego where it is incorporated with the Self.

II. The second grand stage in the process of Nature is the chemical. The material body is now broken into, torn to pieces by its own inner agency co-operating with an outside agency; it is decomposed into its constituents, which may be recomposed into a new and different body. Chemism manifests an inner quality of the object; in mechanism the latter is separated or united outwardly, in chemism it separates within itself according to its own law, and unites in the same way. A stone is broken or put together from the outside, mechanically, and each part is still a stone, and the whole too is a stone; but when it is dissolved, chemically, the separation causes it to lose its characteristic, it is no longer a stone, it becomes another object or element.

Chemism, accordingly, changes the form and property of the thing, assailing and undoing the individuality thereof. Mechanism through its forces may break to pieces or mix together objects; they remain the same essentially in division or mixture; their individuality is not lost. Chemism is the great internally separating and transforming principle of external nature. Mechanism brings objects outwardly together, which chemism then divides and unites inwardly.

A vast environment of chemism in nature surrounds us on all sides, which the Ego is to take

up and appropriate through the senses, which in this domain are chiefly Taste and Smell.

III. Besides the mechanical and chemical properties of matter, there are those which are distinctively called physical — Sound, Light, Heat, Electricity.

Sound results when a body is struck or assailed in some way, its individuality is attacked and it resists, vibrating between the attack and the resistance. A struggle for self is thrown into the air, which is the medium of sound. A sound-world thus arises and environs the man, reaching him through the ear.

Light is caused mainly by consumption of matter, the chemical change of form. The grand source of Light is the sun, the center of the solar system, which is burning up, and thus reveals nature or externality. The result is, Light is thrown out from the center in opposition to gravity, or the principle of mechanism. Such is the destiny of the external world: as it approaches the center or internality, it is consumed, it vanishes, and yet produces the light, in which the inherent character of externality is revealed. Vision is the sense by which all this is brought to the Ego.

Heat also is the result of combustion, primarily of the sun, so that we have a heat-ray as well as a light-ray. It is propagated through a medium in undulations and is taken up by the entire

periphery of the body, requiring no special sense.

Electricity is the result of mechanical friction or chemical dissolution, and moves in a circuit. There is first the separation of this force into opposites, called positive and negative poles, and then their unity in the current. A cyclical movement manifests itself in electricity and begins to suggest the circuits of organic life, especially of the nervous system.

The complete mechanical cycle takes up the earth into its movement — the earth whose revolution around the sun is the outermost form of the cycle in nature, namely the cycle of gravitation. Electricity shows the innermost cycle of nature, in which the force divides itself within itself in order to manifest itself. The chemical cycle is intermediate: the two bodies disintegrate into their constituents in order to integrate anew; thus there is a circuit from unity to separation and back to unity.

Sound, Light, Heat, Electricity can be produced by both mechanical and chemical means. All are the result of an assault on or a dissolution of material bodies, that is, of the negation of matter in some form. Such a negation in the first place negates gravity, goes in opposition to it; hence it propagates itself through the surrounding medium in all directions, or along a wire or confined medium.

The fact then appears that the special senses take up matter in some negated phase; it has to be in the process of becoming non-material in order to be received by the senses and the mind. What we may call the immateriality of matter is the form of it to which the Ego responds, being itself supremely the immaterial principle.

One may see in the form of vibration the oscillatory trembling between the non-material and the material, the opposite of the steady force of gravity, an image or outer semblance of the struggle between the two sides. The air, invisible matter, has this billowy character in its perpetual recoil against the earth and its movement. The air is a vast sea of rolling waves, in which man lives; he takes up an unseen principle in his breath.

The process of negating matter is what the senses receive from these physical agents. (1) The most external is the mechanical assault upon the object which, however, reacts and preserves itself, producing sound or vibration of the air. (2) Heat is also produced by mechanical assault upon the object as well as by chemical dissolution and combustion. (3) Light is the product of negation, being the result of the combustion or destruction of form in all cases doubtless. The peculiar point in the case of Light is that while its cause is form-destroying

it is for the environment form-revealing; the consuming matter shows the limits, the finitude of matter. Such is the dualism which is brought to the Ego by vision — in the negation of matter we behold its limitation. (4) Electricity is set in motion by the destruction of material in a certain relation, by mechanical or chemical means. But this power is not now radiated from a center but takes the circular form more or less confined. The breaking of the circuit causes it to manifest its force to overcome the separation. The transmission of this negative power as electrical is very destructive to all material forms, if they stand in the way of the return, in the breach of the circuit.

Looking back at the natural object in the present connection, we observe that its movement is more and more from the external and extensive, toward the internal and intensive, then back again to a new form of the external and extensive, namely the vibration. This piece of wood as extended is assailed or destroyed, the result is sound or light which is a new projection of the body assailed or destroyed, in the form of the vibration. Its extension is transformed and becomes an intensive (or internal) principle which transforms itself back into extension, which now has motion.

In this external process of nature we note the correspondence with the internal process of the

Ego, which in Sensation takes it up and assimilates it with itself. The mediating element between these two extreme processes (the external and the internal) is the human body whose function in the present sphere we are next to consider.

II. THE MEAN FACTOR OF SENSATION.

We have now reached the corporeal organism, which with its nervous system is the mean factor of Sensation, intermediate between the world and the Ego. Nature in some form comes in contact with and stimulates the nerve-ends, and this stimulation will be found to involve the entire animate body, which is the gate as well as the track from the outer to the inner, and back' again to the stimulated part. Thus the movement in the organism and also its structure, especially its neural structure, is cyclical. Already we observed the same fact as the chief phenomenon of electricity in external nature, and electrical action we shall find transmuting itself into nervous energy.

The neural structure of the human body we shall now study a little as the organic basis of Sensation, omitting as far as possible anatomical details, and trying to see the main thing, namely, its correlation with the Ego. Three divisions of structure we shall briefly designate.

I. The corporeal periphery, with its system of

nerve-endings which receive the external stimulus and start the neural molecular movement —
The Senses.

II. The separative principle of the nervous system, manifesting itself primarily in the dual division of the nerves into afferent and efferent, which come together in a central organ, also distinct, namely, the brain and its adjuncts.

III. The unity of the system made active and real in the neural molecular movement, which, still material, is the final stimulus of the Ego to Sensation. This molecular movement tends to be cyclical, but its circuit is broken, like the two poles of the electrical circuit, till the psychical factor is introduced and unites the current, which is the completed means of communication between the outer world and the Ego.

We have used the term corporeal periphery, which has become quite common in the Psychology of to-day. Conceive your body as a sphere; each point on its surface is connected with a plexus of nerves which sends off a radius to the middle of the sphere, where is the central organ which bears the stimulus of the Ego. The surface of the sphere is everywhere brought into some form of contact with the outer world, which the Ego must receive, internalize, and recreate for itself. There is to be not simply a reflection of the external object as from a mirror, but a reproduction of it, a kind of re-enactment of its

creation. Thus each Ego with its sphere is a microcosm, has to make itself a center of the universe, generating the latter over again for itself. Only in this way can it ever get a sensation of externality.

I. The corporeal periphery is organized into the so-called Senses, which are usually considered to be five in number. The outer surface of the animate body is specialized into separate forms and aptitudes for receiving impressions from the external world. There is an outer bodily organ and a capacity in the same for taking up and transmitting these impressions to the central organ. We may note a gradation in the Senses, as they move more and more toward a complete possession of the environment: first, the general Sense of contact — Touch; second, the specialized Senses of contact — Taste and Smell; third, the Senses which reach out beyond contact, and which are stimulated through the vibrations of a medium — Hearing and Sight. Designating them by their objective character rather than by their subjective, we may call them in a general way the mechanical, the chemical, and the physical Senses, in accord with the divisions of the material world already given. Doubtless these distinctions in certain cases overlap, still in the main they hold good.

We shall briefly outline the general character of the five Senses, which have in recent times

been specially investigated by the physiological psychologists. These investigations start from physiology and seek to find therein some traces or intimations of the psychical principle through experiment, measurement, and external observation. All this is certainly not to be neglected. Our attempt, however, moves in the opposite direction; we have sought here to give a meager outline, not of physiological psychology, but rather of psychological physiology; the mental process determines the physical and not the physical the mental; the purpose is not to indicate natural law in the spiritual world, but spiritual law in the natural world.

1. *Touch*. This may be considered the most general of the Senses, since it belongs to every part of the corporeal periphery in a greater or less degree; yet on the other hand it is the most narrow and particular of all the Senses, since it is limited to the area of contact, and this contact is simply mechanical. It is indeed essentially the mechanical sense, transferring the immediate mechanical element of nature into sensation. Through it we get the notion of weight, of pressure, of the primal relation of body to body, and possibly of temperature. Moreover this Sense is the substrate of all the other Senses, for even the distant object of Sight has to be brought into the field of Touch ere it can be sensed.

The entire periphery, as already stated, is covered with the nerve ends of Touch, so that the body may be regarded as one vast organ of this Sense. Still it is differentiated; every part of the body has its own degree of excitability through the stimulus; the tips of the fingers have the greatest delicacy, the middle of the back the least. The whole corporeal area has been mapped out into regions according to their degree of sensitivity through contact — a significant fact showing the external division of the periphery in its oneness.

Passing to the side of the element of stimulation, which comes through object, we find that it too has various degrees, or stages which can be laid off and measured. The stimulus has to rise to a certain point of intensity before any sensation can be felt; this point is called by psychologists the *threshold*, a metaphorical term which suggests that the stimulus has to pass up a certain number of steps (degrees) ere it can enter the door of Touch. But when the door has been entered, there are still steps or degrees if we wish to go through the house. Suppose we feel the pressure of an object to have a certain degree of intensity; in order to have a sensation of an increased pressure, the stimulus must be increased in a fixed ratio. If the increase be too small, the difference is not felt. The total step must be made in order to have the response

of sensation. The following is Weber's famous law upon this subject: *To increase the sensation, the stimulus must be increased in a constant ratio.* The pressure sensations are said by Wundt to require an addition of one-third to the stimulus, otherwise the change will not be felt. For example, there is a pressure of three pounds on the back of the hand; it will require four pounds to produce any sensation of increased weight; then to these four pounds one-third must be added to make the new pressure felt. This accords with a common experience: if we add one pound to a pound of pressure, we feel the difference; but if we add one pound to one hundred pounds of pressure, the difference is not perceptible, even if it be the last straw which breaks the camel's back. First, then, the stimulus has to reach a certain degree in order to attain the *minimum sensible* or to cross *the threshold* of sensation; secondly, the stimulus has to increase in a constant ratio in order to increase the sensation; thirdly, we may add, the sensation in its various aspects is *localized*, that is, assigned to its locality in the organism by the immediate act of the Ego, and not by any system of *local signs* which are a fiction introduced into recent Psychology by Lotze, and quite unnecessary when the psychical factor of sensation is rightly understood. At least, these *local signs* loudly call for a physiological basis in the

organism, which basis up to the present time has never been pointed out, though often conjectured.

In reference to getting a knowledge of the external world, Touch may be deemed the first stage of the mental awakening. It has already been stated that this Sense acts on a limited area, and that area external; it, the most general sense of the body, is the most particular and confined in its scope of activity. The other Senses, as they become specialized, will be intenser and more internal, always approaching nearer and nearer the internality of the Ego. Very early, however, the mind begins to synthesize through Touch, and bring together different tactile points, and so get a knowledge of surface and its qualities—hardness and softness, smoothness and roughness, movability, distance within certain bounds. Judgment is, of course, involved in such a synthesis, though it is mostly unconscious and gets to be very rapid. Judgment, however, becomes far more explicit in Touch when the latter undertakes to give some knowledge of the external figure of bodies. Still this Sense can but very dimly attain, even with the aid of Judgment, the point of getting possession of total forms, and thus become an art-sense, though some writers have so maintained. We can hardly reach the Beautiful through palpation.

2. *Taste and Smell.* These are specialized senses, each having its particular organ in the per-

iphery, yet requiring immediate contact of the object or of its volatilized particles. Both are essentially chemical senses, bringing to the mind the disintegration of bodies within, and thus they reach a more internal principle of the material world than Touch. The properties of things now go beyond mere external mechanical relations. It is said that electricity can excite both these senses to activity. Both are guardians of internal organs of the body, Taste of the digestive, Smell of the respiratory apparatus, watching lest some injurious substance may enter lungs or stomach. Still not everything harmful to the organism rouses the protest of Taste and Smell; nor is everything disagreeable to them harmful. These two watch-dogs of the inner regions, like Cerberus of Hades, can also be quieted by a soporific cake, and can by over-indulgence in their own special delights, become destroyers of their charge.

It is to be noted that these two senses, though specialized in organs, manifest different forms of specialization. The tongue which is the special organ of Taste is twofold but not yet fully dualized, which last fact we observe in the two nostrils, which still, however, make one nose. This movement of the organs of sensation toward a completer dualization will be more fully characterized later on.

Taste requires immediate contact of the object

with its organ, the tongue, as well as the application of an acidulous solvent to the substance which is to be tasted. Thus we see the main elements of a small chemical laboratory at work dissolving the object and taking the fact up into sensation. Still it must be confessed that taste gives but a very small fragment of the total chemism of nature, apparently only that needful for the protection and preservation of the bodily organism. Taste, we may add, is capable of great cultivation, and rises through all stages, from the earth-eating Indian to the refined Roman epicure who claimed he could tell simply by means of gustation the locality where his mullets were caught. Hence Good Taste has been applied metaphorically to spiritual discernment, especially in artistic matters.

This Sense is very closely connected with Smell both in the locality of the respective organs and in their action; often an object, an onion for instance, seems to be smelt through the Taste and to be tasted through the Smell. The odor of cooked cabbage is distinctly tastable, and the aroma of the oyster stew stimulates the gustatory faculty. Wherewith we pass by an easy transition into the next Sense.

Smell discerns by means of its organ the decomposing body; it recognizes the decay of nature, the dissolution of the object, but it does not bring about this dissolution for its own

behoof, as is the case with Taste. Smell does not require direct contact of the object, though the particles of the latter must reach the organ and stimulate the same. This sense begins to get at things in the distance, and thus leads over to the following Senses (Hearing and Sight). It requires volatilization of the object, which charges the air as its medium, and therein connects with Hearing, which takes up, not the floating material particles, but the pure undulations of the air. Smell, while it does not of itself negate nature, like Taste, nevertheless senses the inner negation of nature through herself, and gives a note of warning it may be, or a response of delight. This sense has also its spiritual suggestion in life and literature, in which the fragrance of the flower has played its part. Smell discriminates races of men to a certain extent. A German has elaborated a system of smelling by which he declares that individual character can be smelt, and that the science can be taught. It is well known that many of the lower animals have this sense far more highly developed than man, and can scent their unseen and unheard foe at a distance through the medium of the air. Smell thus in a lower degree takes the place of Hearing and Sight, to which we next pass.

3. *Hearing and Sight.* Both these Senses take up the external object at a distance from

the periphery, and thus the outer world reaches them through the vibration of a medium — air and light. The object heard or seen is not necessarily in the process of destruction, but is preserved for the most part in its integrity; these are not chemical Senses, though of course one can see and hear bodies in a state of dissolution. The main point is that in Hearing and Sight a medium intervenes, a mediatorial element enters the process of the Senses, mediation begins between the material thing and the special organ. The medium is indeed physical, but much refined, etherealized, we might say spiritualized, so that it takes the impression of the object and vibrates the same to the special Sense, from which it is borne to the central organ. The previous Senses received the object immediately; Hearing and Sight require the object to be mediated for them, that is, taken up and transformed into a medium lying somewhere about midway between the material world and mind. Light has been called an ideal matter, quite contradicting gravity, yet still belonging to nature. For the same cause light has always been deemed the best physical analogon of intelligence.

In this lies the reason why Hearing and Sight are the art-senses. In art the material form is filled with the spirit; both sides, the ideal and the real, must be transmitted through a medium which can take up both, and which is both to a degree. Hearing and Sight through their media

receive totalities of sound and shape, each of which in art express an idea. Touch, for instance, cannot get the notion of a statue, because the whole is not mediated for it, and as an immediate Sense it comes in contact with merely a small part of the surface. Only the total form with its outlines and limits reveals truly the inner or spiritual element of art. Music is a totality of sound ordered in harmony and in succession, which totality must be received and transmitted by the aerial medium to the ear, which in this new shape takes it up and transmits it to the central organ.

Hearing is that sense which receives the sound of bodies. What is the nature of sound? A material object is struck, its individuality is assailed, which, however, it recovers.

The process of this recovery is an oscillatory movement, a kind of trembling, thrilling, vibrating of the object assailed, which the surrounding medium, the air, responds to with its vibrations. A string struck when in tension vibrates from side to side, and recovers its equipoise, thus asserting itself against the assault from without. The roused object thrills itself to rest, but on its way thereto it makes its music, which stirs my Ego to similar vibrations in response. There is a vast sound-world about us which, when duly ordered, becomes an echo of the inner movement of the Ego, and therein is musical.

The sound of the voice prints upon the aerial medium its articulations, and sends them to the ear through a real pneumatic tube made of air and breath, and easily shifted about according to will. This sound strikes my ear-drum, beats it with recurrent waves, which are propagated to my brain, where I get the message atmospheric. The Ego is the recipient; every air-wave has a meaning which I read like a telegraphic message, as it were from point to point, or from sound to sound. You and I — two Egos at the two ends of the line — are the two offices, or the two final readers of the message; that is the important fact in the whole affair. There could be no sensation without this reading Ego, which has the power of going back to the beginning of the line, and completing the cycle from object to Ego and from Ego to object; this total cyclical movement in a single act is what is known as a sensation.

Moreover Hearing is in Time directly, it receives the vibrations in succession, and is a temporal Sense, catching up and reporting the never-ceasing play between the Appearing and the Vanishing. But the Ego by its very nature cannot endure such a condition, cannot rest in unrest; the forms of Hearing have the tendency to move out of their fluid state and to become fixed in spatial shapes which are visible. Thus the spoken word has to crystallize itself into the

pictured, written, and printed word, in which sound can be seen, and speech can be reproduced. For such a purpose a new Sense is called for, to which we now pass.

Sight receives the form of the object through the medium of light (or through the vibration of a luminiferous ether), which does not assail the external body, yet reveals all its bounds and limits, manifests spatial figure. Light itself, however, springs from the destruction of matter, and therein becomes the medium for showing the finitude and limitation of the material of objects. Light rays itself out in opposition to gravity, and yet is itself material; light is matter manifesting in itself its own negation; we might call it spiritual matter or material spirit. Hence it is the most suggestive symbol of spirit to be found in nature, and is so employed by all tongues. It is the medium for the most spiritual of the senses, which is Vision; it mediates the material world with the Ego, which is the immaterial.

Sight is, accordingly, the culmination of the senses, and their conclusion. It has revealed to the Ego the finite, limited character of the external world, bringing the same to its end, so to speak, and showing its final outcome. Vision sees primarily by the self-destroying activity of the central body of our material system. Through this colossal negativity the medium is

begotten in whose undulations is witnessed the boundary of all matter, up to which the previous Senses have led, and of which each has given prophetic indications.

The five Senses have thus an inner movement from the lowest to the highest, from Touch giving only a few separate particulars, to Sight giving a totality of outward form. The driving principle of this inner movement is the secret force or aspiration in all nature to assimilate itself to the Ego, to unify the dualism between subject and object, to become self-knowing, a Person, which is truly the ideal center of the Universe.

At the same time it will be important to trace the outer movement to the same end in the physical structure of the five Senses. It may be said that the sense-organs show an external visible gradation toward the Ego, which is the process through complete dualism into complete unity as observed in self-consciousness. Touch, being the general sense, is twofold only as the whole body is twofold in its bi-lateral symmetry. The tongue, the organ of Taste, is a special organ, yet has its two sides in undivided unity, and is quite as bi-lateral as the total body. The nose, the seat of smell, is a special organ, but is separated in itself by a partition; still the two sides are united into one member. The two ears are completely separated, being not only

apart but opposite in locality; yet they, like the previous organs of Sense, are immediately connected with the organism. The two eyes are also wholly separated from, though not opposite to, each other; still the separation goes deeper, since they are distinct organs, inserted into the periphery of the body, structurally quite independent, spherical and movable. Thus they show two kinds of separation, from one another and from the total organism, to which, however, they are joined by a number of muscular and neural lines.

In such manner the sense organs are seen to move more and more into dualism, till in the two eyes each has the outer form of a distinct individual. Now this separative character unites them with Nature on the one hand, and with the Ego on the other, which latter has also its side of separation. All this external dualism will become ideally one through the Ego, as we shall hereafter see.

Thus there is a structural ordering of the Senses, manifested in the outward form of their respective organs as well in their functions. The principle of this ordering, outer and inner, is the Ego, or the consciousness of Self, of which the Senses are a projection into externality, and toward which they move in a line of gradation. As we have noticed, the movement is from Touch, the most immediate and least differentiated of

the Senses, into a more complete dualism and separation till the eye is reached. Yet all along this line of dualism and separation, the psychical unity is correspondingly getting to be more complete, and the Sense more perfect, that is, more nearly the image and expression of the Ego, which is its ideal prototype as well as end. Along the same organic line the child moves into the consciousness of Self; out of the self-movement of the body he unfolds into the self-consciousness of the Ego, which, implicit at first, becomes explicit through the separation of the Self from the organism.

II. We now pass from the first to the second portion of the nervous organism considered as the mean or intermediate factor of Sensation. In connection with the outer periphery of the body and its special Senses are the two sets of nerves running to and from the central organ, which is the brain and spinal cord. These two sets of nerves, the afferent and the efferent, hint the dual principle of the organic frame work, while the central organ in which they are joined suggests their unity, though it too is subdivided.

1. When we look at the outer shape of the living organism, we are struck by its doubleness, or two-sidedness, often called bi-lateral symmetry. Draw the median line through your body, and you will see that the latter is two in order to be one. Each side is a symmetrical

repetition of the other, yet both are united in a single organism. Such is the outer visible appearance of yourself; it is the picture of your Ego made external, outered, transformed into body. Note the twofoldness, the separation; yet also note the unity. The most direct material manifestation of you is your body; it is your *other*, not that of anybody else, or of anything else; it is the exact outward counterpart of your inward Self — truly the body of your Ego. Altogether the best likeness or image of the Ego in material form is the body, indeed, the best of all possible pictures it must be in the nature of the case. Hence in art it and nothing else can be employed for the adequate expression of the spirit.

Bi-lateral symmetry is the incarnation of subject-object, including the hyphen, being the visible twofoldness which is one. This twofoldness or duplicity is, accordingly, immediate, not yet made explicit.

2. In the next stage of the organism we see this immediate duplicity unfolded in the afferent and efferent nerves, which are distinct from each other and form a principle and indeed a system. The external organs of the body, the muscular, representing more the mechanical element in the human frame, are controlled by these two sets of nerves. In like manner, the internal organs, those of digestion and respiration, for instance,

representing more the chemical principle in the body, are connected by nerve lines with the central organ. The total organism, inner and outer, has this double set of lines, often compared to telegraph wires; we may liken them to a stream of couriers moving to and coming from headquarters.

In bi-lateral symmetry we see the duplicity of the body manifested in its outer shape. But we have to enter inside the organism and take it to pieces in order to observe the duplicity of the nervous principle. Next the separation is carried a step further, and the third organ comes to light in its own distinct shape.

3. This is the central system composed of the brain and spinal cord. Now the mediating organ has appeared, the twofold has become threefold, the duplicity is united in a third, which makes the whole an organic triplicity. It is well to note the movement of structure from below upward, culminating in this central system. There is an unfolding from the immediate outer shape of the body in bi-lateral symmetry, to the complete inner separation in the twofold afferent and efferent nerve-lines, which separation finds its uniting element in the third organ just mentioned. The structural circuit is thus made entire.

The above exposition is intended especially to suggest the similitude between the human organism and the Ego. Thus we may the better see

reasons why this body of ours is the mean, that is, the mediatorial factor between the Ego and the external world.

Such is, in general, the threefold structure, visible, separate, material, of the nervous system. It lies before us in external division, but it has a principle of inner movement which we may now look at — the principle of unification.

III. The active unifying principle of the nervous system as such is the following movement. The external object stimulates the end-nerve, this stimulus is transformed into a nervous energy, which is propagated to the central organ, whence there is a return to the starting-point. Such is what is called often the neural molecular movement, which is unquestionably a form of successive undulation, be it caused by mechanical, chemical, or electrical action. In Sight and Hearing the outer undulation from the object is transmuted into this inner molecular undulation which has access to the brain. But it is clear that this inner molecular undulation in the afferent nerve must again be changed, nay totally reversed, else there could be no Sensation. The undulatory movement would simply continue forever, or perchance be stopped without the return. So, after all, the molecular energy cannot of itself complete the circuit, but calls for another principle.

But at this point comes to an end the mean

factor of Sensation, without having been able to make complete the bond of connection between the afferent and the efferent nervous energies. The total Sensation has to separate from and return to the stimulated part of the bodily periphery. Thus the complete movement is in the form of a cycle, while the afferent energy works in a straight line. What causes the revolution? We have to answer, the Ego; but with such an answer we have transcended our present sphere.

The corporeal organism has shown itself not only the intermediate, but also the mediating factor of Sensation, since it mediates the external world with the Ego. Compared to this external world it is inner; compared to the Ego, it is outer. Its structural suggestion is cyclical, though the Ego has to complete the cycle and make the organism sensitive. Moreover the outer corporeal structure is the image of Ego in Space and Time, manifesting itself visibly, materializing itself in external shape. Now we shall turn to the Ego, who has been all along the hidden demiurge in these marvelous manifestations.

III. THE PSYCHICAL FACTOR OF SENSATION.

We now begin to enter Psychology, hitherto we have dealt only with preliminaries. The activity of the Ego is the internal or psychical

factor of Sensation, the essential principle of it. What is the nature of this activity?

The ball which I see before me cannot enter my brain with its material extension; if it once did, that would be the end of my seeing. I must annul its material extension, thus only can I receive it; yet I must annul this annulment, and posit it anew as object. I see the ball; what is involved in that? I have to wipe it out of existence, as far as I am concerned, and make it over again. As immediately extended, I cannot possibly receive it; but I can reproduce it as extended, after I have negated its extension. Such the Ego must do in order to have a Sensation.

The Ego in Sensation, therefore, first negates the object as extended; but this negative act is really preservative, annulling the externality of the object and preserving it as internal; finally the Ego projects the object as extended, re-creates the same as its own. Thus the Ego makes complete the circuit of Sensation, and unites the external thing with itself. The outer stimulus rouses the Ego to reproduction, that is, to the reproduction of the stimulus as extended, or, in general, of the environment of nature.

We have called the psychical factor internal; it is doubly so, both in regard to external nature and in regard to the human body. The Ego not only

internalizes the vibratory movement of the former, but also the neural molecular movement of the latter. The nervous system showed an outer return of its energy, in some form of succession; the Ego is an inner return which cancels succession, and which is the Psychosis. I can only feel in so far as the Ego reverses the incoming molecular succession, which began with stimulating the end-nerve.

If I touch this table with my finger-tips, I get a Sensation of the object. The end-nerve is stimulated and there is a molecular movement in the nerve to the central organ, where I feel the stimulus. That is, there is an ideal return to the peripheral contact; I go back to it mentally, the Ego returns to the starting-point of the stimulus, it reverses the molecular succession, which, if continued, would simply render Sensation impossible. I, the Ego, negate the successive movement along its whole line, and convert the stimulus into a Sensation by making it return into itself, and thus reproduce the object, which is the original stimulus.

This transmuting or redirecting power has been more or less distinctly acknowledged by psychologists, and has been given various names, such as sensorium or sensation continuum. In a general way both these terms mean that the particular stimulus has to be transmitted to and transformed by some universal agent of Sensation,

and then it can be retransmitted to its particular locality on the bodily periphery. Thus, however, in order to explain an activity, a new and unnecessary faculty or activity is introduced, which itself needs explanation and co-ordination. But in fact it is simply the Ego going through its process, having the stimulus of the object and the resulting molecular movement of the nerves as its content. This Ego, which in its own nature is the return to unity with itself out of difference, cancels the successive difference of the molecular movement of the nerves and produces the return which is the essential fact of Sensation, this return involving the ideal reproduction of the object.

In the present sphere there will be manifested three stages, in which we shall see the Ego transmuting more and more completely the outer into the inner, canceling the vibratory movement of both the nerves and the external world into a deeper and deeper return, and thus making three different cycles of Sensation. The first is confined to the corporeal organism, the second embraces the material body in contact with the organism, the third reaches out to the material body at a distance from the organism and includes that. Three different cycles starting from three different peripheries — the organic, the contiguous, and the separated, or the inner, middle and outer cycles — show the Ego taking up into Sen-

sation its immediate organism and the external world.

I. There is first the cycle of the corporeal organism, being inside the human body. The molecular movement, whatever be the cause of its excitation, is carried to the central organ, where the succession is canceled, and we have what is called feeling, the most immediate form of Sensation. With the return to the starting-point of the excitation, the cycle is complete, and, having both center and circumference, possesses self-movement. That is, the neural movement, being turned back upon itself, becomes self-moving. That which transforms the molecular movement into the cycle of self-movement is the Ego, since the latter is by its own nature the self-return.

In such a cycle each portion of the nerve has an automatic power; it must be able to receive a stimulus, to react against it, to separate from it, sending it forward. Thus each nerve-cell in itself is a small cycle, else it could not take up and transmit any inner or outer stimulus. Then there is the single line or neural circuit, finally the entire system of circuits reaching to every part of the body.

In the present case there is no direct external stimulus, no contact with any outer object; the organism has its own inner stimulus. This is often unknown, and brings about nervous action in disease. A sudden *tic* or stitch is an excita-

tion within the organism itself; there is also an inner locomotion often, without any outer cause. Imagination can bring about intense neural movements with corresponding sensations.

II. When an external object is brought into contact with the corporeal organism, a new environment is drawn into the cycle of Sensation; we begin to feel or to sense the outer world, that is, we start to making the external object internal and to reproducing the same. A periphery of contiguity surrounds our organism, which has to take it up and to transform it into an inner realm of sensation, this being the first stage of all knowledge. Our bodies on every side touch things, which stimulate the end nerves to a cyclical activity of various stages.

In the first place, the stimulus of contact is located on the surface of the total organism, wherever this stimulus may be applied. It is a curious fact that each point on the human body is designated specially and known, if it be stimulated. How can that be? The stimulus on the thumb differs from that on the forefinger, the Ego discriminates them, each is supposed to have what psychologists call a local sign, of which local signs there must be many thousands if not millions on the area of one human body. Really, however, there is here a special cycle of Sensation passing from the part stimulated to the center and back again through the act of the

Ego, which cancels the incoming molecular succession to its starting-point at the stimulus. Localization is very significant as showing the ideal counterpart of the Ego to the molecular movement; thus the Ego feels the stimulus at its beginning.

In the second place, not only the locality on the surface of the organism is designated, but the total organism moves itself, changes its place. The external object in contact produces the stimulus, which is localized; but now the organism breaks the contact, separates itself from the contiguous object and thus gets rid of the stimulus. This demands another cycle in which there is an outward activity from the center which moves the whole body and makes it transcend its limits in space. Or the central power, having localized the stimulus of contact at a certain point, moves that point away from the contiguous object.

In the third place, the total organism locates itself afresh, takes another position, comes into a new contact. Thus it has begun to show its mastery over space, it transcends and posits its own spatial limits. We saw that the Ego obtained an inner or immediate control of the organism in feeling first, but now it shows an outer or mediate control of the organism in locomotion. The Ego at first located the stimulus of the body, now it locates the whole body. The

Ego is adjusting the body to an external world of contact, with which the latter unites and separates according to the process of the Ego.

III. The cycle of Sensation reaches out and takes up an external object not in immediate contact with the organism. The stimulus now passes through a vibratory medium which impinges on a nerve-end and this connects with the central organ. Thus the environment is still further extended and embraces objects at a distance. The ear and the eye are the end organs which receive their stimulus from the vibrations or undulations of a medium. This stage has the two preceding stages as its conditions, which it resumes into itself.

The vibrating medium is the stimulus which touches the peripheral nerve-ends first; this is the stage of immediate contact. But the Ego distinguishes this vibrating medium from the external object of contact; one is an undulatory succession, the other is not, but is fixed and cohesive. Now the Ego cancels this undulatory succession of the external medium, as it canceled the molecular succession of the nerves. The result is the new cycle of Sensation, which extends along the entire undulatory line to the object as its source. The Ego now senses the external object at a distance. The two kinds of vibrations, organic and extra-organic, the Ego takes up, cancels and preserves as ideal; this makes the

Sensation. The vibration is the element of difference, while the Ego is the return out of difference.

In this way the world of Sensation, of which the Ego with its corporeal organism is the center, has been enormously extended. In fact there is hardly any limit to it; by those new eyes, the telescope and the microscope, the invisible is made visible in the infinitely distant and in the infinitely small; by those new ears, the telephone and the microphone, the far-off voice and the still small voice are literally heard. The horizon of Sensation keeps widening with the years; an instrument picks up the hitherto unseen and unheard and carries them into the field of vision and hearing.

What constitutes a stimulus? It too is often a process which reflects the Ego. The end-organ first must accept the outer contact or vibration, and be one with the same and be controlled; then it must react, separate and be itself; then it must take up the stimulus within itself and continue it. When you are roused, you take the shock and are shocked; then you react, assert yourself as distinct; then you control the shock, and take it along with you as something canceled. The end-organ particularizes the grand sea of vibrations flowing to the organism, confines them to one small nerve-channel, gives the first change from outer to inner by adding to the vibration

the neural cyclical principle. The second change takes place when the molecular movement rouses the mental act or the Ego, which also accepts, then reacts and cancels the successive molecular wave, and so reaches back to the starting-point of this wave. The Ego therein annuls Time and Space, or succession and extension, and thus is purely internal.

The Ego is non-material, that is, the negation of matter. The last and finest movement of matter, the neural molecular movement, it has reversed, othered (or altered), negated. It *others* the neural line to the periphery of the organism, feels and localizes the stimulus; it reaches beyond the organism through the vibratory movement to the object starting the same, taking it up, canceling it, thus sensing the object. The brain in and of itself cannot cancel the vibrations of the object, because it must itself vibrate in response; it is too like them to master them; it cannot hold them ideally, but propagates them really, though in a finer form. The mind which grasps vibration must be more than vibration, which cannot seize itself; the Ego is just that which can turn back after separation and grasp itself. Vibration has to be reversed, else it would go on, wave after wave, forever; vibration must be transformed into Ego, when it becomes Sensation.

In comprehending Sensation the most important thing is to show that the Ego, in annulling

the neural molecular movement, preserves it ideally, that this annulling is a taking-up and othering of it, yet just therein a keeping of it. (Compare Hegel's use of the German word *Aufheben*.) We shall find the Ego proceeding thus with its object throughout its entire movement. For instance the Ego in memory has an image of the object; the real object is canceled, but still is ideally preserved. The procedure of the Ego is not, therefore, annihilation, but a kind of translation of the outer into the inner; the destructive act does not destroy but saves. Even in the physical world we may sometimes note a similar fact. Was not the destruction of Pompeii that which has preserved it to this day? That old Roman town had long since vanished, unless it had once been overwhelmed by Vesuvius. Now we pass through its houses and thread its narrow streets, and behold it quite as it was 1,800 years ago; destruction has saved what else had perished by Time, so that we see that destruction has really destroyed destruction, or negation has negated itself and become a positive reality.

In like manner, Sensation negates the object as external in order to take it up and possess it. The object passes through the zero-point of the Ego, losing its extension, its geometrical shape, its materiality. But just this negative process is its preservation and the basis of its reconstruction; the Ego recreates it, projects it anew, makes it

real. For I do not get an image, I get the real object; the image of the tree I know as image, but the real tree I know as reality. Once more we must make plain to ourselves, that the Ego has to create over again in external shape everything that it senses; it has to make the world anew, after the original divine fiat, in order to possess the world. Such creative act is, however, conditioned upon the annulment of the external object, which annulment in its turn is annulled, and the positive result is the reality as given in Sensation by the Ego.

One should go to the bottom of the matter and try to see how the Ego can negate the extended object. In the first place, the object as extended is itself in an external, alienated, negative condition, being the opposite of Self. Now the Ego too is the different in itself, yet also the return out of the same; hence it can respond to the negative character of the extended object and also overcome it. Such is, in fact, the movement of the Ego as subject-object. The material thing is made subject by the Ego, but this is also object in itself. So the material thing through its negation by the Ego is ideally preserved and reproduced as object by the Ego — which is the completed act of Sensation.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON SENSATION.

The discussion of Sensation (often confused with Perception) occupies a large place in the history of Thought. It is the gate of Psychology, not by any means easy to pass and not infrequently, we fear, it is never passed, even by some who write on the science. We shall append a few miscellaneous observations, which may serve to illustrate and to re-state partially the positions taken in the preceding account.

1. Certain questions will be naturally asked in this connection. Where does the transfer take place between matter and mind? The form of this interrogation makes the answer contradictory. *Where* is demanded. Now if you locate the mind, you put it into space, you make it material, finite. The very point is that the mind must annul not only place but the molecular movement from place to place. The answer might be: this transfer occurs everywhere along the material lines from the object to the Ego, all of which is just the reversal of such a movement.

Similar is the question, Whereabouts is the Ego situated in the brain or body? Where is the seat of the soul? Des Cartes, as is well known, located the latter in the pineal gland. But the same difficulty happens. How can you put into a given place that which transcends place, negates it and reduces it to an element or

moment? The point of connection is not to be found with the finest microscope, for the reason that it is not a point, not a place.

Where does the brain touch the Ego? It does not touch the Ego; if it could, the latter would drop back into matter, into difference, which it has just transcended and negated in order to be Ego. The external object touches the nerve-ending, but the function of the Ego is to cancel this contact, and so take it up ideally into itself. That is, the Ego is just the negation of material contact, and only on account of this can it feel.

We may also ask when does all this transpire? After or before what? The answer can be given: It transpires instantaneously and all the while. The Ego transcends Time as well as Space, else it were not the Ego. There is no temporal succession in the return to the point of contact or to the external object; the Sensation is at once. To be sure, we can originate a molecular movement outward through the efferent nerve by an act of will, which is the finitizing of the Ego, but the intellectual act is the reverse.

The animal has Sensation, or what Aristotle calls the sensitive soul. The animal feels, has locomotion; in this stage man and animal are alike. The differentiation between them takes place in the higher activities of mind; yet even there it is very gradual, it is not so easy to dis-

prove that the animal is wholly incapable of what we call thinking.

Many attempts have been made to state the process of Sensation. To say that the external object brings a stimulus to the nerve-end, and the afferent nerve carries the message to the brain, where it is registered for the Ego or mind to read, is no account of Sensation in its complete process. The great question is: How does the stimulus reach the Ego, what change takes place in the latter, and why is it that the Ego reaches out and takes in the object? The insight must be had that the Ego is in itself the negation of the incoming wave, of the external, of matter; it is the other of the outside and of what comes from the outside, being the very process of internalization in the present sphere; it is the making of the object ideal, Sensation has begun to ideate the material world.

The movement of the object to the Ego is a progression in Space and Time, and hence measurable. The period required for light to come from an object to the eye, then to pass from the eye to the brain, is subject to quantity. The rapidity of the molecular movement from the hand to the brain has been measured by scientists, as is claimed; 111 feet per second is its rate according to Helmholtz; certainly it has the element of mensuration. But when this progression rouses the Ego, it stops, it is reversed, it is

made the opposite. Thus the infinite progress of matter (as well as of Space and Time) is transformed by the Ego into the infinite process of mind. The former may be conceived as a straight line running *ad infinitum*, the latter may be conceived as circular, a return into Self, or a cycle.

We may conceive the cycle of Sensation with two halves; the first is the sweep from the object to the Ego, or material; the second is the sweep from the Ego to the object, or ideal. Or we may say that the external world in its manifold phases flows in waves to the universal sea of the Ego, where all particularity of Matter, Space and Time is swallowed up, yet preserved, and made to appear again ideally in Sensation. The whole progressive movement from object to Ego is material, undulatory, successive; the whole regressive movement from Ego to object is ideal, instantaneous, and the total cycle. The medium of the first — air, luminiferous ether, molecular nerve-fluid — is material; but the medium of the second is of the spirit, is non-material, being just the negation of matter.

Undoubtedly the comprehension of the thought before us requires, that we elevate our thinking out of its material form, out of the image taken from nature, into the form of the Ego. Thinking is of two kinds; one kind bears simply the impress of externality, of material things, but

the other seizes the very act of internality, and holds it up before itself as the complete process of the Ego. It is true that the Ego is here taken for granted, being the assumption of all psychology, as well as of all knowledge.

There is a natural tendency to place the Ego in the brain, inasmuch as the external stimulation goes to the brain where the Ego is roused. Let us grant so much of a localizing of the Ego, which, however, immediately annuls such location, and feels on the surface of the organism, and sees at a distance from it. If we accept the *place where* for the Ego, at once it is not there but elsewhere. Unquestionably the Ego must take up externality, then annul it, and finally reproduce it. Such is its process. The Ego is the indifference-point (negation of difference), through which the external world must pass in order to be sensed, and by which it must be posited anew. At first the Ego (being difference also) adopts, takes up, responds to externality; herein the Ego might be called both material and local; yet it annuls this externality, indeed it receives the same in order to annul it, and thus asserts itself as non-material and non-local.

2. Thus in a general way we conceive the passage from the world outside to the world inside, from non-Ego to Ego, from matter to soul. Often in previous ages has the problem been raised and labored over; but at the present time we see

a renewed effort. There are really three problems involving three difficult transitions. The external object is the source of vibrations; how do these vibrations spring up? Then the vibration must be converted into nerve-energy or a molecular movement; what is the explanation of such a change? Finally the molecular agitation rouses the Ego and Sensation is the result. The outer world starts a movement which is first *innerved* and then is *egoized* in its primal shape.

A group of psychologists are occupying themselves with the organic side of Sensation specially. Their chief category or distinctive predicate is that of the neural molecular movement, by which they seek to explain mind. But mind is the reversal, the opposite of such a movement; the Ego has, as often said already, to negate the ongoing material undulation of any kind, and return to the starting point thereof.

The nature of the Ego is well illustrated by its treatment of the image on the retina of the eye. That image is, of course, a shadow, not reality, as is the image in a mirror. But this shadow is transformed into reality when it reaches the Ego. Yonder tree which I see may be a shadow on the retina, yet it is a real tree to the Ego, which will not accept the shadow but converts it to reality. The molecular image it transmutes back to nature. When I see the shadow of a tree, I know it to be shadow, and I do not mistake it for the actual

tree, unless I am in some state of delusion. The vibration transforms the real object to image, but the Ego returns and transforms the image back to reality.

Nor is this all. The image of the object is inverted on the retina, and so it must be transmitted to the Ego. Still we do not see the external world turned upside down; there is a correction of the inversion somewhere. Such a correction can only take place in the Ego, when it cancels the entire vibratory line and resumes it as its own. Thus the inversion is inverted back again, and the image is made to return to reality.

Nor is this yet all. There is a double image on two retinas; the outer object is duplicated on its way to the Ego by the two eyes, yet we do not see double, unless by some derangement of vision. The object is much reduced in size on the retina, yet this reduction is also corrected. Many of these corrections in regard to the external object are the result of experience, yet experience itself is only possible through the Ego.

Herein we see a total reconstruction along the entire line from the object to Ego. The act of vision is primarily a destruction of externality which is reduced to a shadow and then to zero, just in order that it be reconstructed and restored through the Ego, which thus gets to be master and indeed creator of the external.

Thus do we seek to think Sensation, and to formulate the thought thereof. Still the essence of the matter lies not in the naked formula, but in the thinking of the thought. The process cannot well be remembered, for the activity is not that of memory but of thinking. Memory may recall the words, but thinking is the original creative energy of the process itself; to get possession of this we have to re-think it every time. The Ego is not a machine with which you can manufacture results; you cannot put your problem into the hopper and grind out the answer by turning the crank. To a degree you must make over the machine every time it is used, you will make it more easily because you have made it before, still it has to be re-made. The Ego exists but potentially, till it be active, then it exists really. The Ego has to make itself in order to be actual; without such self-activity it is as if it were not — a mere possibility.

3. In this transition from non-Ego to Ego, from matter to mind, or from the extended to the non-extended, the term unknowable has intrenched itself specially, though it has been applied in a number of other relations. Says Hamilton: "How the immaterial can be united with matter, how the unextended can apprehend extension, how the indivisible can measure the divided — this is the mystery of mysteries to man." (*Works of Reid*, Note D.) But the Ego is the

divided, the separated within itself, as every act of consciousness will tell; and it is also the united in the return to self. Mind is what matter is, yet is just the negation of matter, as is implied in the word *non-material*. It would seem that Hamilton, though he has written so much on the nature of consciousness and believes in it so firmly, had never fully analyzed his Ego and seen it as a process. It may also be noted that the above extract makes unnecessary confusion by putting the negation where it does not belong, as for instance, the unextended (mind) is contrasted with the extended (matter). But really the extended (matter) ought to have the negative in it, since it is the negation, the opposite, the other of mind. The true way of expressing the above dualism is by the terms Ego and non-Ego, inasmuch as the material world is the negative of the Ego, which negative the latter has to overcome in order to know the same.

Here we ought to make a brief examination of the so-called idea of the Unknowable, which has wound itself under many forms into our literature, and into our habits of thinking or rather of not thinking. (*a*) It is a self-devouring contradiction. When we are able to affirm that a thing is unknowable, we know a good deal about it already, indeed the essential fact of it. If we declare that a certain territory is unknowable, we must have been over the border and have

brought back a very important piece of knowledge. To be sure, I may say that such a territory is unknown, and draw the limit of my knowledge at a certain line; but concerning what is beyond that line I can make no predications, least of all that it is unknowable. (*b*) The man who uses such a term, and talks it to us in a long discourse, or spreads it before us in print over many pages, presupposes just the opposite in us, the listeners or readers; he takes for granted that we can know his Unknowable unless he is making game of us and slyly playing a practical joke. In like manner, he who declares that truth is unknowable, or that man cannot know truth, unconsciously assumes that there is one truth knowable, namely, that man cannot know the truth. The universe rests upon affirmation, not upon negation; specially does it rest upon the affirmation of knowledge, of spirit; language itself refuses to be made the tool of the negative, and, even in denying, secretly affirms. (*c*) Just the opposite we assert to be the essence of mind—it is the knowable, the self-revealing, the self-uttering. Moreover the world is the knowable in all its manifestations, its destiny is to be known and not to remain unknown. Undoubtedly there are things unknown to us at present; but the movement of man is from the unknown to the known. The sources of the Nile furnished the proverb

for the unknown to all classical antiquity, to Egypt itself, and to modern ages down to the present generation; but now we have to throw away the proverb. The adage about seeing into the millstone still holds, but it is in danger apparently; within the last few months (1896) men have begun to look into the human body, hitherto opaque, and locate objects inside of it through a new kind of ray. Man's grand predicate is the knowable, being just the essence of his Ego which in its very process rises out of all limits, even its own. The Unknowable denies his spirit, crushes him back into impassable bounds, or tries to do so, as if to make him a homunculus in his little glass bottle.

Nor can we help taking brief notice of the air of modesty, sometimes of downright humility, which the Unknowable is inclined to put on. Its follower is so much more modest than that other man, who, brazen-faced, affirms the right, nay the necessity of the Ego, to assert itself, and to free itself of the fetters of ignorance and of error. I have often to confess that a certain matter is unknown to me; but because it may be unknown to me, I do not need to say out of sheer modesty that it is unknowable. In fact, I am led to wonder at my marvelous modesty, which leads me to think that what I do not know and may not be able to know, is unknowable and so must remain unknown to mankind forever.

It is strange that "the philosophy of experience" is employed to bolster up the Unknowable; yet if we take the experience of the last one hundred years, what does it say in regard to the limits of knowledge? If we judge of the advancement of science in the past, what is the inference as to its future? Just the opposite of the Unknowable; experience rather affirms that all is knowable.

4. If the Ego can take up so many forms of difference in nature, why all this change and refinement of vibration? The outer undulation of the air or of the ether (so-called) is transformed and refined into the molecular movement of the nerves; this again is refined still more in the brain, till it stimulates the Ego, which takes it up, and then *others* the whole line to the external object. But why so many changes, and supposed refinements of the undulatory line from the object to the Ego — no less than three? Why does not the Ego take up the external line at once, if it be able to respond to it? In general, the answer may be given that only thus are the distinctions of nature taken up and internalized by the Ego. The different vibrations of light and sound have to be received by the organism as different, through the special senses, and then ideated into the unity of the Ego, which in this way gets external difference. Without such distinction and specialization hearing and sight

would drop down to a kind of touch, which is the general sense, as yet undifferentiated. The organism receives them as different, taking them from the external world, and then unifying them in a central organ, which is the stimulus of the Ego. That is, the Ego first accepts from the outside this difference, then cancels it into unity with itself and finally reproduces it, which last act completes the sensation of the external world.

What is the use of the image on the retina? It is mediatorial; thus the Ego can take up form, external limited form with all its lines, and see the object as such. For the image, though taken up, must also be canceled, and therein ideally preserved as the object itself. Mark, therefore, that we do not see the image, which is negated, but the object as real. No doubt the image represented the object on the retina, but the point is that this representation must be canceled, so that the real object is seen, is present in the Ego, not present in the brain, as is sometimes said; for if the material object were present in the material brain, the latter would have the worst of the situation and probably die on the spot. But the Ego cannot be so hurt by the presence of the object in it. The luminiferous vibrations present the form and the lines of the object to the special peripheral organ, the eye, which takes it up; no other sense can take it up,

the ear cannot see, just as little can the eye hear. This difference, then, is still preserved in the Ego, and indeed projected into externality.

5. This transition from the non-Ego to the Ego, or matter to spirit, is the starting-point for three chief attitudes of the mind, three views of the world, three methods of philosophizing which have prevailed since man began to think, and are three main strands of the history of philosophy. (a) The materialistic view maintains some form of molecular movement, of external succession, to be the explanation of mental activity. In one way or other it denies the ideal return of the Ego, and employs in place thereof some phase of material progression. (b) The dualistic view holds to the absolute separation of the two sides, or declares their union as something incomprehensible. We can at most see the separation or the absolute difference between two elements, mind and matter; then we observe them united in an act of perception or sensation; but how this separation passes into unity is just the unknowable. (c) The idealistic view takes many forms; it may quite deny externality and otherness, or at least the ability to know the same. But it may give to externality the fullest objective right, and still behold it as a manifestation of mind, with which mind fraternizes.

It has been often felt that there is a theistic element in knowing; this too has found many

forms of expression. The Cartesians elaborated the doctrine of Occasional Causes, and seem in the main to have deemed the knowing of matter by mind, of the extended by the unextended as the direct act of God, a special intervention of the deity for the occasion. Leibnitz developed in opposition his theory of Pre-established Harmony, which reduced the many acts of special providence to one primal creative act; God wound up mind on the one hand and matter on the other, as if they were two watches, and set them both to running; both continue to go together and in harmony, though each is wholly independent of the other. The Scotch school seeks chiefly to refute the representative theory of Perception (better, Sensation), and so is essentially polemical and negative; for it does not try to explain its doctrine of Immediate Perception positively, but denies in the most explicit manner the comprehensibility of its own cardinal fact. It batters down the enemy's view, but that does not prove that its own view is correct.

6. As set forth in the preceding account, Sensation is the internalizing of the sensuous object *immediately*; whatever comes is received; there is no break, no fixed separation, no interruption in the flow from outer to inner. In like manner the Ego is one continuous succession of states, each quite displacing the other; it

responds to the influence from without, hardly maintaining its conscious Self in the stream of external impressions.

But the Ego has difference, separation in its complete process, which is next to manifest itself. The Ego will, accordingly, lay hold of the particular object, separate it, distinguish it from other objects. Therein the Ego asserts its self-hood, its individuality, refusing to be swallowed up in this deluge of the sense-world. A new phase of Sense-perception thus opens, which we have called distinctively, Perception.

SECOND SECTION — PERCEPTION.

It has been already noted that Perception is the second stage of the Ego in the total process of Sense-perception. That is, the Ego is in its divisive stage primarily; it separates, isolates, particularizes the object of sense, holding it apart from the flow of Sensation; then it identifies this object with itself, projecting the same into the world as a real individual.

In traveling through a country, trees, hills, houses, streams sweep through the mind in rapid succession, making a moving panorama of varied scenery. But I stop the flow and direct the mind to a single object, a peculiar kind of tree, separating it from every thing else. I *sense* all the other objects, but I *perceive* the tree. In this case, the total act of Sensation I seize and do not permit to vanish, the Ego instinctively or

voluntarily begins to control the object from within, rescuing it, as it were, from the great river of Sensation. To be sure the object must come from the outside to the Ego, which first senses it and then perceives it, holding it fast, making it permanent. Plainly the Ego is getting herein a new mastery of the external world.

Perception, accordingly, is the Ego separating some special object or element in the stream of Sensation, identifying the same with itself, and then reproducing it as particularized in the external world.

In Sensation every object of the external world which presents itself to the senses, is taken up, so that there is an incessant inrushing flow of outer stimulation to the organism. A continuous stream from the circumjacent environment is rolling in upon the Ego, which will be absorbed therein, unless it assert itself and start to master the incoming current of the sense-world. This is the general function of Perception, which will seize hold of some particular object of the total stream, and make the same its own.

The terms Sensation and Perception have been much used in Psychology and often very sharply discriminated. Still they have remained somewhat vague in spite of the lengthy discussion by Hamilton, Porter, and others. The distinction between them, even when correctly made as to

matter, has been capricious in form; the psychologist has not traced their genesis back to the movement of the Ego, but has picked up the terms and their difference from the outside apparently at random. To be sure, he has evolved their meaning from himself, but what we wish to see is their evolution out of the Self as such. In other words we must have the Psychosis, the complete psychical process of which Sensation and Perception are but two separate stages, before we can fully reach around and take in their meaning.

The Ego in Perception will manifest its movement in three distinct phases of activity, which we shall call Impression, Attention, and Retention.

Of the three, the first is more the involuntary act of the Ego, moved from the outside to seize the external object; the second is more the voluntary act of the Ego, moved from within to seize the object; the third may result from both the involuntary and voluntary act of the Ego, which now not only seizes, separates and particularizes the external object, but also retains the same, that is, removes it from the external conditions of Space and Time.

Already in Sensation we could not wholly leave out Space and Time. In sensing the external object in contact with the bodily periphery as well as at a distance from it, we ran upon the Space-conception, though in a very indistinct way. In

like manner, succession in Time is involved in every form of undulatory movement, and thus underlies every cycle of Sensation. We shall now give a short discussion of Space and Time, since they are very prominent elements of Perception, and will henceforth be woven into the whole movement of Psychology. The beginner may find the subject somewhat difficult at first; he can omit the following note (extending to Impression) till he returns for a review, or feels the need of grappling with all the pre-suppositions of the science.

Note on Space and Time. In every age Space and Time have attracted the attention of philosophers, poets, myth-makers; they appear as the external setting of all things; they are pure externality, in contrast with the Ego which is pure internality. Yet the Ego has to take them up and internalize them, these complete opposites of itself; it is at first conditioned by them, but it must at last reach over and embrace its own condition; thus it is free, self-contained, self-determined.

We have already found that in consciousness the Ego distinguished itself from the non-Ego, or object, which is external to the Ego, and then it cognized the non-Ego or object (see Introduction, p. 29). Thus externality is posited by the cognition of the object—externality, outerness, otherness. I must first *other* the

thing in order to know it, but in knowing it I make it my own, identify it with my Ego, even as the opposite of my Ego. What is the result of this process? I know the object as opposite and external to my Ego which is Self; thus the object is external to Self as such; being outside the Ego, it is outside of Self, and so outside of itself; or, it is the other of itself, being the other of Self, which Self can be only the Ego. So the sensuous object of the Ego is cognized as the opposite of the Ego, of selfhood; thus it is spatial, each particle of it is outside the other particle, and remains in that way; also the object, being external to Self, is changeful, transitory, temporal. In other words, the object of Sense-perception is flung by the Ego into Space and Time, which are none the less its natural conditions, the actual fact of its being, as we shall see.

Still further is the externality of the Ego carried in Sense-perception; it perceives not only the sensuous object as spatial and temporal, but rises to a perception of the pure forms of Space and Time. The sensuous object of the Ego is not simply particular, not simply this extended and transitory thing of Sensation, but the Ego as such is externalized, is made into pure otherness of itself as its object. Not this particular example of otherness, such as is the object perceived, but the total Ego is now to be seen as the other to itself, and, being so, it

becomes the universal otherness to Self which we call Space and Time, and in which the particular percept is posited. For all Perception is particular, put into the form of Here and Now, limited to the immediate present ; still this limit will be transcended, and the percept we shall see rescued from the devouring maw of the Void and the Vanishing. Therein the Ego will rise above its particular, limited form of otherness, such as is given in the sensuous object, and attain to a perception of the pure forms of Space and Time.

As already implied repeatedly, this self-externality falls into two forms, both of which are derived from the process of the Ego, its identity and its difference. First is the externality to Self, which is identity with difference canceled, simple oneness, fixity, homogeneousness — Space — each point of which is external to itself, yet identical with itself, infinitely divisible, absolutely penetrable, the possibility of all shapes, being itself the shapeless ; whose individuality it is to be totally devoid of individuality. Then there is difference with identity canceled ; the point is now different from itself continuously, repelling itself from itself, thus becoming a moment, which, when it is, is not ; so there is movement, an endless identical movement of pure difference — Time. Space is one beside the other, which other is the one again — simple extension (alongsideness). Time is one after

the other, which other is the one again — simple succession (afterness). Thus the process of the Ego falls completely asunder, being externalized; first it divides into Space and Time, then each of these infinitely sub-divide into points mutually exclusive and self-external.

Space may be conceived of as absolute rest, Time as absolute unrest, yet both absolutely vacant; one is blank permanence, the other blank transitoriness, both being blank. Space is the Void, the Universe emptied of everything except its own emptiness; Time is the Vanishing, the Universe emptying itself of everything except its own emptying. The Psychosis of Time and Space is to see them as the process of the Ego completely fallen asunder and externalized, reduced to a state of absolute otherness, yet therein still itself.

Thus the percept gets from the Ego the form of the spatial and temporal; also the Ego posits pure Space and Time as objects to itself. Yet these are also real, existent in the world, not simply subjective or mine, not simply my object without any corresponding reality. There is likewise the universal Ego, the divine, creative Ego, to which Space and Time are also object, for this Ego too must other itself and become external to itself, wherein lies its divine, creative act, one of whose manifestations is the real externality of Space and Time.

Here we may notice Kant's doctrine, from which most of the modern discussions of this subject have proceeded. The German philosopher holds that Space and Time are merely forms of intuition (*Anschauung*) which we may translate in the present connection to be forms of the Ego in Sense-perception (*Kritik der reinen Vernunft, die transcendental Aesthetik*). That is, Space and Time are only subjective forms, in which the Ego senses things, and have no real objectivity. Such a view reduces them to a mere appearance, a delusion, a lie told by the world to the Ego. But Space and Time are also objective, creations of the divine Ego, in fact just its externality, otherness, outsideness of Self, since it must also be the opposite of itself to be the totality. Thus the eternal creative Idea makes itself its own object, first in the purely external forms of Space and Time, which are, accordingly, the other of Self in its absolute being. In Sense-perception the Ego not only cognizes but recognizes Space and Time as real, as the objectification of the universal Ego whose knowing is creating. The human Ego as subject-object recognizes the act of the divine Ego which is also subject-object, and identifies the same with itself, which identification is knowledge. That is, in order to be truly known, my Space and Time must be recognized and identified as God's Space and Time.

Thus again we note that a theistic (not theologic) strand winds through all psychology, overarching the science of knowing (epistemology) from beginning to end. The individual Ego through knowing the external world, and reaching up from cognition to recognition, mediates itself with the Divine Ego, and the consciousness of man finds its true counterpart and fulfillment in the consciousness of God.

I. IMPRESSION.

The object in the stream of Sensation is distinguished and particularized by the Ego *spontaneously*, that is, without a conscious act of the Will. There is, in Impression, a specializing both of the object and of the Ego, but this specializing act is as yet instinctive and involuntary. Impression is an involuntary Attention.

The movement of the Ego in Impression is *from* its most external form as an automatic response to an outer stimulus, *through* its native bent to take up with some outside object by a kind of natural selection, *to* its acquired tendency for being impressed by certain things, which tendency, starting usually from inborn inclination or talent, is unfolded through the acquisitions of culture.

Thus we may observe, in the movement of Impression, the general sweep of the Ego, whose

three stages herein can be designated as the organic, the native, and the cultured Impression.

The perceptive Ego receives the stream of sensations coming from the external world, which have in themselves variety, difference, degrees of intensity. Also this perceptive Ego is predisposed, through innate tendency and acquired equipment, to take up more directly and decidedly some of these sensations than others. That is, it is more interested in certain objects than in others. The result is, a selection takes place, from the outside through some energy in the thing, as well as from the inside through some interest of the Ego.

Such is, in general, the first stage of Perception, which we have named Impression. The word puts stress upon the determining power of the external object in relation to the Ego which is modified by that power, and which responds immediately to the differences of the external world of Sensation. The Impression by its nature is immediate, instinctive, not consciously voluntary. Still the Ego in Impression has its process, its development, moving from without to within, from external determination through the object toward internal determination through itself. Yet this activity of the Ego in Impression never reaches the volitional stage, but remains spontaneous. The phases of the

present movement we shall set apart more distinctly.

I. The Ego, in the first place, responds immediately to the differences in the stream of Sensation, through the reaction of the organism. Such is the experience in case of a sudden pressure, pinch, or prick, a loud noise or a vivid light. This is the most external form of Impression, since the Ego is so completely determined from the outside, through the affection of the organism. Still such an Impression is not merely the reflex action of the muscles or of the nerves, though this be involved. A brainless frog cannot have Impression, though its muscles twitch in response to an irritation.

II. Native differences, in the next place, appear in the Ego itself, which responds to the differences of the object in Sensation. The child begins to notice certain things, we say; the light attracts it in distinction from darkness; it laughs in answer to its mother's laugh. The differences of the external world reaching it through the senses, begin to call forth the innate differences in its Ego, which develop into temperament, talent, character. Early impressions are noted for their power, permanence, and even formative influence. The educator will carefully observe what impresses the child, what outer objects or actions find in it the response of attention, or interest, or imitation. The so-

called bent of nature first manifests itself in the answer which the child's Ego makes instinctively to the world of Sensation.

III. The acquired differences of the Ego, that is, its different acquisitions in the form of knowledge, character, taste, respond to the differences of Sensation. A barbarian and a civilized man receive very different impressions from the same object. A Gothic window impresses a rustic and an architect diversely, still both are impressed. Here an apperceptive power plays in, the Impression is modified according to the content of the Ego. The main point is, however, that the Ego, though still immediately determined by the object of Sensation, modifies it, indeed may choose it or reject it in an unconscious way.

The acquired differences of the Ego, which have become instinctive, go back in most cases to native differences, which have been developed by activity and by fresh acquisitions in the same direction. One develops into culture on foundations largely given by nature; the talent for art is an inborn one, yet it has also to be inbred, ere it comes to much. Thus the native and the acquired elements fuse indistinguishably in the Ego which receives the Impression, and determines the latter, spontaneously, however.

In this manner the Ego passes from being impressed by the object in the most external fashion by means of the reaction of the organ-

ism, to an Impression in which the Ego contributes the largest part through its native and acquired qualities. This brings us to the point at which the Ego starts to determine itself from within consciously; it begins to choose its own object, to separate the same from the stream of Sensation, by an act of Will, and to appropriate this object of its choice. From Impression, which is an involuntary Attention, we pass to the voluntary one.

II. ATTENTION.

Attention, as the second stage of Perception, distinguishes itself from Impression in being voluntary or intentional. The Ego from within determines itself, and moves forth to get possession of the sensuous object, which possession involves its reproduction.

The movement of Attention is *from* the Ego particularizing and concentrating itself within itself, *through* its separating and particularizing the object in the stream of Sensation, *to* its internalizing and reproducing the same as a particular object.

In the complete act of Attention, accordingly, there must be the concentration of Self, the particularization of the object, and the uniting of the particularized object with the Self. All these three stages or phases are, however, one act of

the Ego in its threefold movement, which, when performed as a single immediate process of mind, shows the Psychosis of Attention.

In popular speech we are often said "to mind a thing," that is, to put the whole mind upon an object, to focus our thoughts upon some particular thing. Such an act is, in general, an act of Attention. There is first the mind focusing itself, secondly the object focused, thirdly the unification of the two, whereby the object becomes ideated or perceived. It is well to note again that this object, when perceived, is projected by the Ego into externality.

It is also well to observe at what point in the total mental evolution Attention is introduced. Out of what does it develop and into what? In other words the procedure must be genetic, Attention must arise in its proper place and define itself. It is not to be picked up on any emergency and thrust into some psychological gap; it must be seen unfolding out of what has gone before and into what comes after. Its definition is not to be imposed upon it from the outside, but must be generated in the process of the Ego. Caprice, however brilliant, is not a sound definer.

Attention has been very diversely treated by psychologists. Especially do they differ as to its place in the evolution of mind. Some put it first, some last, or almost so; some deny it as

“a faculty of the soul,” or as a distinct mental activity. Some give it much attention, some give quite no attention to Attention. But it should be seen at the start unfolding out of simple Sensation; then its activity is continued all through the development of mind. There is quite as much Attention in Thought (the third stage of Intellect) as in Sense-perception (the first stage); still its unfolding belongs properly to the latter, where it first appears. Hence it is to be considered just here and not elsewhere or anywhere.

In fact nothing can show the present chaotic method of psychologists than their treatment of Attention. The inner mental genesis is lost in mere experimentalism, or in pure caprice. This book, however, is not intended to be critical, and so we shall pass on, still holding to the faith that the human mind is an order and not a chaos, and that a prime duty of the psychologist is to reveal that order.

The Ego now breaks into the stream of Sensation which flows in upon us from the external world, and seizes some particular object in that stream, holding it fast and appropriating the same. The individual lives and moves in the realm of nature, of externality, which is always beating up against his senses and seeking entrance to his Ego. What an enormous mass of objects is thrust upon his organism, through vision, through

hearing, and through the other senses! All are importunately knocking for admission to the inner chamber of the Ego, where they will no longer be external and real, but internal and ideal. Moreover this outer world of objects is continually shifting, every moment the scene changes and a new panorama slips into vision. Now, the senses let in everything unless they are stopped and controlled; this control is a most important element in psychical life; the Ego will simply be drowned in the vast ocean of Sensation, unless it draws itself out of the same and asserts itself.

The fundamental characteristic of Attention is, therefore, willed separation — separation of Self from the sense-world. The Ego is first affected by the particular object of sense, or it has a sensation; then it separates itself from this immediate affection or excitation and observes the same, which is as yet one with the external object. Thus the sensation is no longer simple sensation, but is held off from the Ego by the Ego, which thereby beholds it and makes it objective. Such is the primal fact of Attention — this self-concentration of the Ego which comes from separating itself from the sensation.

Still further, the total Ego, having centered itself, throws its whole power upon the sensation, separates it from all other sensations, seizes it, masters it, takes it up into itself. Thus after the disruption comes the redintegration, and the

Ego takes possession of all the sensations to which it gives attention, storing them up, as it were, in its ideal storehouse.

Were it not for Attention, the world of Sensation would be a mere passing panorama, an ever-flowing stream of impressions which rise and disappear with the moment, and in which the Ego would be absorbed, vanishing like a river which sinks away and is lost in the sands of the desert. Attention is the Ego asserting its own self-hood against absorption in the sense-world, it is the first distinctive act of individuality and remains henceforth active through all Psychology.

The educative value of Attention is of the highest. Mental training may be said to begin with this act of concentration, which frees the Ego from an absorption in the sense-world. Here the school starts; the child, in learning the first letter of the alphabet, has to separate his Self from all external matters and throw it upon the one object, the letter A, which must also be held apart from every other object for the time being. The pupil is taught, first of all, to break the endless chain of sensations, seize the important link and hold it till it be internalized. Repetition must come to his aid, and repetition is here repeated acts of Attention. Thus Attention is the first mastery of the sense-world as well as the primal assertion of selfhood against

the might of the external. Therewith education has begun as regards both moral self-control and external knowledge.

The object of Attention must at the start be chosen for the pupil by the teacher, who has gone in advance and organized the chaos of mere sensation. The selection of the best objects for Attention makes the best course of study. What are the best? That is a great pedagogical question, which is variously answered; but, in general, it may be said that those objects are worthiest of Attention which lead the individual most rapidly and securely into the highest culture of the race. The pupil, however, must at last rise to making his own selection of that which he will attend to.

Doubtless the Ego pays best attention to those things in which it has an interest. What is it that makes an object interesting? The Ego must be connected with it in some way; the mind has some purpose which it subserves, some goal to which it leads. A botanist, a painter, a wood-chopper, a forester, all look at a tree, all have an interest in it and pay special Attention to it, yet in very different ways, according to the end which each has in view. But the ultimate interest of the Ego is to remove its limit of ignorance, to assert itself as limit-transcending, to know. To reach beyond present bounds is the necessity of the infinite nature of

man; the spirit's true interest is to rise out of its confines.

In Attention, the Will is prominent, of which there are two kinds. Unconsciously an object draws Attention to itself, we may say that there is Will in the act, but Will spontaneous, unconscious, such as we discussed under Impression. Then there is the conscious effort of the Will to bring the Attention to a matter from which the mind may rebound. The primal conquest of the sense-world is only accomplished through some training of the Will in the child, who is not drawn to his alphabet at first by interest. Perchance he has to learn to subordinate interest to knowledge, and to subject pleasure to duty in his first lesson.

It is worth while to call to notice again the effect of Attention in its moral aspect. It is the foundation stone of character-building. When the child withdraws itself from the dissipation of the senses and gathers itself for a concentrated effort, it has begun self-control, which is ethical as well as intellectual, which should become a habit of conduct as well as of mind. All its life it will be called upon to exercise this command of Self, which starts with the first act of Attention, perchance with its first self-concentration upon the letter A. Truly in learning the alphabet of letters, the child is learning the

alphabet of morals. The training in intellect and the training in character, here at least, go hand in hand; the external information is worthy, but the inner discipline is yet worthier. To master the implements of culture, such as reading and writing, is very necessary, but to master Self in the same process is the real fruit of education.

In the preceding remarks the movement of the Ego has been stated in a discursive way for the purpose of a general view in advance of a more precise formulation. We may now proceed to mark distinctively the three stages of Attention.

I. The separation of the Ego from the stream of Sensation, and its self-concentration; the Ego particularizes itself.

II. The separation of the sensuous object from the stream of Sensation through the Ego; the object is particularized.

III. The Ego returns into itself with the particularized object, unites and identifies the same with itself; the object is ideated.

Here again we must exhort the student to verify the process in his own mental laboratory; he must make the Psychosis of Attention, unifying in a single thrust of mind all that which is divided, analyzed, held asunder in the preceding exposition. Words are inherently separative and separated; only the Psychosis can overcome

the separation which lies in all speech, and especially in terminology.

I. In the first place, the Ego in Attention must purposely separate itself from Sensation. The external world flows inward incessantly through the senses, and floats the Ego helplessly away in the stream, till this Ego asserts itself as distinct, as Self, and holds itself apart from the great environing world-stream of objects. Such is the primal act of Attention: voluntary separation of the Ego from the immediate unity of Sensation.

Already we have found, in discussing the Ego, that it had separation in its own movement, that it separated itself from itself in its second stage, to be restored to itself in its third stage. Perception is, in general, this second stage of the Ego, which therein separates itself from the stream of Sensation. So it must do in order to be itself, it cannot be swallowed up in the sense-world. Still further, in Attention the Ego by its own native movement of will frees itself from the external and turns back to itself, holding aloof the object, which is now emphatically its other or opposite. Let us repeat the first act of Attention: Self-concentration through volition, Self getting hold of itself, the primal deed of Self-mastery.

The first stage of Attention, which pertains particularly to the Ego unfolding within itself as

related to the sensuous object, will also show the customary movement.

1. First is the simple act of separation in which the Ego divides itself from the sense-world. The difference appears in its immediate form at the start, but the Ego cannot stay in such a condition.

2. The Ego not only separates itself from the sense-world, but turns back into itself, collects itself, and holds itself off from the stream of Sensation, which is its opposite. The simple separation of the previous stage has now deepened into mutual opposition. The Ego has turned back and concentrated itself within itself; it has made itself individual, a particular distinct Ego, not determined from without by the sense-world, which it posits as its other or object, and so it determines the same.

3. The Ego being now its own, the self-centered and the self-determined, can determine the sense-world; or, the Ego, having particularized itself, has also in the same act posited the object as particular, distinct, separated, and indeed separable in itself. Hence follows the next stage of Attention.

II. As in the preceding stage the Ego separated itself from the stream of Sensation, and individualized itself, so now it separates the particular object from the flow of external things, holds it, fixes it as here and now, wrenches it from the

extension of Space and the succession of Time. In Sensation the object is ceaselessly fleeting and indefinitely connected and continued; but in Attention the Ego, having particularized itself, next particularizes the object. Thus the latter becomes distinctively a percept and the Ego the percipient. The sensuous thing is thereby rescued from the transitoriness of the sense-world, it is drawn out of the sea of oblivion, and fastened by Attention, which is thus a kind of salvation of the object.

Here again we may regard the movement somewhat more closely. Three stages: the immediate seizure of the object, the seizure with Space and the seizure with Time.

1. The Ego having liberated itself from its entanglement with the sense-world in simple Sensation, and having asserted itself as Self, turns about and seizes the object of Sensation, which it has selected. For the Ego is also object, and must identify the same with itself. The Ego is now particular, distinct, separate, so it impresses its seal upon the object which it particularizes by attending to it, by a simple act of Attention.

2. But in order more completely to particularize and to seize the object, the Ego must make a new separation, must distinguish the object from its other, from its limit. But what is that which is the other or the opposite of the sensu-

ous object? The Void or Space unfilled. From the object of Sensation, which is extension filled we pass to and beyond its limit which is extension unfilled or the Void, empty Space. That is, the Ego again shows itself as limit-transcending.

Every sensuous object is made definite or is particularized by that which it is not, as well as by that which it is; it exists through its limit. This ball which I hold up is made what it is by what it is not; if it had no limit against everything else in this room, it would not be a ball; all would be ball, that is, there would be distinctively no ball. Sensation gives us a filled extension, but Attention puts the bound upon the same and hence calls up a non-filled extension. The fact of particularizing is the placing a limit, and the limit is the outer negation of the object as extended. Thus the Ego calls forth a filled and a non-filled extension, which together make up the total perception of Space.

In Attention, therefore, the Ego begins to develop into the idea of Space. To be sure it by no means yet grasps the creative thought of Space, which is one of the most recondite in all philosophy.

In this spatial particularization of the object we can discern the subtle sweep of the Ego through its various stages. When the thing sensed is separated from the indefinite continuity of the sense-world, that which is cut off is ex-

tension ; the Ego puts a spatial limit upon Space, and thereby makes the object definite. Let us note its movement herein, which we may distinguish as follows :—

(1) The Ego first separates the object from the external series, and breaks up the sensuous continuity ; it senses the filled Space, which has a limit. Accordingly it reaches out and takes up this limit of the object, which limit is the non-being of the object, yet at the same time its being. Thus the Ego comes to and grasps the Void, or the unfilled object, by its own necessity moving from the filled object to the other or opposite thereof. (2) The Ego still holds fast to the object filled, now showing in itself the twofold element, the filled and the unfilled, or the object and the Void, as distinct, as opposite, as being and non-being. Here is the stage of the dualism of the Ego. (3) But each is through the other ; there would be no object without the Void, and no Void without the object ; each not only limits the other but conditions the other. Thus they have a common underlying principle and are one ; both are extended, one filled and the other unfilled ; both are spatial and constitute Space. So the Ego psychologically begins to take up the Space-idea through Attention.

3. If the Ego unites extension with the limit of extension, and thus gets the spatially limited object, in like manner it unites succession in Time

with the limit of succession and gets the temporally limited object.

The sense-world is in a perpetual flow, coming and going; the senses, receiving its stimulations, are absorbed into this everlasting flux of Sensation. All things are in Time, it is said; still the flow of the Time-stream must be arrested by the Ego, or, rather, the Ego must free itself from its immediate unity with Time, and seize the fleeting object, hold the same, and rescue it from its rush to oblivion, which rescue of the object is the Ego's own salvation.

Here again there must be a separation, but of a new sort. The spatial object, though limited and definite as to extension, is not yet limited as to succession. So the Ego puts a limit here also, fixes the object in Time yet against Time, holds it fast against the Vanishing. The Ego stops the indefinite succession of objects of Sensation, and pays Attention to the one, retaining it through a certain lapse of Time. Then the Ego takes up the other or opposite of this persistent seizure, which opposite is the Vanishing, and holds the two elements asunder. Finally, the moment, the point, the Now as object (or the object in the Now) is made to persist, by negating its evanishment; thus the present is seen to be the abiding element in all transitoriness.

For instance, let us grasp by Attention this ball before us and study it. First we separate it

locally from all adjacent objects, we limit it in Space. Then we hold it fast in the mind, not permitting anything else to take its place; we take it out of the flow of the stream of Sensation. This holding it fast in the mind is the Ego persisting through Time in retaining the object, which is not allowed to be succeeded by any other object. Thus persistence, fixedness is attained.

And yet the Ego, in order to get this fixedness of the ball in the mind, has had to reach forth and put down the opposite, namely the unfixed, the fleeting sense-world always flowing in and trying to sweep the object away. So the Ego, in seizing the fixed, must also seize the unfixed, the Vanishing; hence it has the dual elements, the fixed ball and the unfixed world round about the same. Thus we see that, as Space had the filled and the unfilled, so Time has the fixed and the unfixed, being both in one, which one is the Now, most fleeting of sublunary things, yet the most persistent, too, in fact the only thing that persists. The Now is all Time that is.

In a most significant mythical form ancient Homer has hinted this nature of Time, of the Abiding in Change, of the Fixed in the Vanishing. Ulysses is told to seize the old sea-god Proteus, master of shapes, who can transmute himself into every conceivable object in nature. Ulysses grasps him, and he turns to a tree, to a

wild beast, to a running stream; still the hero holds fast, through all appearances and transformations, till finally the divinity takes his true shape and tells his prophetic secret. The persistent hero at last gets that which persists through Time and is eternal amid all the fleeting shows of the world.

In the temporal particularization of the object, we can discern the threefold movement of the Ego, corresponding to the same movement already noticed in the case of Space. (1) The Ego breaks up the succession of the sense-world and puts a limit upon it, by seizing the Now, or the Object in the Now, and fixing the same. Yet even in this limit there must be the other or the opposite of the fixed, namely, the unfixed or the Vanishing. (2) Accordingly the Ego grasps yet holds asunder the dual elements which have risen in the object, namely the fixed and the unfixed, or the Now and the not-Now, or the permanent and the transitory. Such is the act of separation; the Ego in Attention, holding fast the object against the Time-limit, becomes aware of the present and the not-present, which latter is still further dualized into past and future, or the not-Now which has been and the not-Now which will be. Thus the separative stage of the Ego in Time manifests a double dualism. (3) Both

elements, the Now and the not-Now, form one process which is actual Time. The Now, while it is, is not, and while it is not, it is; its being cannot be without its non-being. While I speak, the present vanishes and becomes not-present; yet this not-present vanishes and becomes present. I must grasp Time as the ever-present yet the ever-fleeting, both in one; the persistent is momentary, and yet the momentary persists. The vanishing Now vanishes, and the eternal Now endures through the vanishing of evanishment. What a dialectical play of empty subtlety! Yet this is just the fact, the very reality of empty Time, which the Ego must master and fill, or be danced on its vacuity like a shuttle-cock.

So the Ego in Attention reaches the Time-idea, as it previously reached the Space-idea; it stops the mere flow of successive sensations, and holds the sensuous object fast in the Now, out of which act the process of Time develops. Time is always moving, separating, going away from itself, yet always coming back to itself. The present is all of Time that there is; this moment lasts forever yet is forever leaving. The horse in the treadmill is always moving, yet always in the same place.

The second stage of Attention has now completed itself. The Ego has fully particularized the object of sense, having seized it not simply immediately, but also in its limits which

are in Space and Time. This is the end at present; we are ready to pass into the following stage.

III. Attention concludes its process with the act of Ideation. The Ego unites the particular object with itself (the Ego) as particular, identifying the two sides. That is, the object is now made internal, ideal; hence we call this final act Ideation, the sensuous object is ideated, and this its Ideation is also the reproduction of it as particular in the external word.

The Ego in Attention first particularizes itself; then it particularizes the object, having made it the same as itself; finally it joins with itself the object which it has already transformed into a likeness of itself through particularization.

The student will note that this ideating act of Attention is the first form in which the ideality of mind begins distinctively to assert itself. The destiny of the whole external world is that it be transformed by the Ego and made ideal, first as a Percept, then as an Image, and finally as a Thought.

The student will also note that this act of Ideation re-creates the object and projects it into the external world. We have already observed that the Ego negates the extended object, then reproduces it as extended. The Ego annuls the difference between itself and the object, ideating the latter; yet it preserves this difference as

annulled, and hence must posit the object anew through itself in its act of Ideation.

Let us designate a little more fully this third stage of Attention, in which the Ego completes its possession of the particular object of Sensation. In the second stage just concluded, Attention seized this object, separated it from the stream of Sensation, held it from the Void and the Vanishing, fixed it in the Here and Now, thus making it particular. In the first stage the Ego separated itself from the stream of Sensation, concentrated itself within itself, and so began its own self-mastery. In these two stages, accordingly, we have the Ego getting possession of itself on the one hand, and completely particularizing the object on the other. In the present stage, which is the third, the Ego takes up the object as particular into itself, makes the same its own, re-creating it, for the object is not the Ego's own, till the latter can re-create it. That is, it unites the two previous stages: The object, which was so completely held apart from the Ego, is now adopted and identified with the same, yet also reproduced in order to be thus identified.

Such is the completed act of Attention, which is the work of the conscious will. Attention is a grand rescuer both of Self and object; the former it elevates into self-control, the latter it saves from the great sea of Space and Time in

their negative phases, which are the Void and the Vanishing. Both Ego and object would be lost in a nebulous, chaotic, fleeting Sense-world, were it not for Attention. The fixing of the object in the Here and Now saves it from an indefinite extension and an indefinite succession; the Ego having individualized itself in Attention, individualizes the object, and then makes the same its own, appropriating and reproducing.

For this last stage we need a special term, we shall call it Ideation. The object is now ideated, has become internal with its own Space and Time, and is united with the Ego. It is no longer merely an external object in external Space and Time; it was particularized by the Ego, and distinguished from yet joined with extension and succession. Now the whole object with its spatial and temporal adjuncts has been identified with the Ego, transferred from the real to the ideal, and thence again realized in the world through the Ego. Attention, therefore, has gotten possession of the sensuous object by this final act of Ideation, which not only annuls the difference between subject and object, but annuls this annulment, and so posits the difference anew with the object.

In this work of ideating the particular object we can discern the process of the Ego, as it unifies the external with the internal.

1. There is the immediate union in which the

object as a limited sensuous whole is taken up and ideated. For instance, I take up and ideate this ball as a total object of sense. Still this ball is itself composed of many particulars, and the Ego still further particularizes, this being now its character.

2. There is what we may call the analytic union, in which the Ego divides up the particular object into many particulars, and then ideates each of these particulars singly. Thus every object calls forth a multiplicity of ideations.

3. There is what we may call the synthetic union, in which the Ego returns out of this multiplicity, and re-unites all the manifold ideations into one concrete synthesis. Thus we ideate again the total ball, not now immediately, but as mediated through many particulars, which form a new whole of Ideation.

Again let us grasp in a brief record the three-fold activity of the Ego in Attention: first, the Ego collecting itself within itself, particularizes itself; secondly, it particularizes the object; thirdly, it takes up this object into itself, making the same its own, appropriating and reproducing. If we wish distinct names for these three stages of Attention, we may call them respectively: the Self-concentration of the Ego, the particularization of the object through the Ego, the Ideation of the object with the Ego—in

which triple movement we catch again the sweep of the Psychosis.

Let us now look about us for a moment. Manifestly the outcome of Attention is that the single sensuous object is ideated, and the Ego possesses it for once. But will the Ego keep possession? Hardly; there must be a manifold Ideation which makes permanent. Wherewith we go over into the next stage, in order to see how the object, ideated a single time in Attention can be ideated for all time in Retention.

III. RETENTION.

In the preceding stage of Attention we succeeded in ideating the particular object, internalizing it for once and uniting it with the Ego. But this is itself a particular act, and so falls into Time; it is still exposed to the danger of the Vanishing, on account of its remaining element of externality. Not merely once but many times it must go through the process of internalization, ere it can be made a permanent possession, ere it be retained.

Retention is the making permanent the act of Ideation, which, being a particular act, is limited, temporal, transitory. Just as we saw the particular object of Sensation fixed in the Now and rescued from the Vanishing by Attention, so also this total act of Attention (which is the

ideation of the Object) must be fixed by the Ego and rescued from the Vanishing. This is the process of Retention which is itself the third stage in the total movement of Perception.

We shall designate briefly the stages in the process of Retention, or the making permanent the act of Attention.

I. There is always an Immediate Retention in every mind, yet different minds vary much in their retentive capacity. The Ideation must be retained for a while, though the act be quite involuntary and instinctive. The particular object is taken up and unified with the Ego; such is a complete act of Attention, and yet it is but a single act, passing, transitory for most minds, unless the Ego picks up this passing single act of Attention and frees it from being just in the present moment only.

II. This it does by repeating the ideating act, repeating the same through the power of volition. Thus the act is no longer single, but manifold; no longer confined to one fleeting Now, but is made to persist through many Nows, according to the number of repetitions. I see an object, say, a picture; I go to it often and make many ideations of it, until these many become ideally all; that is, I can ideate the picture without its being present. I no longer need the external picture in order to see it, I can see it whenever I will to do so. I have removed it from the

outward Space and Time, to the internality of the Ego.

This is accomplished by repetition ; I perform these repeated acts of Ideation through my will. The outer object is made inner so often that the whole process, object and all, becomes internal, and is united with the Ego.

III. The inner process of Retention is now instinctive again, it works of itself, it does not require the external stimulus of the object. Not merely the single object is ideated, as in Attention ; but the object with its total process is ideated, and identified with the Ego, which thus possesses the object and controls it at will. Voluntary repetition has stored up in the mind, we say, the external object of sense, and this process has become instinctive ; the Ego needs no longer to have the external object present and to internalize that by an act of will, but the ideated object and its whole process of Ideation are its immediate possession. The will puts forth its effort still, but not now in the form of repeating the external object ; it controls the ideated object.

The process of Retention has, therefore, its immediate, its repetitive, and its ideated stages. All these are seen to be manifestations of the Ego in its triple movement, which is the Psychosis or unifying energy in these distinctions.

Moreover Retention is itself the third stage in

the larger movement of Perception, which is, in general, the receiving, the particularizing, and the identifying of the sensuous object with the Self. The whole moves from the Ego as determined by the external object in Impression, through the Ego separating itself from the external object and internalizing the same in Attention, to the Ego completely ideating the external object and uniting the same with itself. Thus the sweep is from the object determining the Ego without to the Ego determining the object within.

Such is the psychical history of the acquiring of a percept by the Ego. The sensuous object is transformed from ruler to the ruled, and thus is itself saved from the Void and Vanishing of the external world, the negative elements of Space and Time, and is stored away in the eternally preserving ideality of the Ego, of which it is now a spiritual portion.

At this point let us conceive that a new sensation comes out of the external world, and flows in upon the Ego through the inlets of the senses. In such a case Perception is again invoked to do its work, and to internalize the object as particular. But the process is not the same as hitherto, there is an added element which is now introduced. The Ego has gained a *content*, possesses an acquired percept, and soon many acquired percepts, all of which co-operate with it in the new act of Perception, and give to it a

new character. The Ego not only perceives but *apperceives*; its content having coalesced with it, co-operates in the aforesaid new act of Perception. Accordingly the Ego now, with the aid of its content, not merely internalizes the object, but orders and correlates it, which process is called Apperception.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON PERCEPTION

1. The student will probably agree with the statement that the discussion on Space and Time is the most difficult part of the preceding account of Perception. This difficulty lies chiefly in the fact that they are the pre-suppositions of the sense-world, every sensuous object implies them, every act of Perception falls back upon them ultimately as its very condition and possibility. Thus Perception runs upon its limit in them; we may say that Perception has to transcend Perception in order to perceive, it has to reach over to something which it does not perceive (at least, not directly) that it may act. It has to particularize Space and Time, which are thus pre-supposed by it as its primordial materials.

There has been, however, no attempt in the foregoing account to show how Space and Time get to be, as objective existences. The design is simply to point out the way by which we come to them subjectively. Some philosophers

have held that they are subjective forms only (see Kant's doctrine above alluded to); that we make them and impose them upon externality through our own Ego. That we do so, is true; but that they are also real, is likewise true; in fact, both sides (subjective and objective) are counterparts and necessary. But this question is not strictly psychological, though the Ego certainly pre-supposes the reality of Space, and recreates it in Perception along with the object perceived. No attempt, therefore, can here be made adequately to construe Space and Time, though we have already suggested (in the note on Space and Time) that they are posited along with all externality by the creative act of the Divine Ego, and that our cognition of them is ultimately the recognition of that act.

2. Time is the first and most external manifestation of the Dialectic, the inner principle of all movement, growth, development in nature, in life and in mind. This word we shall now introduce to the student, that he may begin to grow into its meaning, premising, meanwhile, that its full significance can be unfolded only at the end of Psychology, in the last stage of Thought. At present, however, as a preliminary exercise, let him reflect further upon Time, specially upon the Now as above set forth, how it is the most fleeting, evanescent, shadowy of all things, and in the same breath the most solid and persistent,

in fact just that which endures. Let him note also the Ego whose movement takes up both these extremes and unifies them. Such is the first glimpse of the Dialectic, or the Play of the Negative, most subtle, sinuous, elusive, yet precisely that which must be caught and held and cast into the fetters of speech by the thinker. This Play of the Negative, which undoes itself and turns over to its own opposite, which negates the negation and therein sweeps out of itself and becomes positive — this Play of the Negative is truly the most important matter in all philosophy, it is the driving-wheel of the Universe.

Let not the faithful student, however, listen to those insidious voices which will whisper in his ear that all this is a gorgeous fabric of illusion, or an intricate network of insoluble problems which the spirit makes for itself and then gets caught in its own toils, to its lasting injury or even destruction. Many minds are too indolent or too impatient to perform the task of Thought, and just for that reason feel themselves called upon to proclaim that it is merely a cunning web of sophistry spun by the Father of Lies to catch innocent souls, which web they are too shrewd to dally with. Such is a not uncommon prejudice against this dialectical Play of the Negative, as if it were the old Serpent himself, subtle, slippery, sinuous, ensconced in the Ego so slyly, and ever ready to fling his coils around

the unwary explorer. Still the Ego must assert itself as master over its own monsters, else it will indeed be caught, it is already caught when it flees—another case of this double-dealing Dialectic.

3. A further instance we may ponder in the matter which we have just been considering — that of knowing the object. Often has it been stated already that the external world is in itself negative, is, so to speak, self-alienated, outside of itself, hence indefinitely projected in Space and Time. Just for this reason it is rightly called non-Ego. But in cognition the Ego negates the *non* of the non-Ego, making the latter internal, which process is thus seen to be the negation of a negative. That is, the act of the Ego knowing the external sensuous object is the negation of a negation. Thus the Play of the Negative lies in the first act of knowledge; by such means only (by negating its negative or non-Ego) can the Ego get to be concretely positive, and thereby *know*.

Let the student still further unravel the following Play of the Negative, and mark its psychological significance. Ignorance (linguistically a negative) is primarily not to know that you do not know — unconscious or unknowing ignorance; the first negation of it is to know that you do not know — conscious or knowing ignorance; the second negation of it is to know

that you know. The whole movement of knowledge is, from this point of view, a negation of a negation.

Humor is essentially a vision of the dialectical nature of all things; wit sees the negative, humor sees the negative too, but also its negation. Some people have neither wit nor humor and cannot understand either; others again have keen wit but no pervasive humor. The Play of the Negative sometimes embodies itself in the anecdote, and has to be seen through to get the point. A sailor was pulling a long rope up out of the sea; growing impatient of his task he exclaimed: "I believe somebody has been down there and cut off the end!"

4. We have often spoken of the *reproduction* of the object by the Ego, when the latter has taken up and internalized said object. In Sense-perception such reproduction means that the Ego reproduces its external form, its geometrical shape, its extended body. In Representation the Image will be reproduced, and in Thought the creative Idea of the object will be reproduced. Note, therefore, that the word *reproduction* will have necessarily three different senses in the three different stages of Intellect, passing from the outer material figure to the inner genetic thought of the object.

Here also we may observe that the ideation of the object always involves its reproduction in the

world, its projection or objectification. For if the external object be truly made internal by the Ego, it cannot be lost as object, but must be preserved and restored. That is, the Ego, in appropriating the object, cannot let it vanish in this act, otherwise the Ego would not get the object, there would be no appropriation but destruction.

5. In Perception, as here considered, the Ego is without content; it is treated as the simple activity of the Self in getting a percept. But there are very few, if any, such cases of Perception actually; in psychology, however, we wish at the start to see the pure perceptive act of the Ego, and so we make the foregoing abstraction. The mind of the small child even has some kind of content which enters into the work of its Perception. Practically, therefore, and concretely taken, Perception is quite always Apperception.

SECTION THIRD—APPERCEPTION.

There are many terms which express or suggest the notion of Apperception. In general, it may be conceived as mental assimilation, whereby the food of the mind — percepts, feelings, experiences — is assimilated, is made over into the mental organism. Or, to take a term which we prefer (as it is not derived from a physiological process), Apperception *integrates* the percept, it is essentially an act of *integration*. This term, accordingly, we shall use as synonymous with Apperception, especially when we wish to put stress upon the fact of the percept being made one with the Ego, both together constituting the active mental *integer*. The present sphere has also its place in the well-known doctrine of the Association of Ideas, which has played such an important part in English Psychology.

The apperceptive act is not only the perceiving, but also the ordering of the percept through the Ego and the content of the Ego already acquired. In Sensation the external object was received; in Perception it was separated from the mass of Sensation, particularized and ideated; thus the Ego in Perception begins to have a distinct content. In Apperception the Ego orders each newly acquired percept through itself and its own stores.

We can see that the Ego is now quite different from what it was at the beginning of Perception. The fresh object of sense is taken up by this new Ego and incorporated with the same (or rather insouled therewith). Yet there was a previous percept or percepts, which we shall call its *content*, ideated, one with it, and functioning with it. This content, now an ideal element of the Ego, enters into relation with the arriving percepts and assists in ordering them, which act is their Apperception (literally a perceiving in addition or something added to Perception). In what does this ordering consist? That is to be unfolded in the present section.

The act of Apperception may be illustrated by the arrival of a new box of goods in one of the great stores of a city. The man in charge opens the box, looks at the article or articles, and commands where each piece is to go, on what floor, in what department, at what counter, possibly

on what shelf. He must have the whole store and its parts in his head to be able to tell where the given article belongs; his Ego with its content of previous percepts orders the new percept. Imagine him without this previous knowledge and already ordered knowledge; however great his Ego, or his genius, he would be helpless.

In like manner the arrival of a new percept in the mind has to be ordered by the whole mind, which is the Ego and its content. The act of Apperception completes the movement of Sense-perception; the object is not only ideated as a particular, but is put into its place in the total mental economy, which is indeed an inner world, that of Ego, taken from the outer world, made ideal, and organized. The particular object is united into an internal order, and no longer remains in an external succession or contiguity; the cosmos is within.

The Ego alone, without its store of Apperception, is like a business man having no capital. With little he can get but little, with much he can get much, provided of course that he is able to handle his acquisitions aright. A good merchant must have not only general capacity, but his occupation must become ingrown with his Ego, so that he not only perceives a piece of merchandise, but apperceives it in all its relations. Why are students of a certain grade required to pass an examination before entering

upon a further course of study? For the sake of Apperception; if they have not sufficient knowledge to apperceive the new lesson, they must be sent where they can get it, or be put to doing something else. Nine-tenths of the complaints about the obscurity of certain great books proceed from insufficient Apperception on the part of the complainant. One of the clearest books in the world is said to be Newton's *Principia*, yet it is certainly one of the darkest, unless you have sufficient stores already in your Ego to apperceive this work. Coleridge has declared somewhere that Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* was to him one of the most transparent of books, and its style most luminous. Happy man, he had the divine gift of Kantian Apperception. Tremendous is the outpour of indignation against metaphysics and philosophy in these days, particularly is such to be found in books of psychology; indeed the psychologists of a certain school are fast approaching the condition of monomaniacs on the subject of that awful man-eating goblin metaphysics. Yet one has not to read very far in order to find out that the trouble lies chiefly in their Apperception; if they only possessed a sufficient Ego with sufficient stores to integrate and assimilate the metaphysical monster, the dyspeptic attack would be much alleviated, if not transformed into a state of positive health.

The Ego in Apperception has undergone a threefold change from what it was in simple Perception. In the first place, it has developed into its actual form out of its potential, it has furrowed its channels of activity in making its primal percept; it works along its own lines already laid down; what it has done once, it more easily does again. In the second place, it has a content, which is united with it, is a part or rather element of it, since it too is object as well as subject, the content being the particular object of sense ideated. In the third place the total Ego, both in form and content, is united in a single activity, which takes up, ideates, and orders the object, making the same a constituent of its inner world. Thus there is a passing of the object from one world to another, from the outer sense-world in Space and Time to an inner mind-world in which the Ego is the connecting bond and the orderer. We have moved with the object from the real to the ideal realm.

Apperception, whose general sweep shows the Ego ordering the percept, has three stages. These are all phases of the uniting of the percept with the Ego, as determined by the movement of the latter. In other words the Ego integrates the external object of sense with itself, making the same an element of itself.

I. Simple Integration, in which the percept is united with the Ego immediately; the Ego

with its content orders directly what is brought to it. Here the procedure is on the whole, involuntary and instinctive.

II. Selective Integration, in which the Ego separates itself from the total mass of the object or objects, and chooses what it will take up. Here a volitional element enters.

III. Redintegration of the act of Apperception, which, being a single act and so subject to Time, must be integrated over and over again, till the presence of the sensuous object is no longer needed.

Already we have noticed apperceptive phases, in Retention for instance; henceforth Apperception will continue through all Psychology. A similar process will take place when the object is an image or a thought as well as a sensuous object. But here at the end of Sense-perception is its true place in the science; here it becomes explicit and must be considered. In like manner (as already observed) we shall have Attention further on, and this is really founded upon the Will, which is not especially under consideration in the present work. All of which may serve to recall to us that the mind is a whole always, though it specializes itself in certain activities at given times; such activities are but waves on the surface of the sea, which is underneath them all and is their totality as well as their substance.

I. SIMPLE INTEGRATION.

We are now to pre-suppose that the Ego with its content is present, as the result of Perception. If we look back at the movement of this content as already traced in the perceptive process, we find that it has, first of all, a spatial and temporal character; the percept was ideated along with its Space and Time. Accordingly the new object, which is now taken up along with *its* Space and Time also, has in common with the original content the spatial and temporal elements. This is the first form of Integration, external, mechanical. Then follows a deeper Integration which comes from analysis, and the object integrates with the content according to a common quality. Finally an Integration takes place in which the total object is ordered by the totality of the Ego.

Thus we have three stages of Simple Integration, or that form of Apperception in which the external object is integrated by the Ego with itself *immediately*; that is, this object comes from the outside and stimulates the Ego, which responds to the stimulus through its own necessity, without inner choice of its own. These stages may be designated as follows:—

I. External Integration, that of the object in Space and Time.

II. Qualitative Integration, that of the object through its properties.

III. Total Integration, that of the object as a whole after analysis.

Generally, in this sphere of Simple Integration, the object is the determiner, while the Ego is determined externally to order the object, without selective volition. Here too we may note, in passing, that this is the sphere of the so-called Laws of Association, which are supposed by a certain school of thinkers to determine the Ego in all its activity. Hence Association is usually coupled with the doctrine of Determinism. Undoubtedly in this sphere the external object stimulates the Ego, and the Apperception takes place immediately in response. But we shall also see a sphere of choice later in Selective Integration. At present, however, let us examine more fully the three stages above mentioned.

I. The first stage of the Integration of the sensuous object with the Ego is the external one, that through Space and Time, which are themselves the very forms of externality. In this external Integration we may also notice the three-fold movement; the object is integrated with the Ego through Extension (Space), Succession (Time), and Simultaneity (their union).

1. Taking the sensuous object which is now to be apperceived (integrated or associated), we observe first that it is in Space, and so must be

ordered spatially alongside of the content of the Ego, which content is also in the present case a sensuous object ideated. Thus the two ideated contents have their spatial relations taken up into the Ego together, and so are spatially integrated. They are contiguous in a common ideal Space, which is their first and most external Integration, though this be in and through the Ego. Such is the basis of the so-called Association by Contiguity; things which have been integrated (or apperceived) in the same ideal Space, belong together in the mind and will recall each other (see Memory, which is the reverse or *disintegration* of the present process).

I see to-day in an American home a picture of Raphael's, the original of which I saw abroad in a Roman gallery; I bring the two places together with their objects, both are integrated and joined together by my Ego in an ideal Space, and not only the too wheres, but also the two whens are integrated — with which fact we pass to the next.

2. The sensuous object which is to be apperceived is likewise in Time, and is taken up with the same in the act of Apperception, and is ordered temporally with the content of the Ego, which content in the present instance is a sensuous object ideated along with its own Time. The two contents are thus brought together in the Ego, and are integrated in a temporal relation. They are contiguous in a common ideal

Time, or they co-exist in a common ideal succession; objects which have been thus integrated belong together, and will recall each other. The picture which I now see integrates temporally with the picture I saw abroad; I bring the two times of seeing into a common succession, or temporal contiguity in my Ego, though the two events may have been years apart.

Thus the Ego, having a content which is in its own ideal Time, integrates temporally the sensuous object, which is also in Time, and which thereby becomes likewise the content of the Ego. These two contents are united in a common element, namely in an ideal succession. Every thing is preceded and followed by other things, it exists in a succession which the Ego ideates with it and thus makes internal, ideal. With such a content the Ego integrates the sensuous object in its Time, which is also somewhere in Space; thus Time insists on having Space as its setting, and the two are united in the sensuous object.

3. The spatial and temporal elements co-exist in the thing of sense; they are likewise fused into unity and coalesce in the Ego in a great variety of ways. *Where* and *when* I saw the picture are blended together in the past; *where* and *when* I see the picture are blended together in the present. The two *Wheres* (There and Here) are integrated by the Ego in an ideal

Space (spatial Integration); the two Whens (Then and Now) are also integrated by the Ego (temporal Integration) in an ideal Time; so much we have unfolded in the two previous paragraphs. But now comes the third Integration, the unity of the two preceding, which we shall call *Simultaneous Integration*. The twofold Where and When of the object present integrates with the twofold Where and When of the object past, which is the content of the Ego; thus both doubles co-exist in the Ego in an ideal Space and Time, or contiguously and in succession, that is, simultaneously. Mark that this Simultaneity (Togetherness) is predicated of both Space and Time in coalescence.

It is the divisive act of the Ego which separates the temporal from the spatial and makes them two distinct Integrations. Really, however, the sensuous object must be integrated in Space *and* Time together, or simultaneously. The concrete act of the Ego as well as the concrete object is spatio-temporal; the act becomes the more abstract and one-sided, in proportion as we hold apart one or the other of the two elements. Still, in this movement of External Integration we discern the threefold movement of the Ego, and we make the Psychosis, which unites not only the single process within itself, but also integrates the same with the total process of Psychology.

The double Where and the double When in this final step are integrated through and through *mutually*, straightwise and crosswise. The result is, that either Where not only recalls the other Where, but also the corresponding When. The place of the picture now seen brings up not only the former place of seeing it, but also the former time. In Memory we shall find that these four integrated elements (the two Wheres and the two Whens) stand in such relation that any one of them may recall any other one of the rest or all of the rest.

In regard to Simultaneity, let the reader analyze his mental process in perusing or witnessing the drama of *Julius Cæsar*; the place of the action (Rome) integrates with the time of the action (first half-century B. C.), and may still further integrate with the present time and place of reading it or seeing it acted.

These three terms are often designated as Laws of the Association of Ideas — Contiguity in Space, Consecution in Time, and Simultaneity in Space and Time. But whether they are laws or not, they represent the various stages of the Integration of the external object with the Ego — the juxtaposition in extension and in succession.

It is manifest that the temporal and the spatial contiguity is really one, though each is separated by an act of the Ego. But just as well each is united with the other by an act of

the Ego, whose process is both divisive and unitary. The primal Association is apperceptive, uniting the perceived object by its place and its time with the already acquired content of the Ego with *its* place and *its* time. Still further, the Ego integrates the two elements (place and time) of the two contents, which thus are doubly integrated in Simultaneity ; nay, the reader, if he wishes to push this business to its last refinement, may here trace a quadruple Integration. It is well to note, however, that the word *simultaneous* means usually quite the same as *co-temporaneous*, as for instance, we speak of two events occurring *simultaneously*.

Still the Integration of the objects remains external, being in Space and Time, which are just the forms of externality. Each is outside of the other, though they be contiguous, spatially and temporally. Their relation in the Ego corresponds to the mechanical relation in the outer world of matter. But the Ego in its separative character must take to pieces the object within, separating the same into its properties or qualities, and thus finding its inner constituent elements, which will form the basis of a new kind of Integration. This activity of the Ego corresponds to the chemical process in the outside world of matter, with its separations and recombinations. Accordingly we are next to take up Qualitative Integration.

II. Into the sensuous object the Ego begins to put distinction — the distinction of qualities. These are internalized with the object and correlated with the content, which has also such distinctions. I see a red coat, this quality of redness may unite the object with a mental hat which is red. These qualities again may be superficial or profound; the tendency of the Ego is to deepen them till the essence of the object is reached, in contradistinction to mere appearance. In integrating the external object with the content in this sphere, the Ego proceeds by Resemblance, by Contrast, and by Combination.

1. As is well known, Resemblance brings the sensuous object and the ideated one together. Two men have similar cloaks, or similar looks, or similar characters; they integrate mentally in the observing Ego. Resemblance passes from the outer to inner; the qualitative Resemblance may be merely that of color, or it may be that of the profoundest thought.

2. The difference of objects may mentally bring them together; this is Integration by Contrast. A giant will not only integrate with a giant, but a dwarf with a giant; the opposites determine each other and are connected. Here we see the movement of the Ego, which is not only identity but also difference; it has not only Resemblance within itself but also Contrast or otherness; the Ego can integrate in both ways.

The psychologists have called Resemblance and Contrast Laws of Association; but how can they be regarded as Laws, since they are not a fixed principle of action, but can work exactly contrariwise? They must be finally referred for explanation to the process of the Ego, which is not only the law, but the law-maker.

3. Out of Contrast we can develop the thought of Combination, which integrates two opposing elements. The giant is the opposite of the dwarf, and the dwarf is the opposite of the giant; they are thus alike in being contrasted. Underneath Contrast, therefore, lies the movement of Combination, which is also the deeper fact of Resemblance. (That is, Resemblance and Contrast are one in the act of Combination, which is essentially the process of the Ego in its three stages.) The object is taken up, divided, then united in the complete process of the Ego; then it is integrated fully. The giant resembles a giant — first integration, that of identity; the giant contrasts with a dwarf — second integration, that of difference; both giant and dwarf are united in their difference, are made one in the Ego, though specially contrasted. Both are men, and in mutual relation; thus they are combined in a process with each other. We do not naturally contrast a dwarf and the planet Jupiter for instance, as there is no underlying resemblance, such as two men have. The beautiful,

poetic Titania, queen of the Fairies, in love with the "rude mechanical," Bottom the weaver, with an ass's head on, forms a famous comic Contrast, resting also on Resemblance. Each is alike in loving the opposite in speech, character, and looks, and both are very human. Were they not so much alike in being so different, there would be no fun.

Already we have come to a new stage when we have detected the Ego as the underlying factor of Integration. In Resemblance there was the comparison of the two things, which was more or less external; in Contrast their diversity was introduced into the comparison; but the two objects were found in a common process with each other in the act of Combination. This act was traced into the Ego — wherewith we pass to the next stage.

III. We have now reached the sphere of total Integration (or Assimilation) which shows the object assimilated into the complete process of the Ego. The sensuous thing is taken up, ideated as a particular, and then ordered instinctively, or assimilated into the structure of the Ego. It is an Assimilation analogous to the taking of food into the bodily organism; the food is transformed into the various corporeal constituents by the vital process. At present the process of the Ego is taking up the external world and transmuting the same into the mental organism.

In this Assimilation the total process of the Ego has become the apperceiving principle explicitly, and so integrates the object. Yet here too we must note the stages. First is the immediate or formal Assimilation which belongs to the Ego as such; second is the grand diversity of Egos in the process of Assimilation; third is the unity of all Egos just in their diversity of Assimilation.

1. At the start we may simply notice, what has already been set forth, the fact that every Ego has its process of Assimilation, in order to be itself, and it must move through the same in appropriating externality. The Integration of the object with the Ego is direct, primordial, constituting the very nature of the Ego, without which it could not be at all. This is only saying that the Ego, to be Ego, must assimilate the outer world into its own process.

Unquestionably the Ego assimilates many separate percepts in quite every object which it takes up. I see a ball, it has color, shape, smoothness, hardness, size, odor, each of which is given as a distinct sensation, yet all are unified, assimilated, and finally named as one thing by the Ego; they constitute the one object called a ball. It is manifest that therein many small integrations are completely and inseparably assimilated by the Ego, so that the distinctions vanish, or are only recovered by a special act

of the Ego. The ball, however, becomes integrated as a total by the Ego, and is separated from the same in Memory as a total, quite in-complex, or at least not consciously complex.

Here we can place in the main the doctrine of Inseparable Association, enforced so strongly by the elder Mill and defended so warmly by his son. But the Associationists seem to hold that the matter gets itself done without the Ego, by the fiat of a Law of Association, which comes from the outside and imposes its decree upon the free-acting Ego. To the teeth of which statement we must again affirm: the Ego is not only the Law but the Law-maker, yea, the Law-unmaker, when the fullness of time hath come.

2. Now enters the fact of the prodigious difference in the Egos of different people, which comes chiefly from a difference of content. The simple process of the Ego in the savage and in the civilized man is the same; but how diverse is the content of his mind through its acquired stores! These again re-act upon the process of the Ego and make it seem very different; still both men have fundamentally the one common process of the Ego, else they would not be men, endowed with personality.

Take, for instance, this flower; the rustic integrates it as an object having a certain form and color; the botanist integrates it with the

whole vegetable kingdom, orders it at a glance under species, genus, family, etc.; all these are the content of his Ego. The philosopher ought to make a deeper integration still, co-ordinating the flower not only with the vegetable world but with the animal, with conscious existence, with all creation. The different contents of the Ego make the difference in the Apperception of the object. In apperceiving a great complex fact, such as the World's Fair, one man will make the primary Apperception and hardly do more than order the objects in Space and Time, where and when he saw them; another man will go deeper and order them according to their qualities, superficial and profound; still a third man will seek to order the World's Fair as a totality made by the Ego, and hence to be grasped as a process thereof, as a Psychosis. Thus light shines through all complexity, when the order of the object is seen to be born of the inherent process of the Ego.

To come to the matter just at present in hand, the facts of Psychology may be put together as merely external, indeed as so many spatial objects strung capriciously along in a string of observations and experiments; or they may be integrated according to some qualities external or internal, which, however, remains at best but an ordering from without. Finally all the facts and divisions of Psychology may be integrated by the Psychosis, in which the whole Ego makes

whole (integrates) the Ego in every special activity, ramification, or subtlety.

3. With all this difference in the various Egos manifested in assimilating the object, we return to the fact that they are one, and that their common function in Assimilation is to overcome the difference of the object, to make the same ideal and thus to preserve it. The result of the process of Assimilation is to grasp the Ego as the subjecting of the external difference and the internalizing of this difference, so that henceforth it is a factor of the Ego itself.

That is, the Ego does not now let the object put its distinctions upon the Ego, and so determine its activity from without, which has been the case throughout the present stage of Simple or Associative Integration, but the Ego has become aware of itself as the orderer and the master; from this awareness it proceeds to action, and next it will in turn impose its distinctions on the object. Herewith we pass to a new stage of Apperception.

Taking a retrospect of the threefold movement of Simple Integration, we should specially note that it manifests the Psychosis. The first or immediate stage is the external (spatio-temporal) Integration, which leaves the objects as they are, taking them up in their extension and succession *immediately*. The second or divisive stage is the one in which the objects are sepa-

rated into qualities, and are integrated through these with the Ego and its content. The third stage restores the unity of the object after qualitative separation, and the total Ego integrates the object as total, undivided, or with division overcome — inseparable Integration.

But when the Ego totifies the object thus separated into many qualities, and then integrates the same, it (the Ego) is already implicitly controlling the object according to its own principle, which cancels the qualitative separation into unity. This implicit control is now to become explicit, the Ego passes from the *determined* to the *determining*, wherewith a new separation will appear.

II. SELECTIVE INTEGRATION.

The Ego in its apperceptive movement is now to choose the object which is to be integrated with itself. The object is, accordingly, separated and selected; moreover the Ego, in order to make such selection, has to bring about a separation within itself, which is involved in taking one thing and rejecting another.

There is now an act of Disintegration preceding the act of Integration, or of Dissociation going before Association. The Ego brings a new separation into the object, which is not the qualitative separation such as we observed in

the previous stage, but one imposed by the Ego upon the object for its own subjective behoof.

The object is not now co-ordinated by any sensuous or external element, but by some mental element, belonging to the Ego itself. Accordingly we shall behold the Ego take certain factors of the object and integrate them with itself, while it rejects others.

The question rises, why does the Ego thus select some portions of the object and leave the rest? Why lean to certain things and spurn the others? In a general way the answer can be given, because it is interested in them; the Ego and its content are already ideally related to them, or have at least a secret tendency in that direction. Thus the Ego divides the object, since it is divided within itself, choosing and refusing. Note, therefore, how this second stage, here named Selective Integration, is the stage of separation; in an act of choice the Ego separates itself from all its many other relations, and throws itself upon the particular thing, which is also separated from everything else for the moment.

Let us grasp the sweep of what has just been called Selective Integration, which, as distinguished from the preceding stage of Simple Integration, is subjective, voluntary, determined from within, proceeding outward to the object. The Ego now manifests will in selecting, in-

fluenced primarily by some internal tendency, motive, purpose. The following are the stages of its movement.

I. The Ego will choose the object and integrate the same with itself according to some native bent ; it takes spontaneously what it wants, what it feels an affinity for, what it is interested in. Selective Integration through *interest*.

II. The Ego will choose the object and integrate the same with itself according to some end of its own, which gives to said object a *value*. This end is, however, at first finite, that is, a means for some further end, and hence, can give only a finite value to the object. Selective Integration through *finite value*.

III. The Ego will choose the object and integrate the same with itself according to its own supreme end, which is to unfold the Self to completeness. Selective Integration through *infinite value*.

It is now time for the student to ask himself : What is the Psychosis of this trinity just announced? Doubtless he has already asked many such questions in the course of the preceding movement. At present, let him think it out for himself, and then read the following development which may give him some help. The purpose of psychology is to impart to the student the power of creative thought, so that he can make his own psychical process, and feel its truth,

its inner necessity, which always lies in the Psychosis.

I. The Ego is interested in one object rather than another, it separates or disintegrates in order to find its affinity and to come into unity with its own. A natural interest exists, the result of innate disposition and acquired tendency. Every human being has a certain number of likes, talents, aptitudes, all of which go forth with the Ego to the object, as it were in search of their real counterpart. This natural selection of the object by the Ego is sometimes called taste; one man has a taste for fish or for flesh, another for mechanics or for poetry. Often an acquired element plays into such a tendency, which, however, is based upon a natural bent.

Native talent has its place in education as well as in society. At a certain point the student must begin to specialize in his training, he must get himself ready to do a certain thing in the social order, to have a vocation. It sometimes happens that what he can do best, what he has a natural capacity for, is just what he has no desire for. Talent does not coincide with wish or ambition. Thus the interest in doing or being something is dissevered from the ability.

The result is, that interest has to be controlled and reconstructed by reason, and adjusted to the situation.

At present, however, we are trying to trace the

movement of the Ego in its tendency to affiliate with some things and not with others. It integrates with this object specially, following its bent, as we often say, or through interest.

1. There is, in the first place, the interest which comes through *familiarity*. The object in some phase has been seen or known before, and at once it attracts the Ego. In a strange city a familiar face becomes a matter of deep interest; the mind, overwhelmed with new things is delighted to run for a while in an old channel. Particularly a familiar tongue heard in a foreign land draws irresistibly the whole Ego, which identifies its present with its former Self, or integrates the fresh object with its ideated content instinctively and through a feeling of pleasure. Interest indicates the spontaneous uniting of the two sides; the interest of familiarity is the recognizing of the thing as belonging to the family, the ideal family of father Ego, who so gladly receives the unexpected member.

2. There is, in the second place, the interest which comes through *novelty*. The Ego finds familiarity a limit, and at once sets about transcending it; things trite and familiar it now casts away. What is the ground of this contradiction? It is to be seen in the nature of the Ego itself, which must be, of necessity, its own opposite; it will not harden in the grooves of familiarity, but must break over them and assert its freedom, its

infinite character. Hence the Ego is interested in the novelty of the thing as well as in its familiarity, and it loses interest in novelty as well as in familiarity. In the latter the Ego shows its principle of identity, the object must be identified or ideated with Self and its content. But in novelty the Ego shows its principle of difference, since the object must be different from Self and its content. The novel thing excites interest, if it be among familiar things; yet the novel thing among novelties only, gets to be familiar and stale, it strikes over into the opposite; for if all is novel, then the novel is just what is familiar.

3. In the preceding interaction between familiarity and novelty the reader has probably detected already the third principle, which is the movement uniting both sides. Already it was the familiar thing among many novel things, the familiar face among many strange faces, which caused the interest. In like manner, it was the new thing among many familiar things, which caused the sudden integration. That is, both familiarity and novelty go together, are sides of one process which is fundamentally that of the Ego. The interest in the new is determined through the old, and the interest in the old is determined through the new. The familiar thing amid familiar things, and the new thing amid new things excite less interest, as there is no complete process of the Ego, which does not

pass from sameness to sameness but from sameness to difference, and back again, when it fully and freely utters itself. That is, the final interest of the Ego lies not in any separate part or separate activity of itself, but in its own complete self-activity, in the Psychosis.

II. The Ego has an end or use to which it wishes to put the object; thereby it gives *value* to the object in proportion to the latter's serviceableness for some purpose of its own. Thus the Ego acquires a new kind of interest in the object, which is now useful, not simply interesting; that is, it subserves some end, which may be graded in different ways.

The integration of the object with the Ego through interest was more the result of native likes and dislikes, or, at least, of instinctive tendencies. The mind is interested in that for which it naturally has some affinity, and makes its selections quite unconsciously. But when the Ego puts value into some object and selects the same on that ground, it has an end in view to which the value corresponds. Thus the Ego has divided itself and has an end distinct from itself, and also it has divided the object, which has a value by virtue of the end. It is plain that the Ego separates consciously such an end from itself, though still its own, and integrates the object with the same, and thus gives to the object value.

Everything in the world may have value, if it can be made useful for any purpose of the Ego. Everything becomes valuable in proportion as the Ego can integrate the same with its end. But this is also of many grades, and hence there will be a grand difference in values.

1. The immediate value is felt when the sensuous object subserves some purpose of the physical organism. A cup of water has value in slaking thirst; a loaf of bread is not only of interest, but of value to the hungry man, and he is willing to exchange for it something of equal value. Upon the integration which has to take place between subjective ends in the shape of desires, needs and greeds, and objective values in the shape of food, raiment, and shelter is built the mighty structure of the commercial world.

2. The Ego has within it a vast realm of what we may call finite ends, those of fame, power, love, wealth, of which every means has value to him. The given thing is a means to a certain end, yet this end is itself but a means to another end, and so on *ad infinitum*. Every individual is a little world (microcosm) full of plans, schemes, ends, which he is seeking to realize; society is a huge collection of such striving atoms; no wonder that they collide. Still it is just these ends of an enormous number of Egos, which render all things and indeed all persons valuable; nothing is without some value, everything is at least

destined to have some value. In the Walpurgis-Night (see Göethe's *Faust*, Part First) such a social order has been portrayed by the poet. One person has his particular end, great or small, and pursues it with the means at his command, but another person is seeking the same means for his particular end; to both persons the means, which is some object, let us say, has value; both, therefore, fall into struggle and competition for its possession. Thus arises a vast society of Egos, first giving value to the object and then competing for it with one another, for every person having some end and requiring some object as a means for its attainment, produces value, which, however, may conflict with the valuation put by some other person upon the same object.

In like manner we may consider spiritual things. The character of a man has a universal value, rising from the estimate put upon him by his community, his nation, or the world. His fellow Egos place their valuation upon him, higher and lower; his life is a totality of thinking and doing, higher and lower; finally the universal Ego, or Public Opinion, strikes the balance, and he receives his measure of universal value in fame, be it good or ill.

Thus a universal value hovers over and unites all things, and all particular Egos with their special valuations of persons and things. All

has value or ought to have, belongs somewhere in this vast integration of the world with the Ego, which must employ the same for its end. But even this universal value has still a finite end; the price or universal value of an article of merchandise is, say, one dollar, which the seller receives and the buyer pays, and then uses for his own purpose. Note, however, that the Ego previously set the value on the object, but now it finds the object already valued, which value it has to accept before using the object; that is, value is raised out of the caprice of the individual Ego, and mediated with all Egos.

3. Upon such a world of struggle and dissidence, with all its diversity of values, thus rises the idea of a universal value, by which every object is integrated with an Ego. There are many Egos competing for every object, but there are many objects competing for every Ego; the result is that between the totality of objects and the totality of Egos a ratio is formed, which expresses the universal value of the object in relation to the sum total of Egos. What makes the value of a bushel of wheat to-day? Supply and demand, it is said; supply of the object and demand of the totality of Egos; if the supply is short, the value rises through the competition of the Ego for the thing. Yet other articles of food begin to compete with wheat as an article of food, and so keep down its value. Thus

wheat has a universal value, which may fluctuate from day to day, but which always expresses the equilibrium between the totality of Eggs competing for the object and thereby raising its value, and the totality of objects competing for the Egg and thereby lowering its value. The money expression of the universal value of an object is called its price.

The universal value is not the infinite value; this distinction we must try to make plain to ourselves. The sum total of Eggs proclaims a certain thing to be useful, and so gives to it a universal value. Still such utility is finite, not absolute; the thing is useful for some end which in its turn proves to be only a means. For instance, the value of sound advice in economical matters, for making money, is useful to all men, and hence is a universal value; Poor Richard's maxims are universally valuable. Still the making of money is a finite end, money is not an end in itself but is for something else outside of itself. But when the Egg has itself as end, that is, its own Selfhood, its Personality as such, it has that as end which is the maker of all finite ends, it is Self-end. Herewith we rise into a new sphere which is next to be unfolded.

III. We have reached the infinite value of the object, which can be created only by an infinite end. The Ego, as the self-active principle, has now an infinite end, namely to unfold itself as

self-activity or self-determination. The object which conduces to such an end has an infinite value for the Ego, which therein brings forth itself.

Finite ends we have already observed; there is a series of means and ends falling outside of one another without any self-return; for instance, my end is to build a house, but the house is not an end merely but a means for shelter; this shelter again is not an end simply but a means for health and comfort, which again may point to another end. Even the universal value, which is illustrated by the price of an article, is only the value fixed for finite ends. But the infinite value expresses the worth of the object not for some finite end of the Ego, but for self-end.

With this statement, the idea of educational values enters our field. What branches are best adapted to realize the Ego, to unfold it into itself as self-active, self-determining? Such is, in general, the primary problem of pedagogics, including all education and culture. The organization of studies is probably the greatest spiritual need of our time or of any time. The Ego moves through three stages in organizing its instrumentalities for making the object a means to unfold the Person into its completeness.

1. Those studies are first which develop the Ego into the mastery of the implements of culture, along with a development into a free, full self-

activity. The Ego gets possession of itself and the intellectual weapons of its race. This is the sphere of the School and of its training from the Primary Grade to the University.

2. This universal training in what is universal, must specialize itself in the training for a vocation, whereby the Person is to fill his place as a member of society, perform his function in the social Whole — The Technical School.

3. The return to a universal training through Literature, History, Art, Philosophy. The individual engaged in the special work of life must be a universal being also, a cosmopolitan, a world-man, though at home in his own circle. The instrumentality for such a training may be called the new University, which is just at present in the process of being evolved. The Study Class, the Literary Club, the Reading Circle, the Lecture Course are the faint beginnings of this new University, which is to be truly universal, located in every village, embracing not only the young, but the middle-aged and even the old, not only the professional student, but the man and woman in active life. Thus the individual, though engaged in his narrow special activity, is to be elevated into participating in the grand universal movement of his race. Only through continuous effort is such an existence possible, the battle must be fought and won every day.

The Ego has now put an infinite value into the

object, making the same into a means for realizing itself not merely as an individual, but as a race-man, as a member of total humanity. Therewith the object has attained its absolute worth, being employed to develop such a personality.

The movement of the Ego which was called Selective Integration has now run its course, passing through the stages which we have designated as Interest, Finite Value and Infinite Value. The Ego, from integrating the object with itself through some native tendency or through some intermediate end, has risen to the point of absolute Self-end, in which the Ego employs the object for the complete development of itself as Person. Thus the Ego has grasped its own unfolding into perfect selfhood as the infinite end which gives an infinite value to the object or means. We say the infinite end, since the Ego has returned from all external ends into itself as end, and so is not limited by anything outside of itself. We say infinite value, since the object cannot now be measured by any finite standard, and since its value springs from being means to an end which is infinite, namely the Ego as self-determining.

The object as means has, accordingly, reached its supreme integration with the Ego. But such an integration may be single, and hence may fall into Time and vanish. Hence it must be re-integrated.

(On the subject educational values, see the *Report on the Correlation of Studies* by Dr. W. T. Harris, United States Commissioner of Education. This report, the masterpiece of its author, is the greatest educational document that America has produced, and ranks very high in the world's literature of education. More profoundly than any pedagogical writer hitherto, this author grounds the elementary branches of the Common School upon their infinite value in unfolding the pupil, without neglecting their finite value in the utilities of human life.)

III. REDINTEGRATION.

Just as we found that it was necessary to have Retention following upon Attention in order to make permanent the work of Perception, so we find that it is necessary to have Redintegration following upon Integration, in order to make permanent the work of Apperception. Indeed this stage might be called Retentive Apperception. The Ego not only integrates the object with itself and content, but redintegrates the same; that is, integrates it over and over again, till it is fully internalized and ideally ordered. The apperceptive act must be repeated till the presence of the object is not necessary for the act, which takes place, after such repetition, purely through the Ego. Hence Redintegration makes

permanent the process of Integration, removing it from the external moment of Time, and fixing it in its own ideal Time in the Ego. Repetition of the external object through the Ego at last leaves it no longer external, but reduces it simply to an element of the process, which becomes thereby wholly internal.

Three stages of the movement of Redintegration we shall designate — Recurrence, Repetition, Habit. They constitute the Psychosis of Redintegration, showing the triple process of the Ego.

I. Recurrence is the immediate, involuntary repetition of the apperceptive act, usually caused by the presence of the object. I am reading in a book and I find a strange word, strange to me at least, let it be just this word *integration*; I integrate it as a sensuous object, and then read on, when I meet it again, and spontaneously redintegrate it; so I continue doing, till it becomes my intellectual property and I can use it myself. The word merely recurred, and I immediately responded with my integration. Thus we are always spontaneously integrating, whereof again we can detect the inner movement, which is that of the object perceived, as we have already observed under Perception.

1. Impression: the object appeals to the Ego, impresses it, and it responds. Thus the Ego is at first determined from without to make the act

of Integration, and the Recurrence impels the Ego to attend the object.

2. Attention: the Ego now voluntarily directs itself to the recurring object, which, however, still recurs by chance, is not made to recur by an act of will, though, when it does recur, the Ego pays Attention to it, which demands a volitional effort.

3. Retention: the object having recurred, the Ego not only attends to it, but repeats the act of Attention, and thus ideates the recurring object. The next step is that the Ego make the object recur through an act of will; but this is no longer Recurrence, which is external and involuntary. Herewith we have moved forward to a new stage, that of Repetition.

It is one of the most important elements of the training of the Ego to make it seize the advantage of every chance Recurrence, which is coming to it incessantly. This is truly the sphere of Opportunity, which the man must be ready for at all times, ready to integrate the recurrent facts and events of the world, which occur and recur every day. To be sure, that which simply occurs once externally he must make recur internally, but this brings us again to Repetition. The World's Fair, for instance, was one occurrence, but we have the power of making it often recur.

II. Repetition is a voluntary act of the Ego,

integrating over and over again the object; we might call the whole process by the name of Intentional Redintegration. Now the activity proceeds from the Ego, from within, and not from without, as in Recurrence; the Ego determines itself to Repetition, which is a separative act, since Volition is primarily a going forth of the Ego out of itself, while Repetition is made up of distinct acts, and hence is preceded by separation. Still the movement is to overcome just the separation of the object and to integrate it with the Ego.

The importance of Repetition in education may just be noticed in passing. It is, indeed, the formal act of learning, the child has to repeat and review his lesson till it be thoroughly integrated. How many thousands of Repetitions are necessary in learning to read, beginning with the letters of the alphabet! Repetition is the mind kneading the mind, which has to be wrought over many times, till it become pliable, form-taking, responsive to the object. *Repetitio mater studiorum* is an old educational maxim, much enforced by the Jesuits.

The Ego repeats the object which it has selected, and turns away from what it has rejected. In Repetition there is a selection of the thing repeated; this selection, being the act of the Ego, will manifest three phases.

1. Interest: the mind primarily takes up

what interests it, chooses that, integrates it, and repeats the integration. Man wishes to see again what he likes. Already we have discussed Interest under Selective Integration; here the fact is that the Ego will of itself repeat and completely integrate that in which it is interested. The use of this psychological fact has an important place in the School; the teacher is to bring about, as far as is reasonable, this spontaneous movement to Repetition of the lesson on the part of the student.

2. Value: the Ego will take up what has value for it and for its legitimate purposes, and integrate the same. We have to learn our profession, in order to earn our bread; the finite ends of life have their value, though this too be intermediate and finite. The object which is useful to us we integrate and reintegrate in order to make the same our own. Usefulness or the finite value of the thing learned, is the second stage of integrating instruction.

3. Infinite value: the destiny of the Ego is to unfold itself into perfect selfhood, to become actually what it is potentially. Such is its infinite end, in which it is truly free, that is, self-limiting and self-legislating; the thing which conduces to this end has infinite value, and ought to obtain the completest integration. Education and its instrumentalities have this infinite value for the Ego. So important are

these instrumentalities that they must be selected in advance for the child, whose sole vocation in his early years is to redintegrate them in the school, whereby he develops into possession of himself as well as into the culture of his race.

It will be noticed that these three stages of Repetition, whereby the object is redintegrated, bear the same names as those of Selective Integration. We observe, in fact, the same general process of the object, yet with a special difference; there the Ego selects and integrates the object simply, here the Ego selects and redintegrates the object, till the latter becomes an ideal element of the Ego. There the object was taken up in the process and ideated; here the object and the process are taken up and ideated together, so that the Ego is in possession of both, and no longer needs the presence of the external object.

III. Habit is the unified result of a number of repetitions both of the object and of a series of objects; each is redintegrated by separate acts of volition, till the whole series becomes united with the Ego as one object, and requires but one effort of will for starting. Take the well-known instance of learning to play on a musical instrument; to strike each key of the piano demands at first a distinct act of volition, till the movement of the fingers becomes a habit, when the player no longer attends to his hand, but looks at the notes before him, or glances off into vacuity.

The process, once under way, goes of itself, that is, unconsciously, to the end.

Thus the Ego has taken up into itself the separate repetitions and has unified them into Habit, which means that the Ego possesses the whole series or cycle as a unit. Habit is said to be automatic, it requires but a single stimulus or a single volition at the beginning, after which it runs like a machine moved from the outside. We will to take a walk, without further conscious volition the legs move and complete the long succession of movements. Repetition through Repetition does away with Repetition, becoming the latent factor in Habit.

The Ego will have its process in Habit, integrating the series with itself spontaneously, then separating the same from itself, and at last forming the new Habit.

1. The Ego loves Habit, it naturally forms Habits as an element of its inmost Self. I acquire the Habit of Industry or Economy; or the opposite Habits, those of Idleness or Wastefulness; good or bad, they are Habits which the Ego has by its very nature to generate. That is, the many separate Integrations must become one complete Redintegration, which, though the creation of the Ego itself, dominates it, rules it with a rod of iron. Wherewith we begin to see the necessity of a new stage.

2. The Ego becomes the slave of Habit, and

seeks to shake off its slavery. Thus a separation takes place; the Ego withdraws itself from Habit, or from some given Habit, regarding the same as external, as outside of itself. And indeed, Habit does get to be mechanical, a kind of machine which, once set a-going, seems to run without the help of or even against the wishes of the Ego. Especially is this the case with physical Habits; eating, drinking, smoking all engender enslaving Habits which the Ego resists, or may resist. So the Ego hates Habit, fights it, and is not always victorious. Such opposition does not necessarily arise against the so-called bad Habit merely; the Ego begins to dislike any Habit when this gets to be mechanical, external, no longer an inherent part of itself. For thus the Ego finds itself cramped, thrust into limits, whereas it is by nature limit-transcending. Often the Habit which was once pleasurable — notably the Habit of teaching — becomes burdensome through much repetition, because it has dropped from self-active spontaneity on the part of the instructor to the grind of a machine. The teacher must be eternally alive with the Psychosis, else Habit will become his mill.

3. The Ego, having fallen out with the old Habit, separates itself from the same, and retires into its inner Self. But just this separation and self-return is the new Habit being formed; for

the Ego must form a Habit even against Habit. Thus the Ego goes back to its first stage and becomes spontaneous again, yet after having passed through the different, the opposite, here the mechanical; from the Habit breaker it rises to being the Habit maker, which is just its process and completion in this third stage. Thus it has reached beyond its limit, and found freedom, not simply by destroying the old but by creating the new Habit.

The apperceptive act is now complete. It first took up and integrated the object with the Ego and its content in an external fashion; then it selected the object and integrated the same according to its own interest and needs; finally it has reintegrated the object not only as a separate single thing, but has made a new integration of it into a series or cycle, in which several correlated objects (events, actions, things) are still further unified. Thus has arisen an order within an order, and the single object takes its place in what may be called the social system of the Ego. The work of Apperception is done.

Moreover, the inner society of the Ego with its objects ordered and integrated into Habits is the source of the outer society of man, in which Habit again will be a most important factor of order and organization. The Ego will realize itself, it will make its own world to live in, and make it after the pattern of itself. Indeed what

else has it ultimately to take as its pattern? Society is the Ego realizing itself in the world.

Herewith the entire process of Sense-perception is brought to a conclusion. The object which in Sensation came upon the Ego in a vast, ceaselessly flowing stream, has been separated, taken up and ideated in Perception, and has been integrated with the Ego and its content, ordered and organized in Apperception. The object as an external thing, event, act, has come to an end, having been internalized and united with the Ego in all the stages of the latter's movement. It is not destroyed, but is actually preserved and made permanent, being rescued from the negative might of Space and Time, and being transformed into an ideal object out of sensuous externality.

Thus the Ego has made the object one with itself. But the process of the Ego requires separation as well as unity; accordingly the Ego separates this ideated object from itself, holds the same up before itself as distinct, whereby this object, still retaining its ideality, becomes Image. At this point we pass out of the first stage of Intellect, which is Sense-perception, into the second stage, which is Representation.

Looking backward again, we may observe that when the sensuous thing has been made to contribute to an infinite end, and thereby has been endowed with an infinite value, it has attained its

culmination. That is, when the object of Sense-perception has been completely apperceived by the Ego, and filled with the highest gift of Apperception (which is the gift of infinite value), then we are done with it as a sensuous object, it has reached its last destiny, and Sense-perception has come to its end through its final fulfillment.

If we take in the entire sweep of the present sphere, we see that the outer chaotic world of Sensation, with which we started, has been transformed into an inner ordered world of Apperception. We see also that Apperception returns to Sensation in a certain sense; both strive to have totalities as their contents, worlds we have named them, though one be outer and the other be inner. Perception, on the contrary, particularizes, separates, and then internalizes; thus it is the mediating principle in the present sphere of Sense-perception.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON APPERCEPTION.

1. Apperception is, on the whole, foreign to English Psychology, though it is beginning to creep into recent text-books. The treatment of it, however, remains desultory and capricious; its special function in the total movement of the Ego is not distinctly seen, though it alone be correctly enough described. Sometimes it is placed here, and sometimes there, in a hap-hazard sort of a

way, a foreigner still, though he has to be recognized. We cannot help thinking that those two writers, Mill and Bain, famous for clearness, would have often been still clearer, could they have had the use of the word *Apperception*, and have seen distinctly its meaning.

The older German Psychology also shows a want of *Apperception*. To be sure, the term is used in fluctuating senses by Leibnitz, Kant, and Hegel, but in them it never came to its fruitage. Pages of Hegel can be pointed out, in which the nature of *Apperception* is distinctly set forth, yet the Hegelian Psychology has no developed *Apperception*.

The merit of having seen the importance and unfolded the true significance of *Apperception* belongs to Herbart and the Herbartians. We hold that this special work of theirs is the greatest contribution to modern Psychology. The recent discoveries of the physiological Psychologists are not to be underestimated, nor are they to be overestimated; their import for Psychology proper, however, cannot be deemed so great as the above mentioned work of Herbart and his school. Moreover, a most weighty practical interest, that of pedagogy, has been enormously benefited by the knowledge of *Apperception*. It gives us special pleasure to recognize herein the merit of Herbart, for on many points we differ from him. In fact we think

that his doctrine of the Ego, the fundamental principle of his Psychology, is nothing but a huge mistake, and really contradicts his doctrine of Apperception. But at present the far more agreeable duty is appreciation, and we trust we have shown this not only in word but in deed, by ranging Apperception among the cardinal activities of mind, and thus giving to it one of the loftiest niches in the beautiful, well-ordered temple of Psyche.

It is probable, however, that the Herbartians would disown the present writer as an expounder of their master. They will be apt to scent in the above treatment of Apperception an instance of the old faculty-psychology. The word *Apperception* is the Herbartian talisman opening the gates of Paradise, but the word *faculty* is the Herbartian devil, the frightful monster of the dark Underworld, where dwell Gorgons, Hydras, and Chimeras dire. It is simply astonishing to see what wry faces some of them can make at the bare mention of the term. Now we hold that the word *faculty* as applied to mind, can still be made to do good service, with a little correction. We notice that Herbart himself, after stoutly assailing the old faculty-psychology, still uses its terms, such as Perception, Imagination, Judgment. This contradiction, however, is very common in other schools beside the Herbartian; we shall come back to it later.

But after all discountings for excesses of various kinds and shortcomings, Apperception — the word, the thought and the application of it — remains the most fruitful contribution yet made to this century's Psychology, and the credit must be mainly given to Herbart.

2. On account of the importance of the term, the history of Apperception has been set forth with a good deal of care and learning by German writers. Many authorities are cited for its usage; of these we shall select four, all of them distinguished philosophers, whose employment of the term forms the chief landmarks in its history — Leibnitz, Kant, Herbart, Wundt.

The source of Apperception — both word and meaning — is usually traced back to Leibnitz, that seed-thinker of two hundred years ago, who planted so many thought-germs, which have since his time sprouted forth into sunlight. The word is scattered by Leibnitz through a number of treatises, and is used in mainly two fluctuating senses. At times Apperception seems to mean in Leibnitz about the same as self-consciousness; in an act of Perception I am conscious of perceiving, and this act of consciousness is something additional to Perception, and hence is named Apperception. The second meaning, however, is the source of the modern usage; according to it Apperception is an activity of the soul along with its content. The

thought, however, is not elaborated, it remains a germ.

Next, Kant makes much of Apperception in his *Critique of Pure Reason*, with a distinct Kantian sense, yet probably derived from Leibnitz. Back of the sensuous percept and of all external experience are the pure ideas, which render sensation and experience possible. The transcendental Ego has its forms, its own activities, which, however, are stimulated by the sense-world; the result is cognition. This inner activity of the pure Ego combining with the impression of the senses is called by Kant Apperception. Such an Ego is designated as transcendental since it lies beyond all external sensation and experience, and is, moreover, the condition of sensation and experience. Kant's Apperception, therefore, is the original activity of the Ego itself without including the acquired content of the Ego.

Herbart now follows and traverses explicitly the Kantian notion of the transcendental Ego. He denies the spontaneous, original activity of mind independent of experience. Here comes in Herbart's doctrine of the Ego (already alluded to, p. 27-9), which according to him has only the power of self-preservation (*Selbsterhaltung*) amid the battle of external impressions and ideas always taking place on its own arena. Through this very one-sidedness, however, Herbart puts

the greater stress upon the acquired content of the Ego and its importance in every form of cognition. The result is, he establishes the new fact of Apperception, really the significant fact of it, and thus makes permanent his contribution. Many of his followers do not accept his doctrine of the Ego; but quite everybody, disciple or not, accepts his doctrine in reference to the content of the Ego co-operating in the act of cognition. Its far-reaching importance both in psychology and pedagogy we shall once more impress upon the student, who is to cherish always the great deeds of the heroes of his science.

After Herbart the most important contributor to the development of Apperception is Wundt. His work in this aspect may be divided into two parts. First he has physiologized Apperception, tracing its course from the outer nerve-stimulus to the sensory centers, thence to the apperception center, which is located by him in the front part of the cerebrum, etc. Much of this is conjectural, much of it is simply a translation of the psychical fact obtained by introspection into physiological language, whereby little is gained, for us at least, and not a little is lost. A far more solid contribution is the second part of Wundt's work, in which he insists upon the activity of the will in Apperception, neglected by both Kant and Herbart. Upon the basis of will the chief distinction in the psychological

process of Apperception can be made, which appears in the preceding account as Simple or Spontaneous Integration, and Selective or Volitional Integration, and has its parallelism therein with the antecedent stage of Perception and the succeeding stage of Memory.

Such is a brief statement of the usage of the term Apperception in the works of the most eminent thinkers who have employed it — Leibnitz, Kant, Herbart, and Wundt. In this line of usage we observe a continuous unfolding. (For a fuller account of the history of Apperception, see Part III of *Lange's Apperception*, translated by the Herbart Club.)

In the preceding treatment of Apperception we have sought to give validity to all its elements as developed by time, and to order its movement internally and externally, that is, in relation both to itself and to the total sweep of Psychology. In Apperception must be the element of the original, self-active Ego (Kant); in it must be also the element of experience (Herbart); in it must also be the element of will (Wundt), both unconscious and conscious. Still, further, Apperception must be grasped as the Psychosis, the living unitary principle of every psychical process, however minute; thus it can specialize itself into the smallest details, without becoming isolated. For there has to be specialization, but there need not be isolation. Finally the move-

ment of Apperception must be seen genetically, evolving itself out of what goes before and into what comes after, by its own inner necessity. That it follows Perception and is succeeded by Memory is not a whim or an accident, but a psychological evolution.

Too often has its treatment been capricious, it has been picked up anywhere and dropped anywhere, at the mercy of the expounder, who has recognized no law and felt no inner ordering principle in the movement of his own Ego.

All of which simply declares that the apperceptive act itself must apperceive Apperception; the Ego is not to stand outside of its own activity, and glibly talk of the same as something wholly different from itself. The height, therefore, of Apperception is rightly to apperceive Apperception.

3. The relation of Apperception to Pedagogy has been already mentioned, and may be here looked at for a moment. It is not the Ego alone but the acquired content of the Ego also which integrates the given object; it is knowledge which assimilates knowledge; it is the intellectual capital already won which chiefly wins other capital. The act of learning is essentially an act of Apperception; the child, through its acquired knowledge, acquires the new knowledge.

The question then rises, what knowledge best

apperceives knowledge? What shall be the true order of imparting instruction to the pupil? The school curriculum thus becomes of great importance. The studies of one day, month or year must be so chosen, arranged and taught that they are the best apperceptive preparation for the studies of the next day, month or year. Thus education begins to base itself practically upon the fundamental psychological process of learning. Apperception alone, however, cannot tell what studies are to go into the curriculum, though it has much to say about the order and manner of instruction.

4. The relation of Apperception to the doctrine of Association has been already touched upon, and will again be considered under Memory. Here, however, we may request the reader to note that what we have called Simple Integration is the primal phase of Association; the Ego with its content integrates or associates the sensuous object spatially and temporally, which is the foundation of the so-called Law of Contiguity in Space and Time. An integration also takes place when the object resembles some previous content of the Ego — Association by Resemblance. The fact now to be noticed is that the Ego spontaneously takes up the external world, and makes the same coalesce with itself. Hereafter the Ego will be equally ready to break this coalescence and to separate the associated

object from itself. Both activities, as often seen already, are inherent in the Ego, constituting phases of its complete process.

5. At this point, then, the sense-world comes to an end, as far as it is presented immediately. The particular external object has been made internal, and so has reached its true destiny. But not only the single object, but the totality of the sense-world in a degree is transmuted into the Ego. We may use a metaphorical expression and say that the percept is now laid away in the storehouse of the mind, and there shares in the ideality of the Ego; its reality has vanished, the non-Ego has been taken up and identified with the Ego; the object is now made a participant in the Self, is endowed, so to speak, with selfhood, no longer being externally present, no longer coming to the mind through the senses, but through the mind itself. Moreover, the object is no longer in an external Space and Time, but these have become internal with it, and it is now in its own Space and Time.

Manifestly we here behold the starting-point of a new realm, the external object is internalized; what shall we call it now? It is the mind's copy of the object, or rather the object as mental; it is the image. This image is itself to be taken up by the Ego, not from the outer world, but from the inner, not through the senses but through the Ego itself, and is to obtain a second

presentation, which has been often called a representation. The Ego therein perceives the object within, the outer object having been over-made into the semblance of itself. What has the object lost? Its reality, its externality, its material fullness, and specially its independence. It is now correlated, it has taken its place in an order, possibly in the universal order, if the Ego concerned is able to construe the same. Such is the ideality of the object, for in Sense-perception the Ego is ideal, but in Representation the object also is ideal, is Image.

RETROSPECT OF SENSE-PERCEPTION.

The student has now before him the entire sweep of Sense-perception in its threefold movement — Sensation, Perception, and Apperception. Each of these has again subdivided itself, not externally and capriciously, but internally and organically. Thus division has manifested itself in sufficient abundance; but at the same time there has always been the return out of division through the unifying act of the Psychosis. The unity of the mind has been vindicated (if we have succeeded in winning our point) to be not a dead, blank identity, not a mere negative unity which negates difference and then ends itself in such negation, but a living, yea a thinking unity which is the process of the Ego itself.

1. The first fact, accordingly, in this brief review is the Psychosis of Sense-perception, whereby the latter is seen to be one act of one mind, specializing itself, yet just therein going along with itself and remaining itself.

The three stages — Sensation, Perception, Apperception — are the three stages of the Ego in its process of internalizing the object; Sensation is the immediate, Perception is the divisive, Apperception is the unitary stage. But these designations are not the Psychosis by any means, though they be the preparation for it; they still leave the mind of the learner in a state of separation, division, analysis, helplessly floundering in the trammels of nomenclature, out of which the Psychosis must rescue him. This rescue comes when the Ego beholds itself as the inherent process of these three stages, and thus knows itself not merely as their abstract unity but as the concrete act of their unification. The Ego of the learner must recognize itself as the living center of knowledge before it can know with any degree of completeness. The Ego thus identifying the Ego as the process of Sense-perception is the Psychosis of the latter.

Nor must we omit to notice in this retrospect that each of the three stages above mentioned (Sensation, Perception, and Apperception) is itself a total act of the Ego, and thus manifests by itself the Psychosis. Indeed, however

minute the act of the Ego, it is the whole Ego which acts, whereby the Psychosis again is shown. The unifying principle of mind must reveal itself in the smallest act of mind, just as the unifying principle of matter (itself therein a reflection of mind) reveals itself in the smallest microscopic speck of dust through gravity. It is a most important (though neglected) part of psychology to set forth this vital oneness of mind, which is the counterpart and the antidote to the ordinary psychical vivisection, life-endangering if not life-destroying, which has the habit of slashing into the mental organism pretty much anywhere, and leaving the dissevered fragments scattered about the dissecting room. Undoubtedly we must have division, dissection, and even amputation; but we can also have the healing (whole-making) restorative power of the Psychosis.

To carry this retrospect into some further detail, let us fully make our own the fact that Sensation is a Psychosis, is the total movement of the Ego, yet in a special form; that the Ego in Sensation first takes up immediately the molecular movement of the Senses, then separates itself from the same, othering and negating it, and finally restores and re-creates the sensuous object which started the molecular movement, thus manifesting the complete activity of itself. In like manner the Ego in Perception

though in its divisive stage specially, shows its total movement through the three stages of Impression, Attention, and Retention. The same holds true of Apperception, of which we have just given an exposition. All these stages are capable of still further specialization and division, which, however, must be again made whole and restored to the psychical totality through the Psychosis.

At this point it becomes plain that we can forecast the future movement of psychology. If we have found its law or its universal method, we can in a general way know what is to be as well as what has been. We can, and must, to a degree, create its process; indeed we shall find that to think is to re-create the process of the Ego in the object. This process we can know and foreknow, being the most intimate fact of ourselves; thus we get a double relief: our inner world is freed from caprice, and our outer world from chaos. The Ego is, in its true reality, the order and the orderer; but it bears within itself the possibility of being disorder and the disorderer. It can insist on remaining in separation, discord, negation; but its supreme function is the Psychosis, which is always the return and the restoration.

2. The second point which may be here emphasized is the genetic procedure of psychology. This naturally follows from the foregoing

movement of the Ego, whose stages are unfolded one out of the other, the whole being connected by an inner process. It is the fundamental nature of the Ego or the Self to be creative or Self-unfolding; this fact of it is always to be shown in the development of its science. For example, in Sense-perception the three stages are not to be caught up at any place, defined formally, and then dropped out of sight; thus the Ego becomes the victim of its own divisive energy. The inner genetic act which passes, like an electric spark, from one separated part to another, must be made to manifest itself, since it is the vital link of connection. Again the formula fixed in words must be transcended, since the genetic act of the Ego is not a formula, which, however, is necessary to provoke it into realizing itself.

3. The annulment which the extended object has to undergo before it can become a percept is usually a point of some difficulty in Sense-perception. The spatial extension of the object is at the start annulled by the senses, for the extended thing cannot enter the corporeal organism immediately without destroying the same. If our physical body does not negate the material object in sensing it, the material object will negate our physical body. This knife easily enters my eye when spatially annulled; without such annulment its entrance would destroy my

eye. The senses of the corporeal system thus negate or annul the extension of the object, and in this annulled condition transmit it to the central organ through which the Ego is stimulated.

But the Ego, or the psychical activity, reproduces the object as extended, and projects it as real into the external world. That is, the Ego annuls the annulment and restores the external form, recreating the object after its annulment through the senses.

Herein we may note a characteristic of the Ego. It is inherently not negative, but the negation of the negative, and thereby positive. The Ego throughout Sense-perception has to annul the annulment of the object, and to posit the same anew; only thus can it know externality. This is the same fact which we have seen in the process of the Ego: it has to overcome the stage of difference, division, negation, and thus attain its true unity. The object as merely external is non-Ego; this is what must be annulled in the act of Sense-perception, which is the Ego negating the non-Ego, whereby the object is internalized and reproduced.

To the student of thought it may be worth while to mention that the characteristic of the Ego above described is what some philosophers have called its "negativity." That is, the Ego takes up the negative, but takes it up in order to negate it and thereby to become positive. In

this universe of ours the great positive fact is the Ego (human and divine), since it gets to be only through the negation of a negative. So the "negativity of the Ego" is more deeply a positivity.

4. The question may be asked, what Ego, whose Ego is this to which appeal is so often made in psychology? Primarily, it is your own particular Ego which is now thinking and acting, the Ego of the individual, whose characteristic is to know itself, to be self-conscious. In the second place, it is the Ego of your neighbor, which your Ego recognizes to be like itself, fully endowed with self-consciousness. Thus you and he are one, yet two, and many. In the third place, the Ego of psychology is the universal Ego, the common element in all Egos, yours, mine, and the rest; so that we recognize the psychical process as our own in particular, and everybody's in general. Idiosyncrasies, illusions, maladies, insanities form important by-paths in the science of the Ego, but the present book intends to survey only the highway along which travels the universal human soul in its career of development.

CHAPTER SECOND.—REPRESENTATION.

The result of Sense-perception is that the external object has been internalized, and has been brought into implicit, unconscious unity with the Ego. The next great step is that this internalized object is made explicit, and rises distinctly into the field of consciousness; it becomes object, though still internal.

The Ego separates itself from its own ideated content, reproduces the same, which it holds up before itself, and calls the *Image*. The Ego, having translated the outer object into percept, now translates the percept back again into the object, which, however, remains internal, being the Image aforesaid. This is the second great Sphere of the Intellect, the separation, which deals with the explicit Image in all its manifestations, and is called *Representation*. It rep-

resents the object in the new form of Image, which is now the central fact of the mental process.

The Image has been present in Sense-perception, but we have paid no attention to it, inasmuch as we were always looking at the sensuous object and were watching its development through the Ego. No difference between image and object entered the mind distinctly, they were one and unconscious throughout Sensation, Perception and Apperception, which were the process of unifying the external object with the Ego.

But in Representation the object is presented a second time, not by mere repetition, but in a new form, taken by the Ego from the Ego, and known as its own. Now the difference between image and object is posited, is the central conscious fact, controlling the whole sphere of Representation. Thus the second stage of the Ego, that of separation, is here emphasized, but of course we must carefully observe what is separated. Note accordingly, again, that the thing which is now separated is object still, but the object which has been ideated with the Ego previously, and then removed and held up by itself. Such an object is internal, ideal; yet a copy of the real object, at first a mental portrait of the reality.

The Image is, therefore, the new object in the world of Representation, as the material

thing was the object in the world of Presentation. The Image is not given to the Ego from without, but taken out of the Ego from within; this calling forth the separation of the internalized object is the first stage of Representation, whose whole process takes place in the mind. In Sense-perception the object was furnished from the outer world; in Representation the Ego furnishes the object; I reproduce it out of myself. The tree which I see before me is a percept; but when I separate this percept, and look at it within and not at the tree without, I have the Image before me. Similar to the original it is undoubtedly, but also dissimilar; the external realm has been internalized and made my own.

The Image is the Ego's, and is next to go through the process of the Ego; thereby it is to become more deeply identified with the Ego. It will unfold from being the mere external copy of the object to being filled with the content of the Ego in the Symbol, when it will pass over into Thought.

The Ego in Representation is, therefore, reproductive, reproducing the Image, which was previously implicit. But the Ego in Sensation was also reproductive; that is, it had to reproduce the sensuous object before it could experience a sensation. It has already been noted that when I see a house and take it up into my Ego, I

annul its extension, its geometrical figure, and then re-create it and project it out of me, transforming the external object into the product of my own activity. In Representation, however, the Ego reproduces the Image, that is, reproduces the reproduction of the object in Sensation, the sensuous object not being present, though reproduced. Now the object is the Ego's own, being made by it or made over by it, and hence is the ideal copy, picture or mental likeness of the external thing. In like manner Perception and Apperception are stages in the unfolding of the object present yet reproduced by the Ego. Representation is, however, the reproduction of the Image, that is, the reproduction of the reproduction of the sensuous object, as given by the Ego in Sense-perception.

The first reproduction of the object is that of Sense-perception, the second is that of Representation. Now it is to be observed that this second reproduction involves the entire corporeal machinery of Sensation, the bodily organism is moved from within by the Ego, which becomes the stimulus instead of the external object and starts the neural molecular movement. When I recall the image of a house which I have seen, the retina is stimulated and acts in response quite as if the object itself were present. The Ego takes the place of the external visible thing, and of the waves of light coming from it; the

Ego is the excitation from within, and not from without, as in Sense-perception. In order the better to call up the image, I shut my eyes, I exclude light and all externality; the mean factor of Sensation, my nervous organism, is under the control of my Ego, and I stimulate the nerve-ends, thus reproducing the entire organic process. So, in Representation, the Ego is the whole cycle, stimulus and all; this cycle includes not simply the mean factor of Sensation but its external factor also, under the form of image.

We have already noticed that the Ego must reproduce or recreate the outer object in order to sense it, annulling its external shape as extended, and then projecting it anew as real. Only in this way can the Ego grasp any reality. The bullet before me cannot enter my brain directly; or, if it does, I am a dead man, and shall not be able to see it or anything else. But I now see it, I reduce its extension to the zero-point, I annul it as external, make it internal, then project it or reproduce it as object. That is, my Ego must ideally undo it and make it over again in order to possess it even as a percept present to the senses. Here lies the reason why the Ego can recall or reproduce this bullet as an Image; it has created the same in the act of Perception, and now in Representation reproduces that reproduction. The sensuous object having become the Ego's own through the latter's creative act,

is separated, individualized, held up by itself as Image. Such is the specially separative work of the Ego in the present sphere of Representation. The Ego in Sense-perception has to create the external world in order to perceive it; then it separates from itself (or reproduces) this created external world of its own, and this is the realm of the Image.

The present sphere of Representation lies between perceiving the real object and thinking the pure thought; it is thus the intermediate sphere of Intellect, which, however, not only lies between the two given extremes but mediates them. Through the Image the sensuous object moves into Thought by means of the activity of the Ego, which finally thinks the object, after sensing it and imaging it.

The sphere of Representation will continue as long as the Ego stands in relation to its mental copies, to its images of the external world. Herein we see the separation which is the characteristic of this sphere; the Ego is divided into itself and the copy, which dualism is what it is seeking to overcome. The Image is still different from the Ego, being taken from the external object, and bearing its likeness. The dualism just mentioned is not overcome till the Image transcends its limits and passes into Thought. This transition is necessary, inasmuch as the Ego, being more than Image,

being indeed Image-maker and master over the limit and all difference, can not be adequately represented by the Image, but must be expressed by something which transcends the same and thus corresponds with itself. Such is our glimpse in advance over into the realm of Thought, which is the third stage of Intellect.

It was said that in Representation the Ego was in its second stage, that of difference, separation, dualism. But in Sense-perception there were also repeated cases of this same second stage; the student is, therefore, to note carefully the distinctive act of the present separation, which is that the Ego separates the ideated object from itself and holds the same before itself as Image. Herein, then, we see the division in its special form, but we must see more, namely the Psychosis which underlies this movement, and which is the universal psychological act ever present in the manifestations of the Ego. Thus the separation just given is not an isolated, or a capricious distinction, not a disunited faculty of mind, but is an integral element in the total process of the Ego.

The movement of Representation passes through the following stages:—

I. Memory — the Image as copy of the external object is separated and identified, or is recalled and recognized.

II. Imagination — the Image as Symbol, in

which the Image is separated into Form and Meaning, through whose process with each other the Meaning moves more and more into possession of the Form, showing the various stages of Symbolism, and creating a world of Symbols.

III. Memorization — this world of Symbols having been created and externalized into objects, must be internalized by the Ego, whose destiny is to dwell in such a world. This last stage we might also call Symbolic or Apperceptive Memory.

Thus the image never vanishes in Representation; it corresponds to the sensuous object in Presentation or Sense-perception. For this reason the whole representative sphere might be called Imagination (the sphere of Image), were not the usage of the word too deeply fixed to indicate the entire second stage of Intellect. So we limit the word to the symbol-making power.

Through the Image man begins to create a new world for himself, of course out of existing materials. External nature may be looked upon as God's imagery or the Divine Act of Representation. What He makes as object unto Himself, becomes the real object. But the human Ego must first take up this real object, internalize it, unite it with Self through Sense-perception. Then in Representation this Ego must separate it from itself, and project it as the new ideal object or Image. Still further, the Ego pro-

ceeds to transform the Image, fills the same with its own meaning, and thereby calls forth the world of Symbols. Finally this symbolic world must be internalized anew by every Ego entering it; every child has to master for itself the Symbols made by its race. Such is the complete sweep of the Ego in Representation, whereof the more essential details will now be given.

Before starting, however, we shall once more call before us the Image (the central fact of the present sphere) as generated out of Sense-perception by the act of the Ego in its separative stage. The Image is the ideated object of Sense-perception, as separated in the first place from its immediate unity with the Ego, as separated in the second place from its immediate unity with the sensuous thing of which it is the copy, as separated in the third place from the stream of imagery (corresponding in this inner world to the stream of sensation in the outer) and thereby individualized into a distinct Image. All this is the work of the Ego, essentially a work of recreation; we may deem it a reconstruction of an inner temple of mind from the materials given by an external sense-world.

SECTION FIRST.—MEMORY.

The act of Memory, in its most general form, is the present reproduction of a past percept. There must have been the previous Sense-perception, which is now reproduced by the Ego and identified as its own. Such a percept becomes the Image, which in Memory is simply dealt with as the copy of the external object, and is not elaborated within itself into a Symbol or sign.

Leaving out the stimulus to Memory, which will be considered later, we observe in its total act three stages. First is the Ego separating from itself the Image, and holding the same apart from itself (that is, from the Ego) as something distinct, something individual. Second is the Ego projecting this disengaged Image into past time as a former experience or activity of

the Self, which is also active in the present. Here is the separation of the Ego into Then and Now; it was active then and it is active now; it divides itself, as it were, into two activities. Third is the Ego uniting both; it recognizes itself to be one and the same in both, and so identifies in a single process past and present. Thus the Ego knows itself as having persistence through Time, and performs the Psychosis of Memory by dividing itself into Then and Now, and unifying the twofold element into its own activity.

I meet to-day a gentleman on the street, to whom I was presented yesterday; I remember him. I must have seen him before in order to remember him, and I must now have some stimulus, which is the meeting him, in order to start the act of memory. What is the process which takes place rapidly in my mind? I first separate the Image of that former occurrence, which is ideated within my Ego; next, I must at this moment project the same Image into yesterday or into some past time, when the percept was received; finally I recognize myself to be the same person then and now, and therein identify my past and present activities, whose respective contents are the Image and the object. The spectre of the former gentleman blends with the real gentleman before me; I recognize him, whereof the outward sign is that I salute him and

may also call him by name. But I had to recognize myself before I could recognize the gentleman ; I had to know myself as one and the same in the Then and the Now, before I could unite Image and object, or connect a past experience with a present one. No doubt all this may go on very rapidly, but at times it can be slow, indeed I may be unable to make the identification. The complete Psychosis, however, must be made if there be an act of memory.

We have already seen in Sense-perception how the Ego comes upon the Time-limit of the object, and masters it through an act of Attention, which holds the perceived object fast and makes it persist through temporal succession, for a while at least. But the Ego in Memory carries the mastery much farther ; what has disappeared, it calls back to existence ; what has been lost in Time, it restores to Time, and thus anew conquers the Vanishing. The dead are resurrected in Memory ; even the external world having been once ideated by the Ego, is everlasting ; or if it passes away, it can again be called forth by the creative fiat. All past is present through Memory, and man lives in the eternal presence of his own total Self. Memory is what causes the soul to endure through all change, and makes the life of man a Whole and not a temporary fragment. In Memory there is, accordingly, a most powerful, indeed an overwhelming suggestion, which is

that the Ego persists through all duration; Memory is the mind's strong intimation of its own immortality.

Observe, then, that Memory makes the Vanishing vanish, and is therein the primordial negation of the Negative which is Time, the all-destroying, all-swallowing monster of the Universe, figured in the Mythus of the ancient Greeks under the name and deeds of Kronus, who was in the habit of devouring his children. But Time has to take his own medicine, which is properly administered by Memory, whereat he vomits up again everything that he has swallowed, sending forth past into present — a fact which is also hinted in the same old Mythus.

The Image or the mental copy of the object is preserved by the Ego unconsciously in Sense-perception, is fused into the simple unity of the Ego with itself, in which the conscious difference vanishes. The Image is not laid away in some brain-cell or nerve-fibre, or in any particular place; the Ego is just the inwardizing and idealization of all locality and particularity; it has its own Space and Time. Even though the Image should lie in some central tract, the questions still remains, How can the Ego pick it up? Here physiological psychology finds its chief difficulty in accounting for Memory; it seizes the mind as local and particular, not as ideal and non-material, and so attributes to

Memory the characteristics of matter, of which it is just the negation. We can hardly think of an act of Memory as "habit working in the nerve-centers," unless this habit be the Ego itself.

In Apperception we saw the Ego making the external object internal, and ordering the same through itself and its content. But in Memory the process is reversed; the Ego makes this internalized content external again, yet not as before, but as ideal; the sensuous object is recalled and recognized as Image. Thus Memory is, from this point of view, the opposite of Apperception, and springs from the reverse act of Association. We have already directed attention to the fact that the so-called Laws of Association move in opposite ways: they integrate (or associate) in Apperception, and they separate (or dissociate) in Memory. Still, to the latter activity the name of Association is usually applied, though it be primarily the work of Dissociation. The movement is, the Image is dissociated from the apperceptive Ego, or from the storehouse of the past, and is associated with the recollective Ego or with the object in the Present. Both acts, however, belong together, are parts of one process; there can be no Memory without both Dissociation and Association, the separating and the uniting; that is, every act of Memory must be seen finally as the Psychosis.

The usage of the word *Memory* is by no means uniform in the history of Psychology. It has often been employed to signify Retention as well as Recall, but the two are really opposite processes. To be sure, Memory is conditioned upon Retention, the percept must have been obtained and retained, before it can be recalled. Still the act of Retention pertains emphatically to Sense-perception, and not to Representation; the sensuous object must be ideated and preserved first, then its Image can be separated by the Ego.

Some psychologists have divided Memory into three distinct faculties, and called them the Conservative, the Reproductive, and the Recognitive. The Conservative faculty, however, stands for the work of Retention, as above noted; the Memory, as we use the word, does not retain but recalls. This last act of recalling the object is named the Reproductive faculty, or the act of resuscitating the unconscious percept to fresh life and presence in the Image. The Recognitive faculty is the act of recognizing the percept as the Ego's own; having been acquired at some former time it is now identified. This division, though it touches valid points, must be set aside, as it totally lacks the Psychosis.

We have observed that Memory, as a factor in the entire process of Representation, deals with the Image as the simple copy of the sensuous

object, which copy is separated from its ideated condition by the Ego, projected into past time, and recognized in the present. Now this process of Memory goes through the various stages of development; these stages furnish the true basis for the divisions of Memory, which are three.

I. Spontaneous, or Involuntary Memory; the immediate separation of the Image, without conscious volition; the spontaneous act of the Ego, which, being difference in itself as well as unity, divides the Image from itself through its own nature, being stimulated from without or from within. Here lies primarily the work of Association in recalling.

II. Voluntary or Intentional Memory; the separation of the Image is now intentional, being done by the Ego through its own will, which wrests the Image, by force as it were, from its perceptive condition. Herein Volition, not Association, is the chief power in recalling.

III. Systematic Memory; the Image is separated or recalled by means of a system, whose principle is in general to unite the spontaneous and the voluntary activities of Memory, which union is the common basis of mnemonical systems.

This last is the act of Redintegration, which unites the two previous stages, wherewith the development of Memory is brought to an end.

The Image has had everything possible done for it, when the Ego sets up this elaborate machinery to seize it and to tear it out of its state of implicit ideation. The reader must not fail to see the Psychosis in the foregoing movement of Memory, since just that is the spiritual life of it, as well as its integration with the totality of mind. Still further, in the following detailed exposition, the Psychosis is the common process in every form of Memory, and hence is its connecting principle not only internally with itself, but also externally with all Psychology.

I. SPONTANEOUS MEMORY.

The Ego disengages from itself the Image of the former event or thing *spontaneously*, following some bent or tendency of its own, which has been called into activity through a present event or thing.

The classic instance is taken from Hobbes' *Leviathan* (I. 3): "In a company in which the conversation turned upon the late civil war, what could be conceived more impertinent than for a person to ask abruptly, what was the value of a Roman denarius? On a little reflection, however, I was easily able to trace the train of thought which suggested the question; for the original subject of discourse naturally introduced the King (Charles I.), and of the treachery of

those who surrendered his person to his enemies; this again introduced the treachery of Judas Iscariot, and the sum of money he received for his reward.”

Here an event of the present disengages through the Ego an image of a past event by means of the similarity of the two events in the mind the person indicated. This was manifestly a company of Royalists; suppose it were a company of Puritans conversing of the same occurrence. The association would have been just the opposite. The mention of the King would not have recalled Christ, but Judas Iscariot at the start, whose fate the Puritan Ego would have deemed parallel in desert to that of the traitor monarch, though the one executed himself and the other was executed. Note, therefore that the native and acquired tendencies of the Ego determine the association and the recall of the image, though the external object or event is the stimulus of its activity.

In the spontaneous flow of images one after another, the Ego seems to be working automatically; it separates image after image from its stores, without any conscious act of will. Some phase of this process is going on all the while, constituting the unconscious background of the Ego's activity; the mind is always linking together its present and its past in varied proportions. The will breaks into this stream of

images and brings forth the deed; but if the will lapse for a certain period and leave the Ego to its spontaneous working, we have the phenomena of day-dreaming or revery; then if consciousness be taken away by sleep, there is the sport of associating imagery known as the dream; finally if rationality be removed, there is the irrational play of association in the form hallucination and insanity.

Thus there is in Memory an inner world of images always rising from and flowing back to the Ego, as there was an outer world of sensations flowing to the Ego in Sense-perception.

Spontaneous Memory is the field of Association, or of Integration reversed. As Apperception ordered and internalized the sensuous object, bringing it into ideal implicit unity with the Ego, so Memory spontaneously turns about the process, and makes the ideal object explicit, free, separated, yet in a new union with itself through recognition.

Here again in Spontaneous Memory there will be a fresh movement of the Ego completing itself in three stages.

I. *First is External Association*, in which the external object comes to the image through the Ego, separates this image from its storehouse and unites the same with itself. I see a tree, I recall its place in my childhood when I played

under it, and the faces of persons who were with me there at successive times. Such an object has an ideal Space and an ideal Time in my Memory, and is recalled by the means of the real Space and the real Time of the Present, and is also recognized as my former percept.

1. As the sensuous object is ordered spatially alongside of the other contents of the Ego in Apperception and becomes image, so the Ego reverses the process and spatially restores this image to its corresponding sensuous object. The presence of the real man brings back the image of him as seen before, and an identification of the two, the reality and the image. Another man who was seen with him may be also recalled. Contiguity of place forms a link of Association, as well as sameness of place.

2. In like manner succession in Time associates two objects, and if the one be present, the other recurs spontaneously. If I saw two friends yesterday on the street, one shortly after the other, to-day the presence of either is likely to recall the other.

3. But in most acts of external Association, both these elements are fused; Space (alongside-ness) and Time (afterness) are commingled in an act of Simultaneity (togetherness). When I see two friends successively I see them also contiguously, that is, in a spatial environment in which they are joined. The Time-movement has

a Space-framework, more or less in the background, yet always visible.

We may again summon before us for comparison External Association in Memory and External Integration in Apperception, both of them dealing with the spatio-temporal element. In External Association we bring and join the Where of the Past to the Where of the Present, while in External Integration we bring and join the Where of the Present to the Where of the Past. In the first case we separate and recall, in the second case we unite and apperceive. We, seeing a copy of a picture by Raphael, remember the place where we saw it in Italy. At the start we integrate the place here (the present) with the place there (the past), apperceiving the present object through past knowledge; then, in Memory, we separate and recall one or both together, associating past with present, or the spatial There with the spatial Here. In like manner we both apperceive and recall the temporal element or the Then and the Now.

II. Such is the most external and mechanical of all forms of Association, that through Space and Time, and the product is the most external and mechanical of all kinds of Memory. But next the Ego begins to make distinctions in the object, separating it into qualities, as color, shape, size, etc., and to associate by means of

these abstract properties, they being abstracted from the total object. Such is what we may name *Qualitative Association*, in which the Ego is seeking to bring together the Image and the object on a deeper line, through a more internal bond. The previous stage took things in their outer wholeness, now they are divided up into manifold qualities, and the Ego asserts therein its own divisive principle. But even in qualities the act of distinction continues, some being distinguished as more internal and essential than others, so that Association may be profound or superficial, according to the quality associated.

We found in Apperception the qualities of the sensuous object apperceived and internalized, now the movement is reversed and they are called back to and by the sensuous object, and united with the same in the form of an image.

We may here also in Qualitative Memory distinguish the triple movement of the Ego.

1. *Resemblance*; in some quality the object is like the image, the latter at once moves from its anchorage and unites or associates with the former. The red color of the ball, or its round form, or its size may join it spontaneously to a former percept, and bring the same into memory.

2. *Contrast*; in some quality the object is quite the opposite of the image, still the latter

at once associates itself with the former. The giant calls up the image of the dwarf. It is manifest that the two opposing elements are united in the Ego, which must be itself both Resemblance and Contrast; the Ego must within itself be the opposite of itself, and in it the two sides of the contradiction must find their one underlying principle.

3. *Combination*; through contrasting objects they are united by an inner bond, they are made alike through being different, and thus associated anew. Memory now works through the total movement of the Ego, recalling and recognizing unity in multiplicity, the likeness in the opposition.

III. We have now reached the sphere of what may be called Total Association, which is the Association of totalities or of a whole integrated series. The Ego separates from itself, through the stimulus of the present object, a mass of previous integrations in the form of the Image, recognizes the same as its own, and unites it with the object. Or, the total thing, internally and externally, is disengaged and associated.

We found that the previous stage, Association through qualities, deepened finally into associating through the inner essence of things, through the common element in both Resemblance and Contrast, which common element lay in the unifying act of the Ego.

But now the totality of the object with its former integrations is separated from the Ego and recognized in Memory. For instance a botanist sees a red flower, it recalls not simply another flower, or another red object, but the very nature of the flower, or of the vegetable kingdom; in the one plant he beholds the science of botany.

Previously the apperception of the plant was the work of his Ego, which ordered the whole vegetable world. Now, in Memory, the process is reversed, the plant seen recalls the entire apperceived world of plants, recalls the total Ego as organized in botanical science.

Herein we shall point out the three stages, which show themselves in this sphere.

1. The object stimulating the Ego, causes it to disengage an integrated cycle or order of images, which are united together in the Ego. The object comes upon the Ego, which by its very nature has to respond and separate not only some single image, but a little family of images, or perchance a large family of them. So in the instance just given, the presence of the one small plant may call up the total organization of the plant-world in the mind of the botanist.

2. Just as in integrating the sensuous object different Egos manifested the greatest differences, so it is in the reverse process, that of associating the integrated cycle of images with the stimulating object. One person travels through a country

and sees little or nothing; another person, coming with due information or with the right stores of apperceptions, has the most wonderful power of Association, and obtains a vast increase of his knowledge. Hence the somewhat paradoxical statement: a person finds in a new country what he brings with him. In fact, not only new countries are thus made known, but also new discoveries in science are brought to light. Through his previous integrated stores, Newton associated the fall of the apple with the movement of the earth and the rest of the planets.

3. Amid these manifold differences of the individual Egos, however, we are to return to the common element; they all have this process of disengaging the integrated series of Images, and of associating them with the present object. The outcome of the movement of Total Association is that the Ego grasps itself as this process of the disengagement and new association of the integrated series. It knows itself as the entire movement stimulated by the external object. But this object next is controlled by the Ego, wherewith we have passed into a new sphere.

Taking a look back at the movement of Spontaneous Memory, we observe the Psychosis in its three stages, corresponding to the immediate, separative, and unitary stages of the Ego. Still its special characteristic persists through

this whole process; that is, Spontaneous Memory remains spontaneous, it is stimulated to activity primarily from without, responding immediately to the external stimulus.

But the Ego in Total Association begins to determine the object, having unified its divisions, and recalled it as a whole. Still the object is the stimulus to the Memory, which takes it up, yet as unified by the Ego. Thus the object is implicitly determined by the Ego, which is next to determine the same explicitly in the matter of separating and recalling—Voluntary or Volitional Memory.

II. VOLUNTARY MEMORY.

The Ego withdraws itself from the element of Impression and Association, collects itself within itself and proceeds to recall through an act of Will, that is, to separate the Image wished for from its apperceived condition and to identify the same with the object.

In this movement of Voluntary Memory we shall observe three stages:

I. The recall through an immediate act of Will takes place.—The Immediate Seizure of the Image.

II. The recall through an immediate act of Will is negated, and so does not take place, the process of Memory is broken atwain.—Forgetfulness.

III. The recall takes place through a volitional act united with a spontaneous act, by whose combined power, Forgetfulness is overcome.—The Mediate Seizure of the Image.

In the present sphere the Ego selects what it seeks to recall, hence Voluntary Memory is parallel with Selective Integration of the preceding sphere of Apperception.

The previous stage of Memory, the spontaneous, showed the Ego acting immediately in response to Association, and separating the image from its storehouse through the stimulus of the object. But now there is the Will entering and making the separation through its activity; the Ego frees itself from the outside influence of Association, or uses it at discretion, summoning itself to proceed from within. Thus the Ego wrests the image from Apperception, and brings the same before itself by an act of Volition, whereby the Ego is shown dividing itself from the external power of Association. This is Voluntary Memory, whose energy comes from within the Ego, by intention. It must know and recognize beforehand what it seeks.

Herein too we observe the separation: the Ego withdraws itself from the outer determination through the object, and determines itself internally to fetch the image from the latter's hiding-place.

I. *Immediate Seizure.* We wish to recall the

name of a certain person; the Ego of its own inner power collects itself and throws itself upon the object sought for, which lies somewhere in our past experience, seizes it directly and drags it into the present. Such is what we call the Immediate Seizure of the Image by Memory (Volitional), the total Ego of the present reaches out and grasps some particular of the past, separates it from its apperceptive condition and makes it again present in image.

The peculiarity of Volitional Memory is that it knows beforehand what it wants to get, it recognizes in advance of separating. A certain face I wish to recall when I hear a name; the knowing that I have such a face in my storehouse goes before the recall; when I have recognized it, I recall it. In Spontaneous Memory the image rises of itself through Association with some object and is then recognized.

We shall seek to grasp the general trend of Immediate Seizure, which has many shades.

1. The child's Memory is known to be the most immediate of all, showing the Immediate Seizure of the immediate object as recalled or imaged. Its stores are easily separable, they still stand near to the sensuous object, they do not sink away into the universality of the Ego, but remain special. The child best remembers the particulars of Sensation; Memory is still akin to Sensation, hence its readiness, its vividness.

2. But with Age the Ego generalizes, classifies, and therewith the Memory loses its character of particularity. It now seizes and recalls reflection, abstraction, the class which embraces the particular. Thus Memory recalls the object as double, as image on the one hand, and as general notion on the other. A child may picture far more vividly a church than a grown man; yet the latter will recall it also with its class, as a Gothic church for instance. Note here the twofoldness of the object recalled.

3. Finally the power of the Memory over the particular almost ceases, while the general advances decidedly into the foreground. The principle is remembered, while the special incident or object has a tendency to fade away. Such is the case mostly with old men; they are wise because they are universal; the youth chafes at their wisdom, because he has particularity; with the one the general principle is the rule, with the other concrete instance. Still the old man must seize immediately, for instance, the thought together with the word which he wants for expressing the same, else he is unintelligible. Indeed if one loses his memory for particulars, the memory for generals is undermined, since the general principle also has its particular element, namely, it is this principle and not that.

Thus Memory develops a negative side, it loses its power of recall, while possessing the object;

it through itself passes over into Forgetfulness, which belongs to all ages, yet is most manifest in old age.

II. *Forgetfulness*. The act of separating the Image is not always under the immediate control of the Will. The Ego is unable to disengage the Image from itself at command, without the spontaneous element of the Ego. In Forgetfulness the Ego is in a state of self-opposition: it knows that it has an ideated object within itself, still it cannot recall the same. The Ego as Volition commands the image to be given up, but the Ego as Retention refuses to respond. The effort must now be to overcome Forgetfulness; this is accomplished by putting the ideated content under the control of the Will. The movement is as follows:—

1. The simple form of Forgetfulness is the mere lapse of Memory between two periods of time. You go to town to attend to some matter, but you forget to do so; you think of it before you leave home and after you come home. The Will does not act at the right time, there is a spontaneous lapse; other things crowded out this activity possibly; such a case we may entitle a case of Spontaneous Obliviscence.

2. From this involuntary lapse of Memory we pass to the direct defiance of the Will on the part of Memory, or of the ideated content. We try to bring back such and such an event or date;

there is a most direct refusal given to Volition, which recoils from the effort thwarted. Thus the separation between the Will and the thing willed is complete, is acknowledged. The Ego is aware that it has the treasure asked for, but it declines to yield the same to authority. It is thus divided within itself, it commands itself, but does not obey itself, it has lost self-control — a striking instance of the divisive stage of the Ego.

3. Such a deep inner scission contradicts the nature of the Ego, destroys its unity, which it must restore. Hence the frequent experience that after a desperate attempt to recall a matter, it comes back of itself, unbidden, when we are not thinking of it. Spontaneously the Ego does what it refused to do through Will. It seems that the Ego does not like to be tyrannized over, even by itself. External arbitrary power even in the Ego leads to a kind of revolt, till the spontaneous element be restored. In this way Forgetfulness is overcome by the Ego itself through bringing back the activity which was suppressed. This is done of its own accord, without the conscious intervention of the Will. Herein lies the suggestion of the manner of mastering Forgetfulness, and of training the Memory.

III. *Mediate Seizure.* The Ego now, instead of trying to remember by an immediate act of seizure and separation of the Image, employs a mediating method; it takes some object which

recalls the Image desired. The voluntary Ego in Memory now co-operates with the spontaneous element, and unites both in one process of recalling. Thus we shall behold Forgetfulness overcome, not spontaneously as just before, but mediately through an act of Will. In this way the Ego restores unity to itself after its inner division in Forgetfulness.

When we wish to remember the name of a person, we have often to recall first some object which we know to be associated with that name, and through this object recover the name. This is the Mediate Seizure of the Image, since it is not taken directly but through a mean or medium. Here we have the stage of unification in Volitional Memory, inasmuch as the Ego overcomes the separation from its object by a middle term, which, however, it seizes immediately through an act of will. Thus, too, Association plays in, since the movement from this middle term to the name is spontaneous, and the two kinds of Memory co-operate. Still the spontaneous element is invoked and controlled by the volitional, which is thereby the paramount principle.

The Ego wills to recall the Image, but cannot; the completed act of Memory is negated. Yet there is still some Memory, since the mind remembers that it has such a content, though it is unable to reach the same. Unless we remember

that we have apperceived such an object, the Will could not act at all, we could not even try to call out what we do not know that we have called in. But the negation lies against the separation of the Image, not against its existence in the mind. We know that we once put the fish into the water, though we cannot now catch it.

The Volitional Memory having been foiled in its immediate act of seizing the Image, will accordingly proceed to seize immediately something which will fetch back the Image. That is, Volition will now employ Association to detach what it seeks for. Hence the following stages.

1. *External Association.* The Ego will bring up the spatial environment or the temporal relation of the thing sought after. I see a face which I cannot designate; I think where I saw it first, when, under what circumstances. I orient it first, then I grasp the name, and possibly the character of the person. Association by contiguity (in Space and Time) is the means employed.

2. *Qualitative Association.* Not being able to recall the object, I grope for that which resembles it or forms a contrast with it. The name of a pupil which is difficult to remember, has some similarity to some familiar classic name which I can always recall; I use the one to fish out the

other from the sea of oblivion, employing Association by Resemblance, or possibly by Contrast.

3. *Total Association.* Equally certain is it that the Ego employs such a mean for bringing back a series of objects which are spontaneously integrated. The cue or catch-word has this purpose. The Memory recalls through Will one thing in order to restore the whole of which that thing is a part.

When the mean is found and the object or objects recalled, both together are united in the one act or process. The volitional element is still the paramount one, overarching and directing the spontaneous or associative element. It has recovered not only the immediate object, but also associations of the object, and thereby has wrenched the latter from Forgetfulness.

Yet not entirely. The Will may recall the mean, but Association may not respond to the mean. I see the face, and I may bring up environment and circumstances and resemblances, and I still may not recover the name or the personal identity which I seek. Somehow I must give to the mean its associative power, my volition must somehow reach over and control that. Such is the movement in the next stage of Memory.

Bringing together the entire sweep of Voluntary Memory we observe that it reveals the Psychosis as its inner process. In the first place

the Ego as Will seizes immediately the object to be remembered. Secondly, the Ego divides within itself, both remembering and forgetting; it forgets the name, but remembers that it has the name; the Will gets a half, as it were, and loses a half. Thirdly, the Ego restores itself from its divided condition by a mediating term which recalls the object spontaneously, through Association. Thus the Ego has passed through its three stages,—immediate, separative, and unifying — in unfolding Voluntary Memory.

But the Ego does not yet control the Memory's spontaneous activity, which is determined from without, by Association. Accordingly the Ego proceeds to get hold of this still external element of memory and to reduce it to the sway of the Will by means of some kind of a system. Systematic Memory has as its object to put Association into the power of Volition, and is now to be unfolded.

III SYSTEMATIC MEMORY.

The process of the Memory for completely vanquishing Forgetfulness gives rise to Systems of memorizing. The principle in such Systems is to make a certain series or totality of objects automatic, and this automatic total is put under the control of the Will. The object is recalled by the System, in which the spontaneous activity of Memory is subjected to Volition.

Already in Apperception we found that many single acts of Will repeated produce a chain of spontaneity. Now if we can interlink objects into such a chain, and put this chain under control of the Will, we have organized a System of remembering which has three main points: the making automatic the series, the associating the object with the series, the voluntary act of Will which can call up the series. All Systems require the Ego to be active in these three ways, whatever be their differences from one another.

We have already found that Voluntary Memory runs upon its limit and breaks down in Forgetfulness; the Will from within cannot always get hold of the Image and wrest it from Apperception. So it invokes aid from without through the power of Association; that is, it supplements its own defect with help from Spontaneous Memory. But Association also may refuse to act under the command of Volition. We may call up the name and bid it bring up the associated face, but the name may not obey. Thus the chasm between the volitional and the spontaneous act is not completely bridged over in Voluntary Memory. Association does not obey at the start; can it be made to obey?

There begins a new process of routing Forgetfulness from its last stronghold. External Association, which acts by chance, with more or less uncertainty on account of its externality, must

in some way be made internal and thereby subjected to the Ego. Thus the negative power of Forgetfulness in the present sphere is overcome, or is circumscribed in smaller limits than it otherwise would be.

The essential fact of Memory is the recall of the Image, or of the ideated form of the past experience, act, or event, which must be separated from the Ego by the Ego. To recall is to bring past into present, and to make over the whole process of Ideation; Memory resurrects the vanished object and recreates it before us. Manifestly the Ego must reverse the previous movement of Apperception, and separate from itself what was then united with itself. The Ego may not be able thus to whirl about and to reverse itself, at least not completely and immediately; it must have a mean, an instrument, a system for so doing. The historical event I can recall but not the date, which herein refuses to obey the order for recall. I therefore cast about to construct a mnemonical System, which interlinks the date into its procedure, and this procedure is subordinated to the Will.

The mnemonical System is, in general, constructed by the Ego to overcome the defect of Memory, which defect is usually the failure of external Association to act when it is called upon. Accordingly this external Association must be made internal and put under the author-

ity of the Will. Such a System in its unfolding is seen to pass through three leading stages.

I. The Ego spontaneously makes a mnemonical series, and integrates the object with the same.—The Natural System.

II. The Ego, becoming conscious of such a System, makes it through an act of Will, employing for such purpose Association.—The Artificial System.

III. The Ego, having found the Artificial System external, takes itself and its own process as the basis of a System of Memory.—The Rational System.

Thus the Ego, having traveled through various external Systems, and found them inadequate (though helpful, doubtless, in certain contingencies), comes back to itself as the center of a mnemonical System, with which it co-ordinates all the objects of its knowledge.

In all forms of Systematic Memory the first thing is to make the automatic chain into which we are to link the object to be remembered. That is, we are to integrate the series, which is the basis of the System. Now this integration is essentially the work of Apperception. If we employ for our System a collection of words these words must be internalized, ordered, apperceived till they become a spontaneous totality, a great team of many spans of horses, to which we are to hitch our single object that we may

draw it forth from Retention into Memory whenever we wish.

I. *The Natural System.* The integration of the mnemonical series is brought about by a number of repetitions which order and render permanent the System. In the Natural System such integration is spontaneous, not conscious at first, not intentional; the Ego of itself constructs the series by the mere presence of the object or objects, which stimulates this integrating activity of the Ego. To be sure, the Will enters when I voluntarily put myself in the way of the objects so that my Ego may integrate them of its own accord; still such an activity of the Ego is spontaneous, and constructs the Natural System instinctively.

Three phases of this kind of integration we may note here, corresponding to the stages of Redintegration in Apperception — Recurrence, Repetition, Habit.

1. *Recurrence or Involuntary Repetition.* I may integrate a series of objects into a kind of System simply by seeing them often. I live in a certain street, I have to pass a row of houses, a group of trees, with statues, fountains, churches, and other constituents of a total scene. Every day I behold and associate these objects, so that they become a cycle, or a System, with which I integrate all similar objects, and by means of which I recover any object thus integrated. I

have had no intention of making such a System, but it makes itself simply by the repetition of my walk. So during the whole of life we are unconsciously integrating these series of objects, events, scenes, and forming them into Systems, more or less interconnected.

Here, however, we are to put stress upon the fact that the Ego cannot help making some kind of a mnemonical series out of its environment; by its own nature it has to integrate recurring objects into a Natural System of Memory.

2. *Voluntary Repetition.* In this the Recurrence is brought about by my own volition. I repeat the scene with design, I go to see the objects again and again, till the whole is made into a System which works spontaneously. At first I had to repeat every thing through a special act of Will, finally, however, the external becomes internal, the conscious becomes unconscious, repetition does away with the need of itself through repetition.

We have now integrated a series and have become aware of the fact; we have found out that we can make our System, and hence can select that which is best for the same; we can take it out of the realm of chance or caprice. From the Systems forming spontaneously through mere Recurrence we can choose, but such a choice involves a standard of comparison which we may not yet possess.

Note, therefore, that such a System is still a Natural System, the immediate work of the Ego integrating the immediate object. My Will simply brings me into the presence of the objects, which stimulate my Ego to spontaneous activity.

3. *Habit.* We have already seen that the many separate acts of intentional Repetition must become one, that is, they must finally be automatic. Repeated Repetition brings forth Habit, or spontaneous energy in the given direction. The Ego must unify all these repeated differences, making them over into a single act; the Ego is simply asserting its own unity in uniting these separate repetitions.

We have now before us the idea of Systematic Memory, or remembrance through a System. We have already seen that the Ego naturally makes such a System or integrated series through Apperception. Memory employs this integrated series to recall the object which it seeks.

When the Ego through Habit has reintegrated the mnemonical series till it works spontaneously under the control of the Will, the Natural System passes over into the Artificial System.

II. *The Artificial System.* The Ego has become conscious that it makes of its accord a System of memorizing. Every day it integrates a smaller or greater series of objects, which series becomes a means of recalling things linked into itself. The Natural System is made

spontaneously, without preconceived design. But now the design is preconceived, and the question arises, Can we make a System in advance, and adjust the act of recalling to the same? The answer is, we can do so, and thus we produce the Artificial System in contrast with the Natural System, which has just been presented.

We found that the Ego through Repetition and Habit could get such complete possession of a mnemonical series that the latter would work spontaneously under control of Volition. That is, an act of will can start the series, which then goes of itself. Objects associated with this series are recalled by it, while it in turn is subject to the Will of the person recalling. Thus the object is put under the control of the Ego, and is recalled at will.

Every such Artificial System chooses beforehand some connected order of objects which must itself be integrated and made automatic as the basis of memorizing. Having mastered this given order the memorizer is to connect the object with the same in some form of Association — contiguity, resemblance, cause, etc.; then the System brings back the object when wanted. The word mnemonics is usually applied to Artificial Systems of Memory.

Now it is apparent that every form of Integration (or Association) can be made the basis

of mnemonical Systems, which may hence be classified according to the kinds of Association as follows:—

1. The Mechanical System comes first, which is a series of spatial Integrations; into these the object to be remembered is spatially linked. A system of geometrical figures, as squares or triangles, has been employed; these are divided into smaller parts and the objects are associated with these parts. A more extensive system is a house with its rooms, each of which has four walls, floor and ceiling; each of these is subdivided into nine squares, and each square has its associated object.

Thus Memory is aided by a system of localization in Space. Succession in Time might be used in a similar manner.

In fact, contiguity in Space and Time easily fuses both elements. Of such a mnemonical System one may justly affirm that it requires as much effort to learn it as to memorize the original object. Still if the Memory is utterly helpless, it may give some aid.

2. The Qualitative System, which System is next in the order of Association, is based upon Resemblance and Contrast. There must be an integrated series of similar objects with which the object to be remembered is united. Similarity of sound in particular has been applied to the learning of foreign languages. For instance, in

French the forgetful student wishes to remember that *Maison* means *house*; he may integrate the two into a mnemonical synthesis as follows: *Maison*, mason, wall, *house*. *Maison* resembles *mason* in sound, the mason's product is the wall, and the wall belongs to the house. Here resemblance makes the main link, the rest follow. Again: *Livre*, leaf, *book*. Probably wit, and certainly punning can be marvelously developed by practicing a system of connecting things by Resemblance and Contrast. The play of hidden Association has an unlimited range. A mnemonic genius has thus connected *pen* and *nose*: *pen* — penwiper — handkerchief — *nose*. A lively fancy is a valuable helpmeet in this System of Memory.

3. Already there have been indications of an Essential System. Take the causal connection which is often found interlinking objects in both the mechanical and the qualitative series. For instance, in the previous example, the mason suggests the house which is the product of his labor; the cause carries the mind over into the effect. The leaf calls up the book which is the totality of leaves; the part recalls the whole. Still further, the appearance recalls the essence, the outer the inner, the created the creator. The deeper fact is always rising to the surface and making itself either a link in the series, or the basis of it. After recalling through external Resemblance or Contiguity, the Artificial System

of Memory falls back upon the causal or the genetic connection of objects, which shows their true inner nature. We may associate two pictures spatially by the places in which we saw them, or qualitatively by their coloring or style of drawing; or we may associate them creatively by the ideas which called them into being. A genetic System of Memory is the truest and deepest, since it recalls objects through their integration in a genetic series.

The mechanical and the qualitative series undoubtedly furnish the groundwork for quite all the popular Systems of Mnemonics based as they are upon Association. Really, however, they are only an external help to start the self-activity of the Ego, a prod used to stir up the true Memory, which is ultimately to connect and to recall objects genetically, that is, through the thoughts or ideas which create them.

Herewith the distinctive activity of the Artificial System of Memory has come to an end. It was constructed by the Ego as a kind of mechanism for recalling the object at will. But the Ego has found that ultimately it has to connect and recall the object, not through any external relation, be it mechanical, or qualitative, or even causal; the essential relation is the final matter to be remembered, which, however, can only be grasped by the thinking Ego in its creative energy. The Ego is at last to integrate and to

recall the object through the thought of it, which is its primal creative principle, its essence; this is what the Ego is to recognize and to take up into its ultimate mnemonical series.

We may find an example in the matter nearest at hand. How shall we remember Memory? By recalling the place on the printed page of the book where we first saw it defined? Or by recalling the formula of words in which the definition was stated? Or shall we henceforth remember Memory genetically, as evolving itself out of Sense-perception, through the creative activity of the Ego? The Psychosis is the ultimate mnemonical series, which is to integrate every object that can be known and remembered, thus it (the object) is both cognized and recalled through its essence, through that which generates it.

Still, Artificial Systems of Memory have their place and their utility, there is no intention of denying their value within certain limits, but they are not the final principle of memorizing. Their tendency is, moreover, to produce an artificial, yea mechanical Memory, which may make the whole mind superficial and become thought-destroying. The so-called memory-cram, be it done directly or through a system, deserves a large share of its bad reputation. This, however, is not saying that there should be no memorizing.

III. *The Rational System.* This has been already indicated in a general way. The Artificial System seeks to get complete possession of the object by freeing it from the uncertainty of external Association, which is made internal and thereby controlled by the Ego. Thus it is that every form of the Artificial System at last leads back to the Ego as its creative principle, for the Ego is what produces the automatic mnemonical series for recalling the object. But the Ego has its own creative principle, or is in fact just the principle of creation in itself, being the Psychosis, the self-active process of the Self. This process of the Ego, as already intimated, is the ultimate mnemonical series, which is finally to integrate and to recall every object. We may name it the Rational or Recognitive System of Memory, since the Ego must now recognize the object as itself, identifying the same with itself, and then recalling the same through such recognition.

Having come back to the Ego again as the center, we may glance at it in the light of a System of Memory.

1. Every man, has to a greater or less extent, his own mnemonical System, into which he integrates and through which he remembers experiences, thoughts, facts, principles. Every Ego has its own inner central idea, which is its very nature, its view of the world (*Welt-*

anschauung), which it makes the core round which it gathers its feelings, its activity, its knowledge. Already we have observed in the Natural System of Memory that the mind cannot help making its mnemonical series out of its environment of objects. The Ego according to its bent and culture constructs such a series instinctively.

2. Hence results the great difference in the manner and content of Memory, since the Egos are so different. An evolutionist like Darwin has in his science an inner principle of mnemonics which has been developed into consummate alertness by his reading and observation; he will apperceive and remember everything which pertains to his subject and let the rest go. The historian like Grote gets to having a mnemonical system in his mind which can chiefly grasp, store up, and recall the historic fact. The philologist will remember the words and often nothing else. What a wonderful diversity among scholars in reading, say Herodotus? One sees the mythology, another the geography, another the history, another the dialect, etc. The vocation constructs a mnemonical System for most people, which often becomes a limit to Memory, quite as much as an aid. Thus mnemonical Systems vary according to the grand diversity of Egos, each with its own innate tendency, acquired knowledge, and special vocation.

3. Still they all have a common principle, every Ego must not only remember but *mnemonize*, employing some form of integration whereby objects are not only retained but recalled. As we have seen, every System of Memory comes back to the Ego, to its inner creative process which has constructed these various mnemonical Systems out of itself for its own behoof. It must get control of the Image and be able to bring Past into Present at will. This being done, Memory has reached its destination; the Ego through its own activity, through its own System, which is the process of itself, can restore the Image at pleasure.

Systematic Memory has now gone through its three stages, which we have designated as the Natural, the Artificial and the Rational Systems. These are seen to manifest the Psychosis, the first being the immediate act of the Ego in constructing a mnemonical System, the second being a consciously purposed act of the Ego in constructing a System more or less external to itself, the third showing a return of the Ego out of difference to its own process as its ultimate System of Memory. Such is the final getting possession of the Image by the Ego, namely, through the System of its own Self.

Having thus completed Systematic Memory, we may cast a glance back at the total movement of Memory, which in its triplicity is also a man-

ifestation of the Psychosis. First the Ego separates the Image immediately, spontaneously, stimulated from without to the act; secondly, the Ego separates the Image intentionally, determined from within, but is thwarted (negated) by Forgetfulness; thirdly the Ego constructs the System of Memory to thwart Forgetfulness in turn (to negate the negation), and thereby to recover the Image and to recall the same at will, through itself.

What is now the situation after the Ego integrates the object and recalls the Image through its own process? The Ego has become conscious of its mastery over the Image, and knows the same as its own; it has re-created the Image and made the same over into an element of its own creative activity. The Ego is now aware that it can transform the Image quite as it pleases. Accordingly it will proceed to the transformation of the Image into the Symbol, in which the Image (or the external object which it represents) is endowed with a new meaning by the Ego alongside or in place of its natural meaning. Thus the Meaning of the Image begins to rise into prominence in distinction from its Form.

Throughout Memory the Ego preserved the Image as the true copy of the sensuous object, which is to be recalled in its reality. But the Ego finding at last that this copy is its own creation, begins to employ the same for its own pur-

pose, especially for its own self-expression. The Image thus begins to be filled with a fresh inner significance derived from the Ego and shows the transmutation into the Symbol.

Therewith, however, we have made a very important transition, having moved out of the first stage of Representation into the second. We have passed from the Image as Copy to the Image as Symbol, the latter showing a fresh division with a new Meaning in the Form; we have also passed from a Copy-reproducing to a Symbol-creating activity of the Ego — from Memory to Imagination.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON MEMORY.

1. The relation of Memory to the brain, the body, and specially the nervous system, has been investigated a good deal in recent years. It is generally held that every sensation produces a permanent modification of the substance of the brain, that this modification lapses into a kind of suspension, till an act of Memory revives it and furrows the old channel afresh. This, of course, explains nothing, for the problem still remains, and we ask whence comes this furrowing act of Memory, which is just the matter which we wish to know about. How do the collection and collocation of brain cells produce Memory? In order to meet this difficulty, it has been supposed that every brain cell has a

Memory of its own. Still Memory is just the thing taken for granted in this explanation of Memory. It must be affirmed that Memory can be rightly understood only by unfolding it genetically out of the process of the Ego.

2. Many of the popular designations of Memory serve a good purpose in a rhetorical way, if not applied too exactly. There is the ready Memory which makes the separation of the Image from its apperceptive condition with ease and speed; the retentive or tenacious Memory, which of course suggests Retention; circumstantial Memory which excels in calling up details and examples; logical Memory whose field is argument and connection in thought. Every mental activity has its corresponding designation in Memory inasmuch as it may become the content of Memory.

Old and young have different kinds of Memory, whose dependence upon bodily condition is pronounced. Disease makes inroads upon the Memory in various ways; injury to the brain may destroy it for a time or forever; fever or delirium can rouse it to a preternatural activity. The case of the ignorant serving-girl, who in her illness talked a number of learned languages, which she of course did not know when she was in a normal state of health, is a classic instance contributed by Coleridge. Many people, as they grow older, lose a certain spontaneity of Memory ;

especially is the power of recalling proper names affected. It is well-known that there are caprices of Memory, varying with the time of day and the time of year.

There is little doubt that Memory, on the other hand, is the most docile, tractable, and teachable of the faculties of mind. The old man can still train himself to remember particulars, and the negligent young fellow can become, through self-discipline, a marvel of thoughtfulness. Memory also contributes its share to character; care, love, duty show their reflection in Memory.

3. Miracles of Memory are of frequent record in the past. Celebrated is the case of the Corsican, Giulio Calvi, "who could repeat 36,000 names after once hearing them," and who is said to have had "an art of Memory" which he taught to others. All readers admire Sir William Hamilton's Memory for philosophical opinions, though they may not think much of his philosophy. Blind Tom, the African musical prodigy, had a marvelous memory for musical sounds, being able to play a long and intricate composition, such as a sonata, on hearing it a single time. Berlioz was famous for his ability in recalling orchestral tone-color.

The question has been often raised whether Memory can be so strong as to jeopardize originality. Undoubtedly many men of ability have had good memories. But are they not the

exception? It seems quite certain that Memory has often the tendency to usurp the place of Thought, which is the creative activity of mind. Learned men are, in the main, the victims of Memory, being chiefly the rememberers of things past and gone, which quality they often deem the supreme excellence. The vanity of erudition bases itself upon the rule and exaltation of Memory, which is a good servant but a bad master. As we have above seen, that form of Memory is most valuable which is readiest in the service of Thought, and recalls objects through their genetic relation.

The largest nation on the globe, the Chinese, is celebrated for its cultivation of Memory, which is often declared to stunt its natural growth, and to crystallize it in the forms of the Past. The Chinese precept is to remember, not to think; to imitate, not to create; such is, at least, the charge which the Occident levels at Chinese education. Yet the counterpart of such education should be stated: China has preserved itself by keeping alive the Memory of itself, it has more completely vanquished Time through Memory than the Occidental peoples, whose history is a record of their successive evanishment in Time. China was in existence before the Pharaohs, and it still exists in full national life, notwithstanding reverses. By Memory it trains itself to preserve the Past in

the Present, and thus persists through Time. So much has the Chinese human being done with himself on this earth; whether it is the best that man can do with himself, is another question.

Undoubtedly the exclusive cultivation or use of Memory has a negative aspect in two directions: it can lame Thought above, and Sense-perception below; the man sunk in Memory is apt not to see fully the object before him, nor does he think it adequately.

4. Many metaphors are applied to Memory, some of which may become misleading. It is often called the store-house of the mind (*thesaurus omnium rerum* is Cicero's phrase), or the deep dark mine in which the treasures of the Past are laid away. It is to be observed that such similitudes do not touch the essence of Memory as such; they refer mainly to Retention and Apperception, and leave out the facts of recalling and recognizing, which are the chief ones in the present case. At most the store-house is the possibility of Memory, not the real act thereof, which must be grasped ultimately as the Psychosis. Still, for the purpose of expressing the element of Retention, such metaphors may be employed, but the reader must not apply them in the wrong way. No psychologist succeeds in eschewing them altogether, even if he be a rabid precisian.

5. The student is urged to consider carefully the relation of Apperception, Memory and Association to one another, as set forth in the preceding exposition. According to our experience, they are apt to get more or less tangled in the minds of students, and we are compelled to add, in the minds of writers of text-books. Apperception is an integration essentially, while Memory is a separation essentially; each is the opposite of the other, yet each is necessary to the other, and both form ultimately one process.

We have tried to draw the limits of Association, which has its place in Apperception as well as in Memory, and which also has its necessary counterpart in Dissociation.

The attempt to reduce the so-called Laws of Association to one fundamental Law has been made by a number of psychologists, among whom Hamilton is specially to be mentioned. With them the principle of abstract identity is paramount. Other psychologists have insisted upon reducing the Laws of Association to two; thus they rest in the dualism of mind.

The truth is, however, that the fundamental principle of Association is not to be reduced to one or two Laws, but is to be found in the process of the Ego which has both unity and duality, both identity and difference, in the living movement of itself. It is certain that the Ego makes

the Law, and then can change it and make it over. No external Law can bind forever the Ego, whose essence is to be self-legislative; it makes its own Law and this self-making Law is ultimately the process of itself. That is, Association is finally to be referred to the Psychosis.

6. The power of volition in Memory (and also elsewhere) is measured by the degree and quantity of spontaneous energy it can call forth. The single act of will is to set a train of repetitions going which gets to be involuntary. The one resolution may clothe itself in a life of deeds. Very important intellectually and morally is the transformation of the Intentional into the Spontaneous, of conscious effort into unconscious ease. I start to learn a language, I have to repeat often each of its forms and words by a separate act of will, till the many intended repetitions become one spontaneous energy; then I can read and hear its vocables without a special struggle after their meaning, for meaning and utterance have become a single instinctive act. Still further, I set about learning a new language in itself quite as difficult, but I master it far more easily than I did the previous one, as I have acquired and made spontaneous the system of learning a language in the first instance. I still have to perform the work of repeating words and many details, but they are now instinctively

ordered by the one principle, the manifold acts move easily on lines already in the mind.

So in study generally. The Memory is aided beyond calculation by the spontaneous order resulting from previous effort ; if every act of learning has to be always an absolute act of will, progress will be indeed slow and painful. A very important question of instruction is, How much spontaneous energy can one volitional effort be made to call forth? Will-power does not show itself immediately so much as mediately, by the amount of power unwilled (or spontaneous) which it can start and direct.

7. The Ego has now mastered the act of separating the image from Apperception — which is the essential problem of Memory. The control of the Image has been obtained which the Ego can recall through its own internal act. Still this Image is as yet but the copy, the direct copy of the sensuous object. The Ego, however, rules it as master, knows it as its own creature, having made the same as the inner reflex of the external object. The whole movement of Memory has been this gradual acquisition of mastery over the Image, that it appear when ordered and act under command.

There remains, however, an element in the Image which is alien and refractory to the Ego ; it still persists in being the picture of the outer world, though this picture be controlled in its

movements by the Ego. But the latter will not endure such alienation, it begins to transform the Image from being a likeness of the object into being a likeness of itself, from reflecting the outer world to reflecting the inner world. That is, the Ego has started the great act of Symbolization.

SECTION SECOND.—IMAGINATION.

In Imagination the Ego not only reproduces the external Image, but reproduces it with a new, internal meaning derived from itself (the Ego). Thus it is that the meaning begins to rise into prominence and to introduce a fresh separation, which we call the separation of the Image into Meaning and Form. In the sphere of Imagination this separation will remain, and will constitute its distinctive characteristic. Still we shall have here too the total process of the Ego, and the Imagination will reveal the Psychosis.

Moreover, we need a special term for the Image in the present sphere, in which it is divided within itself into Meaning and Form, and is being wrought over into a reflection of the Ego. The Image we shall now name the Symbol. This is a somewhat wider usage of the word than

the usual one, but the student will get accustomed to it with little difficulty, we think.

In the preceding activity, which is Memory, the Ego has to do with the Image as copy of the Percept, in which copy Form and Meaning remain in immediate unity. But now the Image is separated within itself, the Meaning is tampered with, the Ego begins to put its own Meaning into the sensuous Form. The Image is no longer simply a true copy of nature, but starts to being a copy of mind, or an expression thereof. Mind, the Ego, begins to transform the object, in fact the whole external world, into a reflection of itself. Still both sides, Form and Meaning, will remain throughout the sphere of the Imagination, making a picture diversely put together, a kind of compound photograph.

Tracing the course of the object hitherto, we find that in Sense-perception, it was internalized and became the implicit Image; in Representation this Image becomes explicit generally, while in Memory it was separated as copy and identified with its object. But Imagination is going to change the Image both internally and externally, both as to Meaning and Form, and produce the Symbol.

Herewith the Ego begins to image itself, mind cannot stop till it pictures mind, since its very nature is to be self-seeing, self-knowing. In Consciousness, we observed the Ego dividing

itself within itself and holding itself up before itself. The alien copy of external nature is now to undergo a transformation till the Ego can see itself, see its own meaning in the Image. Previously the Ego has been chiefly a mirror of the outside world, and the Image has been a true likeness of the object. But the Ego is more than the simple mirror, it in its innermost essence is also the thing mirrored; it is not only the reflecting subject, but also the reflected object; nay, it is both the reflector and the reflected in one, it is subject-object. Thus the Imagination will manifest the Psychosis, or the total movement of the Ego.

Still this imaginative sphere of the Ego has its distinctive characteristic which is, in general, the separation of the Image into Form and Meaning, and the process of overcoming more and more that separation. The Imagination, therefore, shows as its special phase the second stage of the Ego, that of difference, separation, division, since the Image divides within itself, has an inner Meaning to its outer Form, and thus becomes Symbol.

The Symbol, on the whole, has been the mightiest means for training the race out of the condition of nature into that of spirit. It is the connecting link between the material world and mind, it is the bridge which the Ego constructs in order to pass out of the sense-world into the

supersensible. Symbolization transforms the physical object into the bearer of intelligence; the soul of man must symbolize or die in the bud. Its earliest objective expression is a Symbol, language is a Symbol, art is a Symbol. The Ego creates a symbolic world for self-utterance and for intercommunication; human society would be impossible without Symbols.

We shall, therefore, try to organize this symbolic world which environs us on all sides, and whose mastery is the chief end of education. We shall note that it bears everywhere the impress of the Ego which created it, and that therein the Ego is seeking more fully to express itself in order to come to a higher self-consciousness.

The Symbol may be considered as an interpretation of the thing of nature into spirit. As already indicated it has two sides or parts — Form and Meaning or a Nature-part and an Ego-part; it starts with the physical object and elaborates and refines the same more and more, that this object become the adequate reflex of mind. The two sides are always present in this process of the Imagination, which is not merely the Ego as imaging the object but as self-imaging in the object. Still the object never wholly falls away, though getting more and more internalized, drawn more and more toward the Ego, becoming more and more ideal.

Here lies the reason why the Imagination is

often called creative. It does not merely reproduce the copy of the object like Memory, but moulds the object over and puts new meaning into it. Thus it often creates the object afresh, and, when not created afresh, the object has a fresh significance.

The process of the Imagination will keep up the dualism between Form and Meaning, and will show the Meaning gradually usurping the Form and reducing it almost to a nullity.

The Form is here the external element, the object or its image, and it may be said to have two meanings in the Symbol. The first meaning is the physical one, the second is its mental counterpart. For instance, if I see an image of a fox, does it mean the animal literally, or its well-known cunning? The latter makes the image a Symbol, the former is simply a copy of an external object. The same ambiguity exists in language. If I say, "I cannot grasp it," what do I mean? A grasping with the hand, the nature-meaning? Or a grasping with the mind, the spirit-meaning? Grasping a physical object or grasping a thought?

The ambiguity of the Symbol is, therefore, a real matter and lies in the very nature of it, which is double. To be sure, this twofoldness of the Symbol goes back to the Ego itself, which, in the sphere of Imagination, is seeking to make the outer object the bearer of the inner thought,

and shows all the gradations between the two extremes.

The interplay between Form and Meaning will characterize the whole movement of Imagination, which will show three stages, corresponding to those of the Ego, which is, of course, the active principle. In the first place, the Ego will make a Form which has a single meaning, that of the natural object from which it is derived—the Nature-symbol. In the second place, the Ego will make a Form which has a double Meaning, that of Nature and that of Spirit, twofold yet united and related—the Art-symbol. In the third place, the Ego will make a Form which again has but a single Meaning, that of the Spirit, though still in the external object—the Thought-symbol. It is manifest that the Ego, in these kinds of Symbols—the Nature-symbol, the Art-symbol, and the Thought-symbol—moves through its three stages, immediate, divisive, and unitary, and that the Imagination, the symbol-making power, has, as the soul of its activity, the Psychosis.

These three stages of Imagination will be designated in the succeeding exposition as follows:—

I. The Natural or Implicit Symbol, in which the Form has a Meaning still sunk in nature, and in which the spirit is as yet undeveloped, though at work. The stage of immediate unity between Form and Meaning.

II. The Artistic or Explicit Symbol, in which Form and Meaning are unfolded into difference; two Meanings (and sometimes more), show themselves—the Meaning of nature and the Meaning of spirit; between these two is a kind of struggle for supremacy, with final victory for spirit, though the physical side with its suggestion is still retained. This movement of the Symbol is essentially one with the development of Art in the world, from Orient to Occident.

III. The Rational or Completed Symbol, in which the Ego takes possession of the Form, banishes wholly the physical Meaning, and installs its own Meaning in the same. The Symbol is now Sign, and the Ego sees itself fully therein. The rise of the Sign-world.

Thus Imagination is, in general, the symbol-making activity of mind, which statement covers a vast field, not simply poetry and art, but every department in which the Ego symbolizes the object, that is, makes the object the bearer of its meaning. Thus the Ego begins to make itself objective, by transforming the natural into the symbolic world. In this latter world it beholds a picture of itself, the reflection from the image is its own visage. This is not yet the Ego beholding itself purely, as Thought; there is still in the Symbol and even in the Sign an alien element, which prevents the perfect recognition of spirit by spirit. Still the Symbol is a great aid

up to a certain point; education, art, and also religion call it to their assistance. It constitutes a most important turning-point in the unfolding of the intellect, which has hitherto chiefly sought to internalize the external world in Sense-perception and to get control of the same in Memory. But in Imagination the opposite movement starts, the Ego seeks to externalize the internal world through the Symbol.

I. THE NATURAL OR IMPLICIT SYMBOL.

In this stage of Symbolism the mind is still sunk in Nature, though it sends forth flashes of itself through its material wrappage; the distinction between Form and Meaning is not yet made real, though it be potentially present; the physical object overshadows the element of the Ego, which is as yet savage, infantile, or undeveloped, but which nevertheless produces its Symbol, must produce its Symbol if it be Ego.

This stage might also be named the Symbolism of the Human Body, which shows the Ego giving the most immediate utterance of itself in a corporeal movement. The child specially is full of this kind of Symbolism, having indeed no other expression at first; child-study, when it begins to transcend its narrow physiological limits, will be a study of child-symbolism. Still the grown person never gets rid of his body and its

symbolic utterance, till he be laid with his fathers.

The Symbolism of the Body or the Natural Symbol we shall designate in three different phases, in which the student can detect the ordering Ego.

I. The immediate movement of the body *is itself the Symbol*. It has long been recognized that the spontaneous gestures of the human organism have a meaning, which can be developed in manifold ways. The oratorical, histrionic, and mimetic arts depend primarily upon bodily Symbolism. Education in recent times has seized upon the Natural Symbol both for comprehending and training the child. If you throw the infant up into the air and catch it in your arms, you will notice its wriggling and resistance as it falls. What is the meaning of such bodily struggle? It is a Natural Symbol by which the child is expressing itself, and which you are to read understandingly. Froebel has employed just this Natural Symbol as the first play of the mother with her child in his *Mutter- und-Kose Lieder*, which book has many other instances of the educative use of this kind of Symbol.

II. The immediate movement of the body *produces a Symbol* which it separates from itself and throws *into Time* through the voice. The vocal sound is a more internal expression than the

gesture, yet on the other hand it reaches beyond the bodily periphery, and communicates with a new sense, that of hearing. The Ego will take the sound of the voice and elaborate it into language, which we shall hereafter find to be the most complete form of Symbolism. At present, however, we only wish to observe that the body by means of the voice produces a Natural Symbol, which is the raw material of the Artistic as well of the Rational Symbol. The Ego will find in the billowy undulations of the voice with its movement in Time the most plastic medium for creating the Symbol and bringing it to its highest perfection.

III. The immediate movement of the body produces a *Symbol* which it separates from itself and throws into *Space* by means of the picture. The separation of the spatially fixed picture from the body is more complete than the temporally vanishing sound; yet both the body and the picture are spatial objects and therein are alike; the body has, so to speak, produced a body, wholly different, yet also one with itself, while the sound of the voice vanishes, has in it the negative. So much for the Psychosis in this sphere.

Now the Ego, in making the object, makes itself object; in making the picture, it is really picturing itself. The child imitates the thing of nature, projects it into some form of externality, and therein seeks to create it anew. The picture

of the tree means the actual object, but is not the actual object; the child has begun to put Meaning into the Form, that is, has begun to symbolize in making the picture of a tree.

Let us further illustrate this matter. The child bears in its mind the image of a dog derived from the sensuous object which it has seen. It separates the image from the Ego and makes a picture of the same by drawing it in rude outlines. The child must do so, must externalize this internal image; it would not be an Ego unless it made a picture of what it has seen, since the Ego is just this separation and reproduction.

Such a picture is the child's first Symbol, or one of the first. The picture stands for the dog, yet for more, namely, for the activity of the child's Ego, which has therein made itself object. It is well to look into the significance of the process. The picture is the child's own, and is a form which has this meaning: the Ego has begun to separate Form from Meaning, that is, to separate an image of a dog from a real dog, and to project the image into the world as its own product. Such is the process of the early Symbol which has an important bearing on the education of children, who ought not to be punished for making pictures but to be guided therein, else they will put them in wrong places, and probably break out into making bad pictures. Picture-making is inherent, innate, we

say, and can be turned to account in training or be allowed to run to wild excess. The child must make pictures as well as play; picture-making is a means of self-expression and is a phase of the limit-transcending nature of all mind.

Let us trace more fully the psychological movement of the child's mind in its process with the picture.

1. The child sees a picture of the dog. There is no doubt that this is a phenomenon which it feels it must master. (1) At first it is so sunk in the object that it does not distinguish the picture from the real dog. It shows in a number of ways that it expects the picture to move, to run, to bark. But nothing of the kind takes place, and so the child reaches another important stage. (2) It separates the living thing from the picture of the same. It discriminates the real object from any copy, and transcends its first delusion. The image of the dog no longer deludes it into a false belief; one of the shows of the world it has seen through. Still it cannot fully make the separation for a long period; it is afraid of the mask though it has seen the person put on the mask, and in playing an animal (horse for instance), it seems quite to believe for the time being that it is an actual horse. (3) It recognizes a little world of pictures distinct from the reality, and orders the same

through its incipient Apperception; the one experience helps correlate further experiences. The child has begun, in general, to distinguish appearance from reality, or the actual thing from its imaged counterpart.

2. The child sees a person making a picture of a dog. This act, too, excites its wonder and gives rise to a movement of its infantile mind. (1) At first the child is sunk in the motion of the person and the result which is so marvelous, namely, the person becoming a picture of a dog, and therein calling forth a new object by an act of creation. The child fuses the Ego of the maker with the thing made, till the former ceases his action and the picture stands by itself. Then the separation is suggested. (2) The child distinguishes the Ego of the maker from the picture, which in a wonderful way has been thrown out into the world and made visible; the act of separating the image from its invisible source has been shown to it so that it easily moves to the next stage, which is an apperception. (3) The child recognizes the Ego as picture-maker in general. The person who made the former picture repeats the process, and shows himself the possibility of many pictures, nay, of all.

The child will ask for many repetitions, inasmuch as it is reaching out beyond the single percept, and is apperceiving the Ego as picture-maker, which fact gives it unbounded pleasure, since it

is transcending its own limits therein and asserting its freedom.

3. The child makes a picture of the dog. It has already seen the Ego as picture-maker, and will follow on the same line. A double imitation may be noticed here: the child imitates the form of the object, and makes the picture as like to the original as possible; also it imitates the Ego of the previous maker and his actions. The first imitation is the attempt to know the dog by creating it over again, by making its outward shape; the second imitation is the attempt to be also an Ego and to express the Self in an object. The child has thus become its own picture-maker, and will in this respect too manifest the developing Ego. (1) Its first picture will show chiefly the joy of the act, the delight in the expression of the Self; the mood is not critical. The picture need not be very accurate, just a little similar to the real object; the child has separated the image from within and made it external, and therein has uttered itself; it too has now an Ego active, triumphant and can re-create the whole world in its own forms. (2) The child becomes critical, and starts to comparing its picture with the real object. The difference is noted, that which before gave so much pleasure no longer satisfies. The child finds its own imperfections, again a limit appears which must be transcended in some

way. (3) It repeats the picture, corrects the faults which are not glaring, uses the object as a model. A new pleasure arises; now the child takes delight, not simply in expression, but in the more perfect expression.

Also at this point the experience of the race may be called in, which has elaborated the present form of self-utterance in the art of Drawing. The school, therefore, instructs in Drawing as well as in Reading, in the visible and the audible Symbol, for the picture is a Symbol, having a form which has, besides its physical purport, an inner Meaning. The rudest picture of the child signifies that its Ego has uttered (or outered) itself.

The kindergarten, accordingly, should look after the child's need of drawing objects, and use the same as a means of its self-expression.

While picture-making is a kind of play, it is also a counterpart to active play, it requires some contemplation of the thing to be drawn, some little thinking. The child, playing horse, has to show movement, and is really seeking to master the inner, moving principle of the animal, but the child chalking off the horse on a board, has to show observation of the outer form at rest, which requires reflection rather than activity. If the picture be drawn from memory, there is a more internal process: the child's Ego has to separate the

image from itself in order to project it. Finally, if the child is looking at the picture made by another, the contemplative element is still further emphasized.

There is another kind of picture-making, whose material is sound and whose instrument is the human voice. The child begins to talk in pictures, which are also a form of the Ego uttering itself. Speech is, indeed, the most intimate expression of the soul, taking up and embodying in its tones the images which Ego internally separates from itself. The greatest picture-maker is the Ego painting in sound. Moreover it throws its pictures of this kind into Time, into succession, while it projected those of the previous kind into Space, into extension.

Thus the Ego projects its Space-picture, which has shape, and its Time-picture which is at first the word. Both are Symbols having an inner meaning to an outer form. The image of the external object both in extension and in succession is seized upon by the Ego for self-utterance.

In the movement of the Natural or Implicit Symbol we have found that the Ego makes the Form (say the picture), while the Meaning is the real object. At first for the child the making of the picture is a making of the real object, till it separates image from reality. But the Ego has now separated Form and Meaning; the picture means the object, but is no longer the object.

In like manner the vocal sound or spoken word is a Form which has for its Meaning a real object. Thus we observe that in the Natural Symbol the Form has become a product of the Ego, while the Meaning of this Form is a thing of Nature.

The Ego now finds that it has made this Form—the picture or the word—is master of the same, and so can employ it at will. Accordingly the Ego begins, consciously or unconsciously, to put its own Meaning into its own Form, alongside of the previous natural Meaning. Herewith, however, the Natural Symbol comes to an end, and the Artistic or Explicit Symbol has arisen.

II. THE ARTISTIC OR EXPLICIT SYMBOL.

This is again the second stage of the Ego, that of separation, which, however, has its own distinctive character. The Form is now seen to have, strictly speaking, two Meanings, a nature-meaning and a thought-meaning. When I read in Shakespeare the expression: “We have scotched the snake, not killed it,” I am aware of two Meanings, the one pertaining to the literal fact, the other to the human deed which it suggests. The literal Meaning, however, can only be obtained by an effort of analysis, and vanishes before the second Meaning, which is the Meaning that the Ego (in the above instance Macbeth’s

Ego) puts into the Form, here an Image in words. The first Meaning, accordingly, blends with the Form, which is taken from Nature, while the second Meaning, that of the Ego or the thought, becomes the emphatic one.

Thus the dualism between Form and Meaning, which has been hitherto implicit and undeveloped, becomes explicit and pronounced, showing the Form given by Nature versus the Meaning given by the Ego; the two sides, sharply separated yet firmly united, constitute the Symbol, which, therefore, has in it the process of the Ego, and is a new revelation of the Psychosis, through which it is connected with the total psychical movement.

Moreover, this new Symbol may be called the Artificial (as against the Natural) Symbol, or better, the Artistic Symbol, since with it Art has dawned. The Art-symbol, therefore, rises out of and is intimately connected with the Nature-symbol, which is hardly more than the Ego's direct reproduction and imitation of the object of Nature. But the Ego begins to put its own Meaning into the Nature-symbol, and thereby transforms it into an Art-symbol.

The characteristic of the Explicit Symbol, therefore, is the separation and interaction between Form and Meaning. The Ego has unfolded the Image into a difference corresponding to its own; the previous stage, in which Meaning

was sunk in the Form, has gone over into a more advanced condition. Now the symbolie activity of the mind distinctively shows itself and builds for itself a great world, which has to be organized by the person who wishes to understand symbolism in the development of the individual as well as in the historic movement of the race.

Herein we shall find the inner process which has hitherto manifested itself in all the works of the Ego. The distinction between Form and Meaning is made valid in numerous products, while the external Form is kept substantially intact. But the Ego finds this external Form alien to itself, begins to attack it and to transform it in various ways, till it becomes more pliable or more expressive of the inner Meaning. Finally from this struggle there arises a harmony between the Ego and its Form, and the World Beautiful has arisen upon the wondering eyes of mortals.

The general statement of the threefold movement of the Explicit Symbol we shall mark out more distinctly in the following survey.

I. Form kept, but new Meaning put into it. That is, the second or derived Meaning slips in alongside of the native Meaning, whereby the Implicit Symbol goes over into the Explicit one. The duplicity is here in the Meaning.

II. Form changed or transformed; the Ego treats the Form as it has treated the Meaning,

knowing the same to be its own; the duplicity enters the Form also, divides it and alters it.

In the previous stage the Form was single, though the Meaning was double; but now the Form too is double, or treble it may be, or more, while the Meaning corresponds, and thus gets lost in the multiplicity of shapes. Oriental art.

III. Form transfigured; it is restored to unity with itself and to harmony with the Meaning, which now becomes transparent in and through the Form, and finds therein its adequate expressions. Art-forms of the Occident.

The movement of the Explicit Symbol in its complete sweep is what is usually called the movement of Art in its historic development from the beginning down to the present. All Art is, however, not beautiful, at least not beautiful to us Occidentals. An ugly period in the Orient preceded the Greek ideal of beauty. But the latter unfolded out of the former, and a study of symbolism includes both. The Ego was at work in the East as well as in the West, in Egypt as well as in Hellas. Our psychology cannot be limited by æsthetic canons, though it certainly must include them. The groping lines of the savage, the fastastic grotesquery of the Hindoo are psychological as well as the exquisite symmetry of the Greek. A History of Art is an illustrated World History, with pic-

tures taken by the Ego of itself in its various stages of progress. A general outline of these stages we shall now seek to set forth.

I. *Form kept but new Meaning put into it.* The separation takes place, but the Ego in this sphere preserves the external object intact, though changing its physical or outer purport into an inner. Nature is not directly tampered with or forced into an alteration of her native shape in order to express some content of the Ego. Three phases we shall here designate.

1. There is an immediate union of Form with Meaning. Each side is present in full force, yet not sundered. If a poet gives a description of shooting Niagara Falls, it will intimate a great and dangerous crisis of the individual or of the nation; the physical object bears a spiritual counterpart, when it is elevated into a Symbol. A description of the storm in the *Odyssey* reflects the storm in the hero's soul, else it were not poetic. Likewise the story of the wanderings of Ulysses to many a foreign land is not a geographical account, in spite of the commentators; if it were such merely, it would be prose, even if written in good hexameters. A description of a flower may be beautiful, fanciful, ingenious, and still not be symbolical, that is, may not have an inner suggestion. Elaborate portrayals of scenery are often prosaic and dull, in spite of much ornament and effusive sentiment; they

lack the inner bond which unites them with the Ego. Read the descriptions of nature in Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister* and see how a poet makes them reflect the central action. It is, however, a nature-poet who proceeds unconsciously in this matter; his special gift is to see in the physical world about him the deepest intimations of the spirit, and to utter them in his verse. Such is specially Burns at his best, that is, when he does not spoil his poetic vision by trying to be reflective.

In like manner the early Mythos shows an immediate, instinctive unity between Form and Meaning. The mythologizing Ego of the savage puts itself, that is, a person into the sun, the clouds, the storm, the motions of which are indicative of a will. But this person, while an Ego, is different from the ordinary individual; it has unlimited power, and its field of activity is the whole earth and heaven. The savage distinguishes his limited Ego from this universal, all-powerful one, which he calls a deity. Mythology is the rise of man through the phenomena of nature to the conception of God. Thus the physical world becomes a Symbol laden with the spirit. Probably the ancient Vedas reveal the primitive mythical movement of man better than any other human document. The clouds may be the cows of Indra, whose milk is the rain dropping upon the earth and making it fruitful;

or they may be hateful demons seeking to quench the light of the sun-god.

The primitive Aryan must verily have been a myth-maker, instinctive therein above all men; Homer is his greatest child. Still the Semite is not far behind, especially with his story of Eden, which seems so naive, so unreflective, and which has taken such a mighty hold on the race, training it out of its primal unconscious state into a self-conscious life, that story itself being the movement of the Ego in a mythical form.

It is not always easy to say whether the poet was conscious or unconscious in his symbolizing activity. Homer often baffles us. The Hours which open and close the gates of Olympus for the Gods, and who, accordingly, preside over the portals between Time and Eternity, or between the Finite and the Infinite — to what extent was he aware of such a meaning? Still we may be sure that he knew the significance of the Allegory of the Prayers in the Ninth Book of the Iliad, and that he must have been conscious of the meaning of the symbol of the two fig-trees, the wild and the tame, under which Ulysses slept before going to Phæacia. (Odyssey, Book V.)

Our age is said to be no longer myth-making, but it still has the story, which now has become the anecdote. A good anecdote sets off the universal character of a man or event in some narrative more or less fictitious, and is usually taken

up and stamped by the people, though some individual may have started it going. The story of John Brown's reaching down and kissing the little negro child on his way to execution has been shown to be "a myth," still it embodies most effectively the truth of the situation, and well illustrates the old saying that poetry is truer than history. The anecdotes which cluster around the name of Lincoln, who was a myth-maker himself, show that the mythical spirit is not wholly dead. The popular hero is still enshrined in legend, even by a people otherwise prosaic; George Washington with his little hatchet is no exception.

The anecdote has, however, a very wide sweep; it is most commonly an illustration of some abstract principle, maxim or fact; the story-teller usually starts off with saying, "That reminds me" of a similar incident or tale. Here we have a distinction made between Form and Meaning, or the illustration and the matter illustrated, wherewith we are ready to pass to the next head.

2. Form kept, but a separation between Form and Meaning which is purposed. The Symbol thus falls into two distinct parts, and emphatically reflects the divisive state of the Ego. The shapes which arise from this division are many; in fact, the Form divorced from its Meaning, has a tendency to fall asunder into a multitude of fragments. Yet each fragment gives a glimmer

of the sense or significantly points to the same, though it be hidden under a veil. Literature is simply full of these diversified bits of symbolism, a few of which we shall throw into groups wherein the reader will note the general sequence.

(1) Here in advance we may place the *Metaphor*, which lies imbedded in all human speech, when it passes from expressing things of sense to expressing things of mind. The word divides within itself into Form and Meaning, or it has two meanings, the sensuous and the mental. When I say, "I grasp your meaning," I imply the separation above mentioned; the word "grasp" is a metaphor which the Ego has to divide in order to get its mental significance. All operations of the mind have to be expressed metaphorically at first; language has its metaphorical stage, writers have a metaphorical style, or a metaphorical period. Undoubtedly language shows a tendency to free itself of the ambiguity of the metaphor, in proportion as it becomes the vehicle of thought; culture finally gets to be purely the tillage of the mind. Still the Ego, unfolding itself in speech, imprints upon the very words its own duality. The *Parable* takes a simple event or an action, and describes it in some detail, with an undercurrent of a different purport running along with the narrative. "Behold, a sower went forth to sow." But we are made to feel the other meaning in the account of the sowing;

thus it is also with the rest of the parables in the New Testament, which loves to clothe some inner doctrine with the common occurrences of life, and has the general tendency to transform the whole sensuous world of man, even his food, his bread and wine, into a spiritual counterpart. The *Comparison* (or *Simile*) makes explicit the resemblance between the outer and inner, or between sense and spirit, which is implied in the metaphor and the parable. Homer is notably full of comparisons, while the Orient leans more to the implicit metaphorical manner, which Classic Art in all its forms is decidedly inclined to shun. Classicism is open, direct, unambiguous as possible; that Homer has comparisons rather than metaphors is characteristic of his Hellenic blood as distinguished from the Oriental. Shakespeare on the contrary is highly metaphorical, while Goethe returns to the classical spirit. It ought to be noticed that there are many kinds of comparisons, outer things may be compared to outer and inner to inner; still the highest function of the comparison is to reveal the inner through the outer, to help spirit grasp spirit through the external object. We should not forget that the Ego through the symbol is trying to express itself so as to come to self-knowledge.

(2) In the *Riddle* Form and Meaning fall wholly asunder, they are completely disjoined so

that the latter is hidden in its external covering. All symbolism has an element of the riddlesome in itself, the Form may be said to have always two Meanings and sometimes more. In our time the riddle has for the most part dropped down to a mere sport or social game, though we sometimes even now hear of "the riddle of existence." But in ages past the riddle has played no unimportant part in the movement of human consciousness. In old Greece was the sphinx-riddle which the Greek Hero was compelled to guess or perish; in some fashion he had to get the inner from the outer, the Meaning from the Form, or lose his Hellenic destiny. The symbol of ancient Egypt was just this embodied riddle, the sphinx; that old people of the Nile seem to have been a riddle to themselves; indeed the entire Orient has this unclear, mysterious, ambiguous view of itself, which becomes clarified in that little spot of antique sunshine known as Hellas. Yet this sunshiny spot is bordered with circumambient darkness. The Greek Oedipus guessed the riddle of the sphinx, but it should be added, fell into another deeper riddle in his own life. Allied to the riddle is the *Oracle*, the response of the God, which was often ambiguous, double in meaning, enigmatic, to the Greek mind. That is, the divine answer to man is dubious, and man himself must at last interpret the two-edged

oracle through his own intelligence. Apollo himself, God of Light, speaks in riddles, as if saying to his consultor: Think it out for yourself, just for that you have Reason. So Themistocles interpreted the "wooden walls" of the Delphic Oracle to mean ships and not the wooden inclosure of the Acropolis, and thereby saved his people. The oracular stage of Greek mind is seen everywhere in the History of Herodotus, who also shows the beginning of its dissolution. Oedipus could guess the Egyptian sphinx-riddle, but could not circumvent the Greek Oracle that "he would slay his own father and marry his own mother."

In the case of Themistocles, and in that of Socrates too, the interpreter who can see the true Meaning in the Form has become more important than the Oracle, and the latter has to decline. Still we may say that the Egyptian Riddle and the Greek Oracle show two great stages in the movement of the world-historical consciousness, both of which, however, have been transcended, though both may re-appear to-day in the undercurrents of civilized peoples. The mighty dramatist has employed both in his art; Hamlet perishes because he cannot solve the riddle of life ever present to him; Macbeth is led on to a tragic fate by the oracles which drop down on his path. The riddle and the oracle may sink to a mere play of words, ex-

pressing the duplicity of speech ; then comes to light the *Pun*. That well-known Oracle, Baron Rothschild, was once consulted by an American about the way to get rich, when he responded in his vernacular : " I buys sheep (cheap) and I sells deer (dear)." Such was the riddlesome response, which our American questioner had no great difficulty in interpreting.

The pun has had its share of disparagement in these days, still it should be seen to be inherent in human language, which has double meanings in words just through being symbolical. A streak of punning runs through all literature, the very highest is not exempt; Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, Goethe have their puns, every one of them. There is hardly a vocable which has not an inborn tendency toward having two senses, patterning therein after the Ego, its source ; yet these two senses must be joined together by that same Ego, else there is no pun, which consists in uniting the double meaning in a single act of mind. The cunning duplicity of the word is thus overreached by the Ego and laughed at.

(3) But Form and Meaning cannot thus stay asunder, they are seen fused together in other popular styles of expression, such as the *Fable*, which usually gives a short account of some animal or of some physical fact with an implied reference to man. The fable thus has also the two meanings, one of nature and one of mind.

The farmer putting the snake, stiff with cold, into his bosom; the oak and the reed in the wind; the fox and the grapes, are well-known instances taken from Æsop, with whose name the fable is specially connected. He was reputed to be a slave, and his humble wisdom may well remind us of Uncle Remus and Brer Rabbit. The fable chiefly seizes the actions of the animal world for its Form, while its Meaning is some lesson of prudence or cunning, or some sudden flash into the depths of human nature. It always kept its little nook in the grand mansion of literature till the time of Lafontaine, who in his charming book elevated it into one of the world's classics. In this connection we may mention the *Proverb*, which often is hardly more than a concentrated fable. "When you are with wolves you must howl" is a form of statement in which the animal does work for the man. But the proverb has prodigious variety, drawing from every possible source, yet with the general tendency of putting tersely an inner sense into some outer shape. "A rolling stone gathers no moss;" "the longest pole knocks the persimmon;" "unrelated, uneducated." If the proverb comprises the fable into a pithy sentence, the *Apologue* may be regarded as the expansion of the fable into a tale or poem, having considerable length. Perhaps the most famous apologue in literature is the story of Reynard the

Fox, in which the chief members of the animal kingdom are introduced as characters, and an action is spun out of them which reflects the conduct of men and portrays the spirit of an age.

In *Personification* there is also the separation between Form and Meaning. But a new turn comes in; some lower existence, an object of nature or even an abstract quality, is made into a person; the entire Ego may stand for one of its attributes. Hence personification runs the danger of becoming hollow, formal, spiritless, since the all-embracing Ego is filled with one of its own little abstractions; with such a content the Form seems indeed empty. It is well-known that the Roman poets liked personification, which appears so stiff and jejune beside the concrete shapes of Greek poetry. Later Rome had little faith in the Gods as persons, hence they existed chiefly in their attributes; Cæsar hardly believed in Minerva, but did believe in Wisdom. Still the greatest poets, even early Homer, employ personification, generally in a subordinate way. We should not forget, however, that the two most ideal female characters in modern literature, Dante's Beatrice and Goethe's Margaret, hover between Person and Personification. The *Allegory* is an expanded Personification, in which usually the Virtues and the Vices, Peace and War, the Seasons and the Graces appear in some kind of action. Two allegorical masterpieces

have a permanent place in English literature: Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* and Spenser's *Faerie Queen*. In groups of sculpture and in the spectacular drama, allegory asserts strongly its right. But it lacks the fullness of characterization which exhibits the concrete living man, and which shows not simply one abstract trait or tendency but also the counter tendency. Othello is not jealousy alone, but also the struggle against jealousy. The Ego is not the blank identity of one virtue or one vice, but it divides within itself and must show self-opposition in order to reveal its process.

Such are some of the shapes which spring from the separation of the symbol into Form and Meaning. The above list is far from being exhaustive; the figures of speech and the kinds of verse belonging here are almost innumerable. A Rhetoric or a Poetic might undertake to order them; this order, however manifold its details, should always be seen springing from the Ego, whose finest divisions are to be unified finally in the Psychosis.

In the present stage of the Symbol, its inner division has certainly manifested itself in an adequate fashion. But the Ego cannot remain in separation, nor can the Symbol, its imaginative child. Now we shall note a movement toward the uniting of Form and Meaning, which will not be the first or immediate unity, but the unity which comes after and contains in itself

the previous separation. That is, the process of the Symbol is now to be a conscious one, which is the stage next to be unfolded.

3. Form kept, but a unity between Form and Meaning which is purposed. The dualism of the foregoing stage is overcome, yet is ideally preserved in the self-conscious procedure of the Ego. There is still fidelity to the outer object, yet this fidelity is intended; the symbolic activity of mind has become aware of itself, and proceeds to a fresh manner of expression, which takes up its present stage.

In this realm of conscious symbolizing we have to place a large part of the poetry, story-telling and novel-writing of a civilized age. The Ego with its new meaning reverts to the old forms of nature and of the mythus, and makes them again the utterance of the spirit of the time. In this present sphere it will manifest itself in three phases, naturalistic, paramythical and realistic.

(1) Nature is seized upon and made to take the atmosphere and the color of the soul. A picture by Turner seeks not only to be true to the reality but to give to it a psychical mood, or a suggestion of an indwelling presence of the spirit. A description of a landscape by Ruskin will intimate the soul which has or ought to have its home in such an environment. The poet also employs nature for the expression of

his moods or even of his thought; yet she is not to be forced into some strain foreign to herself; her form is to be respected, and even her dim intimations are not to be violently crossed; rather are they to be carried up into the clear sunshine of the self-knowing mind. Dante's landscape is specially wrought over, being selected, and adjusted to the soul at the center of each infernal ditch; the scenery which surrounds the indifferent, the violent, and the fraudulent spirits reflects the character of the sinner and of the sin, as well as hints the punishment. The storm in the Third Act of Shakespeare's *King Lear* is an instance of a conscious adaptation of the outer scene to the inner soul. Lear himself speaks of the tempest within and compares it to the tempest without, and the whole Act shows a grand interplay between the two sides, Nature and Mind. That the poet had such a purpose in view, is manifest from the outspoken connection which he makes between both. The storm in Rome, which is described in *Julius Caesar*, is made prophetic of the great political upheaval which is on the point of transpiring. In Goethe's novel above alluded to there is the subtlest relation unfolded between the characters and their physical surroundings — doubtless a conscious procedure largely, on the part of the novelist. The study of the intimate correspondence between the child's mind and its surround-

ings in nature is one of the hopeful outlooks of the school and the kindergarten.

(2) It is, however, in the Mythus that we first see this symbolizing spirit at work, keeping the old forms in their main outlines, but pouring into them new meanings. Such a transmuted myth we may call by a new yet corresponding name—*paramyth*, that is, a myth with an additional sense. Moreover the present stage implies a conscious mythologizing, and is herein distinct from the first unconscious stage. The story of *Arethusa* the beautiful maiden fleeing from the wild huntsman *Alpheios*, and passing under the sea to Sicily where she rose as a fountain, was probably at first a product of the instinctive mythical spirit, elevating some phenomenon of nature into a person; but it became a *paramyth* when told of the Greeks migrating to Sicily or of the Europeans crossing the Ocean and settling in America. Likewise the tale of *Persephone* was primarily a physical event, the process of the seasons, behind which persons were placed; then it was transfigured into a spiritual process hinting of life, death, immortality, and even resurrection, and was represented by symbolic rites in the Eleusinian Mysteries. Thus in antiquity it became a sublime *paramyth*, and indeed, the most of early Greek mythology in the later classical period was *paramythical*. Quite all reproductions of Hellenic tales have the

same tendency. An enormous output of contemporaneous verse is a working over of classic mythology in forms of the paramyth. Mankind loves to hear the old familiar story, yet colored with a new significance. Goethe in the Second Part of Faust has elaborated nearly all the old Greek mythical stores into their modern paramythical counterpart.

But not only Greek Mythology undergoes this transmutation, the mythical stores of all peoples, even down to the savages, are being drawn upon and whirled into the modern paramythical movement. Christian Medieval legend is again made to flow into poetry and romance; the Saints, the Blessed Damozel, the Holy Grail have obtained a new transfiguration in the poetry, art, and music of our day. Old Celtic story, the Arthurian cycle, has received fresh life at the hands of Tennyson, with many rills, like Sir Launfal, Guenivere, Tristan, running through other poets. The ancient Teutonic Mythus with its rude vigor and colossal stretches has been born again, and woven into the very fibre of our age by Richard Wagner; nor in this palingenesis of mythical Teutonia are Morris in England and Jordan in Germany to be left out. Beyond all forms of the European Mythus are we reaching out; Hindoo legend has its representatives in the verse of the time, and fleeting folk-tales of the American Indian have been wrought over into an

enduring shape in the well-known poem of Longfellow. So the savage man is not only to be transformed into the civilized man, but his legend, the rude utterance of his Ego, is to undergo a corresponding transformation.

Thus the primitive Mythos is not to be lost, though it may be buried for a time; the paramythical spirit digs up the crude gold, frees it of dross, coins it anew, and sends it abroad into the world once more, restoring to the race a portion of its vanished mythical treasures. For the Mythos is a genuine expression of the Ego in one of its stages; this stage every human being has to pass through in his development. The Mythos is truly educative, and must be restored to its place in education; it has been a great trainer of man in the past, and has by no means lost its efficacy in the present. Particularly the fairy-tale in its transfigured form must be restored to children. It was the primitive means of their education, and we see it still employed in active energy in the *Odyssey*, which is probably the greatest educational book of the race. The paramythical spirit of our time must enter the fairy-tale, indeed it has already so entered; keeping the Form, it must pour into the same the new Meaning, and thus restore to the child his lost or forbidden spiritual expression.

We have observed the Ego generating the Mythos through its own inherent need of self-

utterance. It seizes the phenomena of nature and puts into them or behind them itself, namely a person, whose actions they express. The shifting appearances of the sky, clouds, sunlight, thus become the deeds of a mythical man and are employed to utter his Ego. But in the course of time this mythical element withdraws more and more into the background, till at last it drops out entirely; man comes to express his actions not through a mythical medium, but directly, in their own native shape.

(3) Thus the experiences of life give directly the Form into which the Ego puts its Meaning. The utterance is no longer paramythical, there is no taking of the old fable to express the new sense. The movement of human existence, as it really unfolds itself in this world of ours, is shown immediately, in the form in which it occurs. In such manner the modern Novel comes to light, in which the Ego utters its experience in the very form of that experience. Very striking is the contrast with the ancient Homeric method, which had always to interject the God between the Ego and its expression of itself. The mythical world is disenchanted, or rather emptied of its beings, who for so many ages helped man in many things, but chiefly helped him to know himself. Now he can get along without them, being full-grown, or at least having outgrown the aid of the fairies.

No hero or even deity will he take in order to utter his life; his life is to utter itself.

The Novel is the great Art-form of our age. It is essentially realistic, its tendency is necessarily toward realism so-called; its movement is to throw out the intermediate forms of expression, and to portray human doings literally, immediately, without intervening ideal shapes. In it Form and Meaning have reached a new unity; in fact, the Meaning has taken its own direct Form and employed it directly.

Herewith this last manifestation of conscious symbolizing brings itself to a conclusion; though freely changing the Meaning, it has kept the Form through these stages which we may name the naturalistic, the paramythical and the realistic.

Furthermore we should look back a little and note also the fact that the first grand sweep of the Explicit Symbol has reached its end. Through its unconscious, its separative, and its redintegrative stages it has passed, and thrown down in passing many a form of literature and art. But these three stages are also to be seen as in reality the one process of the Ego, which in the present sphere, is uttering itself symbolically, or is creating the world of symbols. All the divisions, distinctions, definitions, which have been so numerous, become one in the Psychosis; they must not be dragged in from the outside,

but are to unfold out of the process of the Ego itself, whose impress is to be seen in the finest sub-divisions. Not a dead cabinet of separate specimens is this science of the mind, but a living process.

In the Novel and also in the paramyth we had many a premonition that the Form could not forever remain intact, that the Ego must finally enter it and alter it according to the behest of the Meaning. In a certain sense we might say that the paramythical spirit changes not only the Meaning of the instinctive Mythos, but also its Form, kneading it over as so much material for its purpose. Still we have to say, in general, that the outline and character of the mythical element are retained in its paramythical counterpart; the latest tale of Helen of Troy still runs on the lines of the oldest. But now we have reached an important new phase in the movement of the Explicit Symbol.

II. *Form transformed; the Ego asserts its mastery over the Form as well as over the Meaning, using and intermingling at will physical shapes.* In the preceding stage, the Form was preserved; there was fidelity to the external object, the outer appearance remained true to nature, though the sense was altered. But now difference penetrates the Form also, as previously it entered the Meaning and made the same two-

fold. The Ego in its separative activity, which divided the one, now breaks in twain the other, in order to manifest the complete process of the symbol.

Historically the present stage revealed itself specially in the Orient, whose chief art-forms are here to be considered. But it is by no means wanting in the Occident, particularly in the Classic world, where Art both rose out of and relapsed into Oriental shapes.

In observing the movement of this stage, we note that there is at the start the direct transformation, the descent of man into the animal; then the animal divides within its own shape, as it were, and two animals or more are in parts conjoined in their complete difference; finally this monstrous play of animal shapes is subordinated to the human form.

1. The first, then, is metamorphosis of the human into the bestial shape, which from the earliest ages has been a phase of man's belief and of man's expression of himself. The highest form of nature is thus transformed into a lower, and the meaning is suggested directly by the fact. It signifies a degradation of the rational to the irrational, and we can still say of a man that he makes himself a brute. This metamorphosis has been expressed not so much by plastic art as by poetry. It is usually in the nature of a punishment, and the consequence of

man's own deed. Through all time runs this idea of a bodily transformation from the higher to the lower shape, a relapse to original animality. The were-wolf is still running about alive to-day in the dark nooks of the civilized world.

We shall have to go back to the Orient for the earliest stage of the doctrine of metamorphosis, especially to ancient Egypt with its belief in the transmigration of souls. Death freed the soul from the body, when it took another body, that of an animal, and so it passed through a cycle of bestial incarnations. Exactly how the old Egyptians themselves looked upon this curious process, is not easy to say; there seems to lurk in it, however, some dim idea of penalty and purgation. In the famous picture of the Judgment of Osiris in Amenti, we have a suggestion that a soul has been condemned to take the body of a swine, doubtless in requital for deeds done in the body. The Egyptian had, however, his sacred animals, which he adored, and to which he assigned entire districts and towns; the holy crocodile of the Nile had its own city, Crocodilopolis. On the whole, the Egyptian must have felt himself very near to the brute creation, and for him it was not so much of a change after all to quit his own corporeal abode and enter that of an animal.

But when we come to Hellas, the change is far more marked. Metamorphosis is a degrada-

tion in the main; to the Greek the human frame was the apex of nature, the dwelling-place of the spirit, and could become the visible manifestation of the Gods. Still the Greek mythus has many kinds of transformation from above to below. Zeus himself assumed the shape of a bull to woo Europa, of the swan to approach Leda, of a shower of gold to enter the chamber of Danae. Only temporary were these shapes of the deity, but the Greeks themselves regarded them as degradations. The famous story of Philomela and her sister Procne tells of transformation through guilt. It is to be noted that Ovid was the poet who collected and transmitted the most of these tales in his book of *Metamorphoses*. He lived in the decline of the classical age, which itself had sunken from its ideal, and was going out in a grand debauch of the senses. The antique world had transformed itself into the animal, and Ovid is its poet in this regard. The sculpture of the Roman time tells the same story, with its multitude of fauns, satyrs, bacchantes, sileni, in all sorts of drunken and licentious attitudes. Very different was the situation in old Greece even in Homer's time. Circe, it is true, changed the companions of Ulysses into swine, but the Hero subordinated her and compelled her to give back to them their human shapes. Thus he was truly a Greek Hero.

In the Christian world there is also the trans-

formation of the man into a beast, but its poet is not an Ovid but a Dante. The lapse of the human being into the animal is now treated not as an entertaining story, not as a folly or even as a crime against self, but as a sin against God. To contain such a soul Hell is born with all its monsters, and the entire heathen world at one cast is whelmed into the pit. Verily the poet has become the world-judge and proclaims the vengeance of God (*vendetta di Dio*). At the entrance to every compartment of the Inferno is a monster, part human part animal usually, picturing in himself the metamorphosis. Geryon, "the image of fraud," has the face of a just man with a body running out into the tail of a scorpion. The general purport of the Dantesque monster is: the animal as animal is not a guilty thing, nay is an innocent piece of God's creation, but man as animal, using his reason to subserve the passions and appetites of the beast, is a thing of sin, a horrible monster, fit only to be damned. Thus Dante makes the grand metamorphosis out of the Heathendom into Christendom; the whole Greek mythology is undergoing in his hands transformation into infernal shapes. The negative side of the Greek world Dante solves, negating its negation; its positive side, however, remains and will again appear, re-incarnating itself under many forms in the body of Time.

Thus we witness three stages of the metamorphosis of man to animal—the Oriental, which is the naive or innocent, at least non-moral, stage; the Greek, which is the guilty or immoral stage, even according to the ancient philosophers; the Christian, which is the stage at which bestiality becomes a sin. The symbolizing imagination has in such fashion given this row of shapes down the ages, to utter a movement of the Ego. But now another row comes to light.

2. We have just beheld the descent of man to the animal; now we are to see this realm of beasthood in a process with itself whereby another order of symbols comes to view. The Ego will take several beasts and join them together in order to express itself. It is a dark, chaotic, forbidding expression, yet true; it is alien to Occidental feeling and thought, yet the preliminary stage to our art and literature. A play of animal monstrosities we witness, yet it is the struggle to rise through the brute above brutishness.

The separation of the Form within itself has now become real, is placed before our very eyes, in the conjunction of two animals, as in the example of the Winged Bull. Previously there was the passage from one shape to the other; but here the metamorphosis is in a kind of equilibrium. In such a picture the Ego shows itself in a state of self-opposition, even in its animality.

It will join animal and animal, then animal and man, finally it will abolish such a monster, when destructive, through the deed of the hero, wherein we reach the principal of the subordination of the animal.

Throughout all countries of the East, both ancient and modern, there is an artistic expression which unites two different animals, or portions of them, into one shape, and sets the same before the people in public places. In the works of old Assyrian, Persian, Babylonian sculpture such shapes often occur, but their home is specially Egypt. Winged lions and bulls are frequent, the heads of birds on four-footed beasts and on the human body, likewise on dragons and crawling things. In the Greek world such forms are also present, doubtless transmitted from the Orient. But it is the special function of the Greek Hero to put down these monsters of the East, else indeed he were no Hero. So the Asiatic Chimæra, a composite threelfold, with the head of a lion, the body of a goat, and the tail of a dragon is conquered by the Greek Hero Bellerophon. Griffins, hippogriffs, fishy half-forms of the sea course through Greek Mythology and Art in a kind of under-current. Here also belong many of the beasts of the Hebrew Prophets, and the apocalyptic monsters of St. John, which have become a grand religious expression of the ages. The

symbolism is indeed dark, being the remotest Form which the Ego can take, and at the same time being twofold and threefold and even manifold in external shape.

There is also the conjunction of some part of the human shape (head, trunk, extremities), with some part of some animal. The two sides stand in juxtaposition, yet in an unreconciled dualism. Thus the grand gulf between man and beast is brought vividly before the mind, yet with the suggestion that they must be at last one. The great example in this sphere is the sphinx, the Egyptian symbol, representing doubtless both the belief and the problem of Egypt. Man and animal, we may say, or soul and body, or even spirit and matter; such is the grand dualism of existence, unmediated, yet indissolubly linked together in its two sides. So, we must think, the old Egyptian pictured himself to himself. Many other similar shapes are found in the Nile valley — the body of a man with the head of a hawk or of a beast of prey, for instance; sometimes the sphinx exchanges its human head for that of a ram or a bird. Most prolific is this interplay of living forms; as the slime of Nile River had a tendency to plunge over into one vast mass of wriggling, creeping life, so the Egyptian Ego must have swarmed with the commingled shapes of animal and man.

The Greek Mythos had also its commingled

shapes of animal and man, belonging in part to the old order of the Gods of nature, and in part to the divinities of the sea, Oceanids, Tritons, Nereids ; Proteus could take what form he pleased. Pan, the Faun and the Satyr have still a relic of the animal somewhere, in the hoof, in the pointed ear, or in the snub nose. The Centaur is half horse and half man, but in the Centaur Cheiron, who was the teacher of Achilles and the Greek Heroes, there is the subordination of the animal part, and just that suggests what he, called "the noble pedagogue" by Goethe, taught to the Heroes.

The Minotaur is the most famous of these commingled shapes of Greek legend. It lay in Crete on the dividing line between Greece and the Orient, and there it demanded its sacrifices from Athens on the mainland. It also had its labyrinth which connects it with Egypt; it was indeed an Egyptian monster like the sphinx, consuming Hellenic people. The Athenian hero, Theseus, at last slays it, rescuing himself and its victims. The double monstrous shape of Egypt is now put down in Hellas, and we pass to a new phase.

3. This is the subordination of nature in all her manifestations to the spirit of man. Such is, in general, the work of the Greek world in Art and Literature. Still the Greek did not do away with the physical side of exist-

ence; he kept it, but he transmuted it into the image and abode of the spirit. In the World's History Greece is the bridge from nature to mind, from Orient to Occident, from the fantastic to the beautiful, from animal to man. The Greek has in him both ends of the bridge, and the bridge too. In him and through him the race made its spiritual journey out of Asia to Europe. Certain landing-places in that journey we may briefly designate.

Greek Mythology has in many ways celebrated the conquest of physical nature, and the subjection of it to man's purposes. Indeed the chief Hero of Hellas, Hercules, has such a meaning in his labors and adventures. He slew the Erymanthian boar, the Lernæan serpent, the Stymphalian birds; he drained swamps, opened new channels for rivers, won new land, routed the dreadful miasma; he made Greece habitable, rendered the earth a fit abode for a rational being through the slaughter of wild beasts, through taming and directing the forces of nature. So much for his doings in his own country. And, as the Greek man was also a sailor, Hercules, the Greek Hero, must appear on the sea, and master that in his way; he passes to Colchis in the East, to the straits of Gibraltar in the West, and thus quite embraces in his voyages the limits of Greek navigation. But the visible Greek world is not alone the

scene of his spirit's activity; he goes beyond, enters Hades and drags thence its terrible dog Cerberus; also he reaches the garden of Hesperides, plucks its golden apples and brings them back to Hellas. With infinite toil is his work accomplished, requiring an inner subjection of self as well as the outer subjection of nature. At last, he, the mortal, is placed among the Olympian Gods, though his *eidolon*, the shadowy image of his mortal part, is seen by Ulysses in Hades. Theseus is another such Hero, freeing the earth of beasts, a Hero of civilization. But both Theseus and Hercules slew the monsters of the East, which fact leads to the next point.

Already we have noted those commingled shapes by means of which the Orient expresses its spirit in art and in literature. The Ego reveals itself in them as still involved in the toils of nature; consequently these shapes too must be put down by the Greek Hero. They are really the products of Oriental imagination and indicate its spirit. A large portion of Greek mythology is occupied with the combats between the two sides — the monster and the man; both are really spirits, Hellenic versus Oriental, and the war is between these. The triple-shaped Chimæra of Asia Minor was slain by Bellerophon; the Sphinx came to an end through Oedipus; the Minotaur was killed by Theseus; the Lybian sea-monster

was destroyed by Perseus in one of his adventures, who released the beautiful Andromeda from the rock and brought her to Hellas as his spouse. In like manner the beautiful Helen was released from Asiatic Troy by that greatest mythical deed of the Greeks, the Trojan war. Thus the Greek Hero must fight for his ideal of beauty and restore her from Oriental enslavement.

Then we have inside of Greece the struggle between the old and the new Gods, perpetually going on, which struggle has been reflected by Greek mythology in manifold ways. For the most ancient Greek Gods were primarily deities of nature, Ouranos, Gaia, Oceanos — Heaven, Earth, Ocean; theirs was the first divine dynasty. Moreover in the background of the Greek Mythos hover many strange composite forms, analogous to the monsters of the Orient—the Gorgon Medusa with her snaky hair, Briareus with his hundred hands, Argus with his thousand eyes. But the chief figures of the Hellenic aforesaid time were the Titans, who made war upon the Olympians, were overwhelmed, and hurled down to Tartarus for punishment. Herein is set forth the final triumph of Greek spirit over inadequate and alien forms lurking within itself; it has purified itself both of nature and of the Orient, and starts the grand Occidental movement. The old poet Hesiod in his *Theogony* has transmitted a remarkable picture of this period of fermenta-

tion, which ended in the enthroning of Zeus and the Olympians in the clear upper sky of the Hellenic consciousness.

The subordination is now complete. Greek spirit subjected and transformed nature and the earth into a dwelling-place of rational man and celebrated its victory in the Mythus; it also went forth and conquered the destroying monsters of the East, which had clutched the human soul and were impeding its free development; it purified itself internally through a series of stages, and at last dethroned and banished the old Gods into darkness. But the chief glory of wonderful Hellas is this: she was able to set forth all these changes in her beautiful world of Symbols — in her mythology, her art, and her literature. Nature, the huge animal, has undergone many transformations in the process of subjection, but now she is made the bearer and embodiment of the spirit.

With this subordination of the Form, the disruption between Form and Meaning is harmonized, and the Art-world, in the Occidental sense of the term, has dawned. The Meaning now takes its Form, no longer creating the monstrous but the beautiful, whose primal note is the harmony between Form and Meaning. The animal world is not lost, however; Zeus is not an eagle, or the part of an eagle, though this bird is still placed with him as an external Sym-

bol. Zeus may sit on a throne decorated with griffons or sphinxes; these are now subordinate, an ornament or a suggestion.

III. *Form transfigured; it is not merely transformed, but it is completely made over into the transparent image of the Meaning.* The Ego seizes the external world and elaborates it anew, *transfigures* it, so that it becomes the expression of the Ego as self-conscious, self-knowing, spiritual. We thus reach the Art-forms, or the Symbols which the Occident has made for self-utterance.

In the development of the Symbol hitherto, we observed the Ego kneading it and working out of it more and more the foreign ingredient of external nature. We found a higher and lower element side by side in the Sphinx, then took place the subordination of the lower to the higher in the conquest of the monster by the Hero. Now, however, the natural side is not simply to be subordinated, but is to be transfigured, though still retained. In Egypt the body of a man was sometimes made with the head of a hawk; such a work, however exquisitely finished, cannot be beautiful to us; it is a grotesque, which we reject. In Greece the human body was taken as the true object of nature for the utterance of spirit; yet the human body must be also transfigured; must be filled with Meaning, and thus manifest the ideal.

Its heavy Egyptian condition is still laden with the externality of nature.

At this point occurs a very important transition in the movement of the World's History as well as in the unfolding of the Symbol. The mighty differentiation between Orient and Occident manifests itself in Art. We have separated from the East in our conception of the Beautiful, Greece made the separation, and the Greek ideal dominates us to-day. We still find in the Hindoo, Chinese and Japanese Art of the present time an alien element, just as we find it in the Assyrian and Egyptian Art of former ages. But we feel at home with Greek shapes, they are ours, and we cannot get rid of them without forsaking our heritage of beauty.

The Greek took the Form of Man to express the Meaning of Man, to be the bearer of the spiritual. He made not a portrait but embodied an ideal, and thus opened the way for Occidental Art. The Form is still kept, but it means now the Ego as self-conscious, and in the work of art the Ego is to recognize itself as self-conscious. In the transfigured body of Greek sculpture the Ego really looks at itself, at its own spiritual image, and knows itself as universal; it recognizes therein the Divine Ego.

But now this transfiguration of the Form is itself subject to the movement of the Ego, and we shall witness the Art of the Occident passing

through its several stages, which we may name the Classic, the Romantic and the Modern.

1. The Classic transfiguration of Nature culminates in the human shape, in which now the Ego finds its adequate expression, as the self-conscious principle of the world. This Meaning takes possession of the Form, keeps it yet transmutes it; is loyal to the natural object, yet also loyal to the spirit. Classicism is the unity and happy interpretation of Meaning and Form, so that neither is forced or disfigured, but both dwell together in harmony, making a true marriage. Serenity is the word usually employed to express this characteristic in Classic sculpture.

In Greek art and literature we have many indications of the movement out of the struggle with the Orient into this state of repose, in which both Meaning and Form are for a time satisfied with each other. The statues of Phidias, the dramas of Sophocles, the temple Parthenon, the man Pericles manifest the culmination of purely Hellenic spirit, the immediate unity and harmony of the inner and outer worlds. Each individual became more or less a plastic character, in which these two worlds met, embraced, and dwelt together in mutual satisfaction.

But there was a multiplicity of well-rounded, self-sufficing individuals — men, cities, Gods. These individuals, each complete in itself, fell into conflict with one another. Thus our beau-

tiful Greek world, after putting down the Oriental, represented in the Persian politically, lapsed into shrillest discord, culminating in a long civil war, the Peloponnesian. The Hellenic Gods were also broken up into conflicting individualities, and that old war of the Gods, prefigured by Homer, became a reality.

Then a new deity began to appear from the outside, Fate, mightier even than Zeus. In the Laocoon group we have an image of the decadent Greek world, which is being destroyed by those two fateful serpents. Not without significance is the fact that the father, Laocoon, has the head and face of Zeus, the Greek father of Gods and men. Already in the story of Prometheus this new Titan, greater than Zeus, had been prophesied by the Greek Mythus as shaped by the poet Aeschylus. Fate, indeed, began to close in upon little Hellas in the shape of Roman conquests, inroads of barbarians, and, internally, on account of the lost faith in the overruling Gods.

Fate is verily the new power which is uniting the divided and distracted Greek world, is the new God who implies the end of the old Gods. These are now subordinated, and Classic Art as the expression of the highest spiritual principle of the age has come to an end. It lives on as imitation, as a play, or an ornament to Roman life, but its soul has fled from the world. What will take its place?

2. It is manifest that the immediate unity between Form and Meaning, which is the characteristic of Classic Art, is broken in twain; the Ego is no longer satisfied with the beautiful plastic individual as its expression. There is something beyond this Greek world of limited shapes, something which controls them, and which is not confined to such limits. The dualism again enters the Form, which is ambiguous as once before, having two Meanings, one external and one internal, or rather one finite and one infinite, one limited and one limit-transcending.

Here we enter the realm of Romantic Art, which takes the birth, life, death and resurrection of Christ as its central Symbol. The individual is still present in body, but spiritually he is the Son of God; he passes the limit, suffers death, which is followed by the rise out of death into eternal life. The Christian individual is the one who meets the grand limitation, overcomes it, and asserts his infinite portion. The human Form is employed in Christian Art, still it must not only be transformed, but transfigured, that is, made the bearer of the infinite spirit. In such a view the body is not esteemed as in Greek Art, it is not the adequate incorporation of spirit, but very inadequate. Still it is retained, and has to be retained, though crucified, tortured, scorned as the Evil One.

Romantic Art will also have its movement,

which is the unfolding of the dualism of the finite and infinite to its natural outcome.

In the first place there is the grand metamorphosis of Classic shapes, indeed of the entire Classic world, into the Romantic one. The Greek spirit, which was so serene and happy in its finite form, is now made diabolic, is damned, and plunged into Hell. Such is specially the work of Dante in his *Inferno*. In the second place, the spirit recognizes the infinite beyond the finite and transcends the latter, is saved and goes to Heaven. Thus the Form with its two Meanings finite and infinite, makes Hell and Heaven, devils and angels, sinners and saints. There is a struggle between the two sides, a war in Heaven, in the church, and in the soul—the angelic host is triumphant. All Romantic Art gives some phase of this dualism, Dante portrays the whole movement. In the third place, a new difference appears, that between secular and religious life, a perennial struggle. The Church arms itself against secularity, puts it down, takes it up within itself and becomes itself worldly. State, Family, Secular Institutions rise to independence. But the Church is really overcome by secularity, by that which it sought to subordinate. Thus the Church in its own process has developed its master who now appears.

3. The return to the secular element of life is a return to the Classic world — Renaissance.

The grand movement is now to reintegrate the Classic with Romantic art, or to unite the two chief stages of Occidental culture. But the Renaissance passes through its stages also, though our own time is still in its movement.

There is the immediate return to Classicism, the study and adoption of Greco-Latin antiquity by the cultivated world. Such in its best manifestation is called the Revival of Letters, the restoration of a great period of advancement in the race to its right in the culture of the individual. This return, however, had its negative side, and became a going back to heathenism, to a stage beyond which humanity had progressed. Thus the return was a relapse from which spirit had to rescue itself.

This brings us to the second stage, the Reformation, not simply the Protestant but also the Catholic, and not simply the religious but also the secular. The Reformation produces the grand schism, is indeed the schism itself, the separation inherent in the movement of the Ego, and divided the Church into two Churches, Catholic and Protestant, and still further sub-divided both these churches. In the employment of ancient Learning the grand distinction must be made, its liberalizing and liberating spirit is to be adopted, while its limiting and heathenizing tendency is to be rejected. Thus humanism breaks the fetters

of the present, political, ecclesiastical, social, yet must not impose the fetters of the past.

Herewith we begin to perceive a new phase of the Renaissance, the reintegration of the Classic and the Romantic, the harmony of the two great movements of the Occidental world. The descent of the divine into the sensible, which is the characteristic of Greek Art, the ascent of the sensible into the supersensible, which is the essence of Medieval Art, can be united and made to supplement each other in a complete cycle.

The greatest geniuses of modern times have caught this spirit and adopted it in their works. These works at their best give grand totalities, which embrace the entire sweep of time. Michel Angelo is the artistic genius of the Renaissance, in the realm of outer form — architecture, sculpture, and painting. Rome is to-day dominated by his spirit, fitly represented by the colossal dome of St. Peter's. In poetry Shakespeare is the greatest child of the Renaissance. In some of his single dramas there is a marvelous interfusion of the Classic and the Romantic, as in *Midsummer Night's Dream*; especially in *Tempest* is there a strict Greek form, united with the freest Romantic content. Shakespeare's entire works taken together constitute a mighty world-drama, which is a complete embodiment of the movement of the ages up to the poet's time. He was hardly conscious of this unity within himself;

he is, in general, to us the wonderful child of genius, yet universal as the race itself. On the other hand, the last world-poet, Goethe, has consciously embodied this unity of the Classic and Romantic in the *Second Part of Faust*, typifying it in the marriage of Faust and Helen. Wagner's music-drama also seeks a new synthesis of the Fine Arts.

One of the most successful artistic embodiments of the symbolic expression of all ages was the last one, which was seen at the World's Fair in Chicago. Here the Form was chiefly architectural. The Classic was present in the edifices of the Middle Enclosure (Court of Honor), while the Romantic dominated the Upper Enclosure (surrounding the Wooded Island); and to these Occidental symbolic shapes we may add the less complete, yet still very striking Oriental Symbol, which manifested itself in the Midway. The total Fair was indeed a genuine expression of the whole race, shown in its varied products, of which the most important and the most significant were the symbolic products.

Still the last is hinted in the first, and the oldest poet has glimpses of the newest idea. Homer in his *Odyssey* has given us a great variety of artistic symbolism; he, to a certain extent, resumes all the forms of expression which had been developed before his time — the Heroic Epos, the Idyllic Epopee, the Fairy Tale. But

even the poetic forms of the future he prefigures; the Classic and the Romantic are both found in the *Odyssey*, which may be called the romantic poem of the classic world. What is most strange, the modern novel is likewise forestalled in that old Greek book, especially in the latter half, which interweaves into its action the story of Eumæus. Thus a great poem is truly encyclopædic, all-embracing, taking up the past, reflecting the present, and prefiguring the future.

We have now passed through the manifold varieties of the Artistic Symbol as they have unfolded in the soul of man down the ages and among the Nations. They all show the Form with a double Meaning, that of nature and that of spirit. Yet the Art-idea always implies that these two Meanings are related, indeed have or ought to have an intimate tie of kinship. The bond between nature and spirit is that which Art lays hold of as a means of utterance for the Ego. The natural object has its spiritual suggestion, perchance its spiritual counterpart; this is what the true artist never fails in seeing and embodying.

Three stages of the Artistic Symbol have developed in this interplay of Form and Meaning, which stages we may designate in a general way: Form preserved, Form transformed, Form transfigured. The Ego has made these

changes in order to utter its Meaning more adequately, unfolding and expressing itself through Art. In this threefold sweep there is a general Psychosis, but the careful student will observe and trace out for himself many subordinate ones in the course of the foregoing exposition.

When the Ego in the process of the Artistic Symbol takes the Form of the natural object, and transfigures it into the transparent expression of the Meaning, still preserving the suggestion of nature in the act of transfiguration, Art has done its uttermost, has reached its culmination. Still the Ego cannot rest in the Artistic Symbol, which as yet acknowledges not only external Nature, but the inner Meaning of Nature corresponding to the spirit. Accordingly, the Ego will proceed to get rid of this last relation of nature in the Symbol, this last natural tinge of the Form in the Meaning, in order that it (the Ego) may come to the complete expression of itself. Thus we pass out of the Artistic to the Rational or Completed Symbol, which the Ego makes in order to express itself purely, without any admixture of an alien suggestion.

III. THE RATIONAL OR COMPLETED SYMBOL — THE SIGN.

The Ego takes the object of Sensation, or the Image thereof, and puts its own purpose into the

same, without regard to the natural significance of the object aforesaid. There is still the separation into Form and Meaning, but the Ego seizes the Form and employs the same to express its own Meaning, quite indifferent to the sensuous Meaning of that Form. This is still called often a Symbol, but may be more definitely considered as the Sign, inasmuch as the distinctive artistic phase, wherein the sensuous element always suggests its spiritual counterpart, has vanished.

The lily may be called the Symbol of purity, its whiteness suggesting the same in a natural way. But when the lily is taken as the Symbol of nationality (*fleur de lis*) it is more the Sign, as certainly this flower does not naturally bring to mind the French nation, or the House of Bourbon.

Thus the Symbol passes into the Sign, or, to speak more precisely, the Ego completes the process of the Symbol by taking complete possession of the external thing and using the same for its own purpose. The Form is reduced to servitude to the Meaning, which no longer respects it as real, but changes it at will. In the preceding stage, even the monstrous and grotesque shapes of romanticism had a certain regard for reality; for instance, Dante's Geryon has the face of a just man, but the tail of a scorpion — both parts being natural as life, yet suggestive of the monster's character. But now the object

is made to mean what the Ego chooses to put there, as when a piece of striped bunting stands for the American People.

When the artistic Symbol becomes Sign, the Ego gives to the same its Meaning, the external Form little or nothing, though the latter must still be present. But the Form is quite reduced to a shadow, which is, however, now filled with a new life, that given by Ego, and it is this new life which makes it immortal. The natural Form, being so thoroughly discredited, its Meaning so completely disregarded, becomes the more pliable instrument of the Ego. The Sign, being a physical object almost without physical significance, is the supple tool of the Spirit, which will employ it as the best means of expressing the spiritual. In human speech the Sign reaches its completest shape, and winds up what we may call the symbolic movement of the Ego.

The Sign is the grand means for the communication of the Ego with Ego. I impart my thoughts to you and you impart your thoughts to me through Signs, which we both have to know beforehand, and whose inner Meaning is the mediating principle between us. That is, we both live in a Sign-world, in which we have to participate, in order that we be associated together. This Sign-world, made by the Ego, is the means and the condition of a social order among men;

without it the human being would drop back into a separated, individualistic state of nature. Thus rises the grand idea of impartation; the Ego can no longer be buried within itself, but is able to share its spiritual treasure with others, both giving and receiving. The Sign, unfolding into Speech, is truly the Sign of humanity, the bond internally connecting man with man.

It is the wonder of wonders that I, writing or speaking here, can get out of myself and communicate to you there what I think. I enter your very Self and impart my Self; all that I have realized in thought, is or may be yours. The mighty and otherwise impassable chasm between Person and Person is bridged by the Sign, and over this bridge both sides can pass in both directions.

The Sign, though a very common matter, is worthy of being examined with profound study. I now put my own Meaning into any sensuous object, and that Meaning can be recognized by another Ego. Thus begins to rise communication between man and man; my Ego has existence in the external Sign, which is therein a medium for another Ego. In this present activity of mind, anything and everything may become symbolical; it rests with the Ego who is master; whatever I see or hear or otherwise sense can be made a Sign. We go forth into the external world, we obtain a percept di-

rectly, from which comes an Image, and then a Symbol, and one form of the Symbol is the Sign.

Hitherto in the sphere of Imagination the Symbol has not been so distinctly for another, has not shown so decidedly the element of impartation. In Sense-perception, the object is simply internalized, is my own, and in Memory I separate the image, directly at least, for my own behoof. In the Implicit Symbol the driving power is chiefly the need of self-expression; in the Explicit Symbol there is not only self-expression but impartation, the artist longs to utter himself and also to say something to somebody. But in the Sign my Meaning is more for another and less for myself; I seek to impart my Ego, though undoubtedly I find or ought to find satisfaction in the act of imparting.

Through the Sign therefore the Ego imparts most of what it has realized within itself to other Egos who therein acquire what has gone before; thus the race is continually receiving the spiritual treasures of the ancestors and transmitting them with increase to posterity. The Sign, accordingly, binds together not only individuals in society, but generation with generation, the past with the future. That the child may gradually obtain the culture of his race is possible through the Sign, which is thus

the grand instrumentality of Education, and which is created and employed by the Ego for self-expression, for impartation to others, and acquisition by others.

The Sign will accordingly develop a movement toward making itself more perfect as a means of communication, wherein we discern again the process of the Ego, seeking to create a completely adequate medium of self-expression and also of impartation.

A threefold movement we may here observe and designate in advance, to be developed in the following order:—

I. The Natural Sign, for which the Ego employs the immediate object (event, fact, deed), untransformed, taken from its own (the Ego's) direct environment. The Ego, seeing this object as Sign, declares the Thing signified by it, both the Sign and the Thing signified being parts or phases of the same objective process, whether in the physical or the social world. Thus the Meaning lies outside of the Form, but in the same process, which process the Ego merely reproduces through its experience and knowledge.

II. The Artificial Sign, in which the Ego still employs the immediate object, but changes it, transforming it both in Meaning and in Form from the natural state, in order to express its own (the Ego's) Meaning, which is thus no

longer outside but inside the object. This is the stage of separation, inasmuch as the subjective Meaning of the Ego in the Sign is consciously separated from the objective Meaning of the latter as a thing of nature.

III. The Universal Sign, in which the Ego transfigures the immediate object into its own Form, so that the outer bears the direct impress of the inner, giving the process thereof by means of the human voice. Meaning and Form are no longer alien to each other, but are in unity, unfolding into the Word, Sign of Signs, the most adequate utterance of the Ego.

(For illustrations of these three kinds of Signs, see below in the special development of each.)

It is manifest that the movement of the Sign is toward the perfection of intercommunication between man and man. In the natural Sign there is a rigid element of externality, which is transformed and partially overcome in the artificial Sign, though this still remains spatial.

But in speech the rigidity of the Sign begins to relax, it moves and becomes pliant. Speech is the plastic material in which the process of the Ego can impress itself as a process, being in Time. The Sign must always have some physical element as the bearer of the communication between Ego and Ego; but this physical element must be more and more refined till it becomes

responsive to the subtlest turns of the Ego, that is, supremely impressionable. Thus the Sign is truly the medium of exchange between mind and mind.

I. The sensuous object in man's environment is seized immediately by the Ego and transformed into a Sign, which may in a general way be named the natural Sign. The whole Sense-world thereby is made over into a Sign-world through the Ego, which supplies the process from the one to the other, for nature cannot recognize its own process, while the Ego can; indeed just that is the characteristic thing about the Ego.

When I go forth into the free air, I look up at the sky and behold a cloud which I at once transform into a Sign, saying: "That is an indication of rain." What is here the rapid act of my mind? I connect the present object with a future result, which connection springs from my experience of the past. The sensuous object before me, yonder cloud, is the occasion of my completing in my mind the whole meteorological process, of which it is but one link, but which lies ideally in my Ego. Moreover the Ego is itself inherently process and hence takes up the process of nature; in fact, that is just the way it grasps nature. Thus the present object or phenomenon is transmuted into a Sign, connecting present with both past and future; the Ego from the one present fact completes the total

process, of which this one fact becomes the Sign.

Hence the Ego looking out upon all externality — things, events, experiences — has to transform them into Signs, which suggest the total process of which they are but a present partial manifestation. Thus the Ego begins to know the object, in fact, the whole external world in a new way. In Sense-perception the object was simply known as present in Space and Time; in Memory it was known as the image of something past; but in the Sign the object projects itself into the future also where its counterpart (the thing signified) is revealed to the Ego in the form of an image. The cloud now seen and often seen before suggests the total process in the coming rain. But the Sign can also refer to the past directly: "This wet ground is a Sign that it rained last night;" so we say, still completing the process ideally from the one real fact.

But there is not merely a seen world of Signs, hearing too has its sphere in this work, and there rises a heard world of Signs. A clap of thunder has also its indication along with the visible cloud. All noises in the street or in nature stir the Ego to reach out and take up their causes; that rumble I know to come from a railroad train or a wagon. Thus the Sound-world we convert into a Sign-world in many ways. The other

senses, besides sight and hearing, furnish their contribution of Signs; that is, they become the basis for a process of the Ego.

Thus all sensuous nature which environs man becomes full of Signs, prognostications, suggestions, for each thing interlinks with other things past, present and future, in a chain of causation, which chain must be given by the process of the Ego, and is finally nothing but a mental chain, with one link real and the rest ideal.

The enviroing Sense-world which is made by the Ego into a Sign-world without changing the external object may be looked at, first as the corporeal organism (the human body), secondly as the mundane organism (external nature), thirdly as the institutional organism (the social order). All these furnish an environment of objects of sensation which can become Signs.

1. The human organism, which is the most immediate and intimate environment of the Ego, is full of Signs. Primarily all its physical processes have outward indications; the doctor calls them symptoms — two things, usually an outer and an inner, come together, and one is the Sign of the other. Diagnosis is a knowing through Signs. The pulse, the eye, sometimes the lower lip and possibly the finger nails may indicate what is going on within the organism. Then the gesture, the look, the twitch are significant, Signs which are in their way a

communication. Best of Signs, however, is the human Deed for revealing character, wherein the Ego shows its true outward counterpart.

The Ego can imagine a process or connection where there is none, and so make a Sign which has no reality. At this point arises the realm of delusion, which is so common in reference to the body, especially its ailments. The hypochondriac and the valetudinarian are mainly occupied with false Signs about themselves.

The body with its senses is the grand highway to the external world, to which we now pass.

2. On every side we are environed by natural phenomena, which are phases of some physical process. It may be truly said that all nature surrounds man with Signs, which he has to interpret hourly, daily, yearly during his life. His success largely depends upon the truth of his interpretation. First are the weather Signs which concern his outermost environment. The farmer and the hunter, who live in such close intimacy with nature, often become very skillful in forecasting the season. But we all have to do a little of the same in spite of the fact that there is a meteorological bureau.

A good deal of science is an interpretation of Signs. The geologist sees a fossil plant; at once he supplies the process which produced it, the climate, the landscape, the physical conditions. These grooves cut into the rock are the

Sign of a glacier, of an ice age long since passed away. A tooth becomes a Sign, to the palæontologist, of the whole animal, its size, its habits, its climatic environment. The scientist must of course have this far-off process ideally stored up in his Ego; thus he apperceives the single object which becomes to him a Sign of the totality. But the untrained Ego simply perceives a scratch on a stone, an old tooth or bone, and straightway forgets the whole matter; to him they are not Signs.

The ignorant man is aware, however, that he dwells in a vast Sign-world, which has meaning, is a phase of some process. Hence his tendency to make the phenomenon of nature into a Sign, even though he has to imagine what it signifies. The comet is a sign of a bad harvest, of political revolution, of the end of the world; the cricket in the wall portends death. Through the Sign a mighty deluge of superstition, fraud and delusion is poured upon humanity, especially the humbler portion. The Ego must believe in Signs; if it be ignorant, then it is their victim; but if it know the full process, then it can employ the Sign as a grand means of foresight, as well as of knowledge. The scientific Ego has to have its Sign as well as the unscientific; both have faith in a Sign-world though they treat it differently.

The prophetic Ego may also read in the occur-

rences of nature great social upheavals, but that is a kind of poetic expression, in which poet and prophet are one (*vates* has both meanings). The natural occurrence is no longer a phase of the process, but simply a vehicle of utterance which the Ego employs for denoting something deeper than the physical process, namely the institutional or social.

3. The institutional world, which also environs the Ego, has its events which the Ego may behold as Signs. Goethe has declared that the affair of the "Diamond Necklace" portended to him the French Revolution, being a Sign whose complete movement included that grand social upheaval. To many people both at the North and at the South John Brown's raid was the Sign of the mighty conflict approaching. Great events of History not only cast their shadows before, but have actual heralds announcing in Signs what is coming. These are what are often called in ordinary speech "the Signs of the Times," events which have a prophetic element in them indicating great national or world-historical changes. Constantine is said to have seen a cross in the sky with the inscription, *In hoc signo vince*; one thing is certain, he saw the cross as the Sign of the Time. What signifies the recent Chinese-Japanese war in Universal History? Or the conflict between Labor and Capital? Signs, Signs they are, which each one

of us seeks to interpret by beholding them as a phase of a grand process to be unfolded in the future. In our own little neighborhood we watch the Signs, political, commercial, even domestic. Who will be the next Congressman or the next President? What are the Signs of a good year for business? Which of us will she marry? Thus we all seek to prognosticate the future fact, connecting it in a process, from the fact before us.

The old Greeks and Romans, before undertaking any enterprise of moment, were accustomed to watch the flight of birds, or to inspect the entrails of slaughtered animals, in order to find Signs of the purpose of the Gods. Those ancient peoples were conscious of living in a World-Order, which had them and their deed in hand; they knew that they were a part of the process, and they sought some indication of the nature of their part. Hence they were always looking for omens, intimations, foreshadowings; they dwelt in a Sign-world which to them was a manifestation of the Divine Order.

The next thing is that the Ego puts its own meaning into the omen, which it interprets according to insight. The sacrifices were at first unfavorable at the battle of Plataeae, then they suddenly became favorable, just at the right moment.

II. The Ego, putting what meaning it chooses into the physical object, converts it into an arti-

ficial Sign. This differs from the natural Sign just considered, inasmuch as therein the Ego accepts the physical object in its native meaning, but adds the process, whereby it becomes a Sign. But now the Ego changes the meaning of the object and puts its own into the same, still preserving the outward form, which is the Sign. In the first case, the object is not changed in itself, but through its relations; in the second case, the object is changed in itself, the Ego will tamper both with its Meaning and Form.

The oak may be regarded as a natural Sign when it indicates a certain kind of soil, in which it grows, or a certain climate; it may be regarded as an artificial Sign, when it is a landmark, or a heraldic designation; still further, it may be used as a natural Symbol when it signifies strength. One naturally connects the oak with human might; but the connection between an oak and a landmark is wholly the act of the Ego. The pentegram (*Drudenfuss*), being composed of two triangles, one on top of the other, may suggest the Trinity, of which it was a medieval Symbol; but in certain parts of Germany it is the Sign of beer, having been thus translated out of its first meaning by the Ego of the German beer-drinker.

In the artificial Sign there will be a process of the Ego, which will crowd out more and more the physical import of the object. At first the physical Form will be retained, but the Ego will

put into the same its own Meaning. Then the Ego, after having changed the Meaning, will change the Form, that is, will transform the same into a different object externally. Finally the Ego, having made its own individual Signs, will begin to order them into systems for its own end.

1. The physical shape is retained without change, but a wholly new meaning is put into it by the Ego. The rose may be considered to have a symbolic touch when it indicates love, or passion, or even majesty ; but when it is used as a blazon in heraldry it is a Sign. The White and Red Roses stood for the Houses of York and Lancaster in English History — a meaning which has no natural connection with those objects. In like manner, various flowers have been used as Signs in Art, Religion, Poetry; the entire flowery kingdom has been made to speak a kind of language. Peoples have their national flower, as the Irish the shamrock and the Scotch the thistle; we, Americans, tried to select our floral representative some years ago. For a similar purpose animals are used, as the lion of St. Mark or St. Jerome, or of Great Britain; birds in particular have found favor, as the eagle, the dove, the peacock, though they all may have a strand of natural symbolism, which suggests their counterparts in human character. The names of fox, dog, ass are applied to man with the emphasis on the symbolic element, and

the famous poem of Reynard is an epic of animals acting the part of persons without renouncing beasthood.

The same physical object may be used with various shades of symbolism. The rainbow is the poetic symbol of Hope (so employed by Goethe, see Faust's Monologue, at the beginning of *Faust*, Part II.) It is an artificial Sign, as used in the Hebrew account of the Deluge, to which it is there made to pertain. It may be also a natural Sign when it is taken as a harbinger of the total process of which it is one phase; thus it indicates that the Sun is shining through rain-drops. Color has also its artistic symbolism and it may be used as an artificial Sign, as the national colors, the color of a party or a class or a society. The cloud which we have already employed as the simplest and most immediate natural Sign when it indicates rain, may be used likewise as a poetic Symbol for obscurity or mystery, and in the well-known passage of Scripture which speaks of a cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night, the cloud is rather the artificial Sign, though the symbolizing fancy can play it into deeper significations.

Language gives us a hint in the expression: What does this thing signify? The verbal purport is: Of what is this thing made the Sign? Some such question we ask of everything in nature and in mind; we have to regard objects,

events, deeds, as not simply standing alone and by themselves, but as Signs, which in one way or other point to the process eternally going on in the world and involving all things. Again we must recollect that the Ego is just the process grasping the process, and hence must create the Sign.

Thus the Ego puts its own Meaning into the physical Form; but it likewise makes over the shapes of nature to suit its own purpose. The plant and the animal, in heraldry for instance, are often changed, transformed, mythologized, as the tree of Paradise and the unicorn and winged dragon. So we pass to the next.

2. The shape of the physical object is wrought over anew and made into a Sign; the Form is transformed in order to express the new Meaning. Great is the variety of this transformation of Nature, running through all its kingdoms, mineral, vegetable, animal. We take a stone and cut it into a seal which stands for our very person, our promise; it is truly our signature. Some colored strips of muslin are sewed together, the whole becomes a flag, which is a Sign of Nationality, for which we lay down our lives. The most revered of all Signs is that of the Cross, which has become the distinctive Sign of Christendom and of the Occident. Thus we all in one way or other deeply participate in this transformed Sign-world; man can share in the

movements of his race, and can associate with his fellowman spiritually by means of Signs alone.

In ordinary life we need but look around us with some attention in order to observe how completely we live in an environment of artificial Signs made by the Ego; whole days are thus transformed, for example, Decoration Day, Fourth of July. There is the outer vesture of the man, as a uniform, a livery, a coat of arms, as clothes generally, costumes of all sorts, from king to peasant, from Orient to Occident. This subject took the fancy of Carlyle, and from it sprang that strange symbolic book known as *Sartor Resartus* or the Philosophy of Clothes. Innumerable badges, emblems, marks designate groups, classes, and societies of men. All jewelry is a kind of Sign. Inns are still named after their Signs in certain countries, and also places of amusement; formerly such was perhaps always the case; who can forget the Mermaid Tavern and the Globe Theater, both having their visible Signs? Audible Signs too may be mentioned in passing; what is the noise made on the Fourth of July but a Sign? The bell is a great maker of heard Signs, joy, sorrow, fire, time for dinner, time for church. How many indications are given by the whistle, from that of man to that of the factory and railroad train? The drum, the trumpet, the fog-horn

make Signs to others. Thus we dwell in a vast sound-ocean, as it were at the bottom of it, on the earth. The Ego wraps itself up in sound and sends itself off with its message to distant ears through the waves of this sound-ocean. The Ego with its Meaning is the kernel, the rest is the shell.

In such fashion we may realize to ourselves that we are living in a Sign-world seen and heard, created by the Ego of man as an important element of his spiritual abode. Yet this Sign-world is organized within itself, as we see by the following.

3. The single artificial Signs are brought into a system by the Ego for the more complex kinds of communication. The single Sign imparts the single fact or thought; still, facts and thoughts are not isolated, but are in an order; hence the Signs also assume the form of an order. In such a connection the Sign is often called the Signal, and the signal service has an important place in certain departments of human activity.

Perhaps the British navy has the completest system of Signals, employing many Signs of diverse forms and colors, but especially the semaphore (sign-bearer), which is a post with two arms; by means of these it spells words at a distance, and thus communicates with other ships. By night flashing Signals are used with an alphabet of points and lines,

like the telegraphic alphabet of Morse; even the fog horn is made to talk by means of an alphabet of sounds, long and short. The army also has its system of Signals, made principally by flags waving from hill-tops. The fire Signals from mountain to mountain, telling of an invading foe, are famous from antiquity. The railroad train in our time is governed in its movements through Signals both seen and heard by day and by night.

Under this head may be considered the many systems of Signs which characterize the secret organizations so common among men. The Masonic Fraternity is the oldest and best known, and perhaps the most symbolical. Grips, gestures, pass-words and other special Signs bind the society together as well as separate its members from the rest of the world. Such Signs, therefore, are limited in their use, their ability to communicate is very imperfect; they belong to the brotherhood of the few, not to the brotherhood of man, and they can only be for a restricted purpose. Hence arises the demand for a more universal means of communication between man and man. This is the human voice laden with some content of the Ego, which two elements produce the word.

The Sign, as hitherto unfolded, is still external, fixed, rigid, is a physical object, transformed or not. It still has too much externality to be

the pliant vehicle of the process of the Ego. In the system of connected Signs the Ego is seeking imperfectly to realize its process, but they fall asunder, and cannot reproduce its unity. The Neapolitan may express much with his gestures and grimaces, but they come short of any clear utterance of the inner spirit of man. The artificial Sign, though it be audible, is single, limited, and arises from an external object, as the sound of the bell. In general, the sign must now be made fluid, must be thrown into tones and become a mere *flatus vocis*, losing its separate, outer, rigid shape. After being cast into the melting-pot, the whole Sign-world can be remoulded into new external shapes.

III. We pass accordingly to the Universal Sign, in which the Form and the Meaning become united and harmonious, no longer standing opposed to each other, as in the Artificial Sign. We may say that the natural object, here the sound of the human voice, is transfigured by the Ego into the Form of itself, and so is most capable of reproducing the Meaning of the Ego. This gives language, the Sign of Signs, in which all other kinds of Signs find their explanation and fulfillment. In language, the Sign not only explains something else different from itself, but also can explain itself as Sign. It is self-defining, turns back upon itself like the Ego, and not only unfolds itself, but also the Self as such. The

spoken word, simply as spoken, as a Form, bears the image of the Ego. We shall try to illustrate these statements by looking at some of the phenomena of language.

The Ego seizes upon the sound of itself which is given out by its own body through the vocal organs, as the best vehicle for self-utterance, being altogether the most flexible instrument for such a purpose. It can control this sound, putting into the same its difference or its continuity, breaking up the same into special tones, syllables, words, and then uniting them into its own process. Hence the sound of the human voice gives the most complete response to the movement of the Ego.

Undoubtedly the completest of all Signs is language. I produce the physical sound of my voice and load it with my meaning, with my Ego, it passes through the intervening distance and reaches you, in whose brain it unloads its content, and you get what I send. I have communicated my thought, my inmost Self to you; the medium is speech, the succession of sound-waves starting from my vocal organs.

The primal fact about these sound-waves of the voice is that they bear in themselves, in their very constitution, the direct impress of the Ego. They are articulated, they form a chain of vocal links, yet those links are joined together into a totality. Every word I

utter is made up of vowels and consonants; the vowel is a continuous sound which is stopped by consonants. There is first, then, the undivided tone of nature, which is next broken into by the consonant, the principle of separation, forming vowel and consonant; thirdly both are united in the word, which thus in its outer shape manifests the unity of the Ego. The utterance of every word, the sound of it apart from its meaning, is stamped by the Ego, is the absolutely pliant material upon which the Ego impresses its own inner process. The human voice is then the plastic material of the sculptor, and the vocal organs are the implements; the result is human speech, words, which an ancient Greek philosopher called speaking statues, applying a true image derived from Greek Art.

The tone as such, which is mere vibration, may set the feelings to vibrating in unison; such is the function of music, which is tone organized, selected and arranged for a certain purpose, namely, to start a certain class of emotions in response. But the tone as a series of simple vibrations cannot fully express mind, the Ego, which must have the separation and the return, while tone has pulses, external undulations continued in an indefinite series. The tone articulated and not merely vibrated is the sound-medium of the Ego in speech; the waves must have oneness and make the distinct word, which is

thus rounded off and complete. The word, as already indicated, has division within itself, its vowels and consonants are its basis of articulation; yet these divisions it brings to unity. Thus the very sound of the word is the image of the Ego and its process. Man cannot speak except in the form of his Ego, which he utters in the sound of his voice, as well as in the meaning which he puts into the same.

It is manifest that the Ego has obtained for its Sign an external material which is absolutely formable, responsive outwardly to its subtlest movement. Hitherto, in the natural and in the artificial Sign, in the cloud or in the flag, it has had a rigid material; now it has a fluid material, responsive, moving with the movement of the Ego, reflecting the same in its most delicate sinuosities.

The Universal Sign we have called it, inasmuch it can be made to express all and itself too, inclusive and explanatory of every other Sign, and just in this fact imaging the Ego. Still even the Universal Sign, since it is a Sign and external, will show limits, which are the limits of externality. That is, the Spoken Word, the Universal Sign, being uttered and externalized, will be limited in Space and Time, which limits the Ego, in accord with its transcendent nature, will chafe against, will seek to surmount, and finally will succeed. The Uni-

versal Sign, therefore, will have its process, that of the Ego, moving toward a completer universality by transcending the bounds of Space and Time. In like manner back in Sense-perception, we recollect that the Ego, in order to have a complete percept, had to sweep over and take in the spatial and temporal limits of the sensuous object.

The process of the Universal Sign (language) in coming more completely to itself, that is, to its universality, falls into three stages which may be given as follows: —

1st. The Universal Sign as spoken; thus it moves in a succession and gives therein the immediate process of the Ego, but as fleeting in Time and confined in Space. That is, the spoken Word belongs only to the present moment a little prolonged, and to the present locality a little extended, being limited to the Now and the Here, to the immediate Present of both Time and Space. Such are the primal spatial and temporal limits of Speech, which the Ego proceeds inherently to transcend.

2d. The Universal Sign as pictured, written and printed; the moving temporal Word is now externalized and fixed in a spatial shape, freed of its immediate connection with the human voice; thus it can be borne beyond its natural limits in the Now and the Here; it is transmissible in Time and transferable in Space.

But the Ego comes to regard just this externality and spatial fixity of the Universal Sign as a new limit, as alien to its own free movement, the Ego being internality and the process in itself. This separation it will seek to overcome, uniting its own immediate internal act with the transcending of the external limits of Space and Time.

3d. The Universal Sign spoken and written by the Ego in its natural limits of Space and Time (in the Here and the Now), is picked up and carried beyond those limits by an elemental power — electricity chiefly — harnessed and working through mechanical contrivances — the Telephone, Telegraph and Phonograph. Thus the human voice is getting to speak directly through Space and down Time.

Manifestly the entire sense-world is to be turned into sound, is to be made over into the tones of the human voice, thereby becoming a spoken Sign, which is the Word. Yonder tree I behold as a percept, I recall it as an image, I transform this image into a sound which is the Sign of that tree to me and to others, and is universal, applicable to all trees. Thus every external thing is to be named, is to be made over into a vocal tone, and thereby universalized, whereof the system is language.

Let us again bring before us the sweep of the vocal Sign; it moves *from* the immediate limits

of the voice in Time and Space, *through* its fixity in external forms — picture, writ, print, to the transcending of the natural limits of the voice, as well as of the fixed Sign. Thus the Ego in accord with its own inherent character, is perpetually pushing the Sign beyond the bounds of Space and Time, in order that this Sign may obtain a complete universality, not merely in Meaning or internally, but also in Form or externally, whereby this Form becomes itself the image of the Ego.

The Sign or the Completed Symbol we have already designated as the third stage of the Imagination or the Symbol-making activity of mind. The Ego starts with the implicit Symbol, or the first separation of Form and Meaning, not unfolded, not conscious, passes through the Explicit Symbol, in which the separation into Form and Meaning is wrought over, and now comes to the Sign in which the Ego takes complete possession of the Form and elaborates it, till it becomes the adequate material of the Ego's process. Thus the Ego at last takes up its own movement into its Symbol; at first, in the Implicit Symbol, this process lay outside of the Symbol, which was the single fixed Form (say the picture of the dog) holding in itself implicitly the Meaning. But the Symbol in speech now symbolizes its own process.

1. The Ego in the first place moulds the sound

of the human voice into the process of itself, which sound thus formed is the articulate word. This moves, accordingly, in Time, not being fixed in Space, for it must express the process of the Ego, just through the form of articulation.

The next important fact of language is, that the Ego pours its own self with all its belongings into this articulated form of the human voice, of which, however, it has first to get possession. The total content of the Ego, its images, percepts, feelings, are to be expressed into the word. Everything seen or heard, everything which comes from the outer world into the mind, is destined to be transformed into speech and uttered (outered), whereby it becomes again an object in the sense-world to be heard by others.

The development of language, which is essentially the Ego moulding itself into sounds of the human voice, goes through three stages, the exclamatory, the imitative, and the metaphorical.

The exclamatory utterance is the most immediate, instinctive, natural of all utterances. The outer, the voice responds directly to the inner, the feeling. It is often merely a prolonged vowel, as *oh*, *ah*; both pain and pleasure find vent in these sounds. Then there is the interrupted exclamation in which the consonant has its place. The affection of the sentient organism works immediately upon the voice, which thus

becomes a direct echo of certain bodily conditions. In like manner the voice gives its response to emotional states.

In the imitative stage of language the expression is not exclamatory, not immediate; a new element enters which produces a separation into sound and meaning. The Ego copies the sound of nature in the sound of the voice, it imitates, it places itself between two sounds, namely its own copy and the sound copied. The latter is identified with the former, and thus becomes the means of recalling the object which makes the sound. The word *moo* is recognized as the bellow of a cow, of which it is an imitation; thereby it becomes the name of a cow to the child, and to the primitive man also. When the Ego imitates, its sound means the thing imitated, and is the first name thereof. The debt of early speech to imitation is very great; the Ego imitates the sounds of nature around itself and gradually transforms them into language.

The third stage of language we may call the metaphorical, in which the word passes through various forms of symbolism till it becomes the Sign. In the imitative stage just mentioned, the Ego copied the sound of nature and made this copy mean the thing copied, which thus has a name. But in its metaphorical activity the Ego comes back to itself, and makes the name originally taken from the thing of nature mean

some trait or phase of itself. The name is transferred from its physical to its mental significance. The Ego first imitates nature by the voice and forms the word; then it takes this imitated sound or the word, and uses it to express the spiritual act which most nearly resembles the physical act, thing, or event. The Ego thus transforms nature into an expression of itself. The word *light* means primarily the physical object, then it is applied to a corresponding mental fact; there is the transference from the outer to the inner sun of illumination. More and more, however, the word becomes the arbitrary Sign, losing its sensuous meaning, and being made over into the pure instrument of the Ego. *Spirit* meant originally breath or wind, an invisible power of nature; but in English it has passed through its primitive as well as its metaphorical stage, and has only its internal significance.

The Ego has now transformed the natural sound of the human voice into a Sign which is the most adequate utterance of itself. We have noticed that the word has to pass through various stages of symbolism, till it reaches the Sign, in which the sensuous meaning quite drops out of view.

2. The Ego, having internalized the spoken word and made it the bearer of a purely internal meaning, will next externalize the word, taking

it out of the movement of Time which is involved in speech, and fixing it in Space. The spoken word passes over, through the necessary process of the Ego, into the written, pictured, and printed word. Or, the Ego having made the spoken word its own, having identified the same with itself, must *other* it, make it different from itself and throw it into externality.

The spoken word being in Time, is transitory, so it is taken out of Time and fixed in a special form which makes it permanent, if not eternal. Moreover, the spoken word has a spatial limit; there is what may be called a vocal periphery at whose center the man stands speaking, but beyond which the voice cannot reach. This limit the Ego must transcend.

There are in the main three ways in which the Ego makes speech objective and fixed, and so saves it, to a degree, from Time and death. These are picture-writing, alphabetic writing and printing. All three appeal to sight, and not to hearing, as speech does; the spoken word, when put in this spatial shape, is transferable to another place and transmissible to another age. Thus the physical bounds of the spoken word in Space and Time are broken through.

These three ways of speech externalizing itself show a grand development of the ages, in which the process of the Ego manifests itself. The first picture-writing passes through the hierogly-

phic into an alphabet, which drops the picture and represents the sounds of the human voice — a most important step in the advance of the world's culture. The alphabet reflects the movement of mind in the vocal tones, and thus can give the process of the Ego, while the picture takes directly the object of sense, which is found to be too rigid a material for the impress of speech. From alphabetic writing, which is done with the pen, to printing, which is a writing with types (typography), is also a great step in the communication between man and man. The print is writ universalized, the type represents many single acts of writing. The material type, at first spatially fixed, is therein movable and combinable, of course in external fashion.

Now just this externality the Ego at last feels as a limit and starts toward removing it in some way. The crystallized shapes of writ and print must again be made fluid in order to give a new response to the Ego.

3. The spoken word thrown into fixed spatial forms — pictured, written, printed — finds at last in these forms, though at first they gave a new freedom, a fetter, a limitation which has to be transcended afresh. A new medium is found for carrying the voice far beyond the vocal periphery which is drawn round the voice by the air; this new medium is electricity, which, in the Telephone, enables man to speak across the

ocean, possibly around the globe. In like manner the Telegraph carries writing around the globe by means of electrical transmission. Finally the Phonograph writes the voice, so that it can be reproduced after its cessation, thus making the spoken word speak always and everywhere, transferring it through Space and transmitting it through Time.

All these instrumentalities are triumphs of the Ego in removing the limits put by nature upon communication; as usual, that very nature is harnessed and is made to remove her own obstruction. They have been invented and applied within the memory of living men, and they are themselves a Sign of the Time. The more or less fixed externality of writing and print gets rid of the movement of the Ego, divorces itself from the individual; we read the types which give and are the general and not the particular. But these recent inventions seek to restore the individual element in all communication; there is a return to the immediate Ego, the Telephone conveys the man's spoken word directly, the Telegraph may convey his writing, and the Phonograph preserves the individuality of the speaker's voice. This stress upon the side of the individual is a true characteristic of our age.

Hieroglyphic writing belongs to the language of the image, alphabetic writing to the language

of thought. When a people begin to think, that is, when they rise above the imaginative stage, they create or borrow an alphabet. This alphabet must, of course, be mastered by every human being who wishes to give or receive a communication. The child must learn it, this wonderful Sign of speech; the first act possibly of memorization is the naming and identifying of the letter A. The learning of an alphabetic language is a rising from imaging to thinking, which the primitive race passed through, and which the child must pass through again. The signs as letters are not a picture of the object, but they exist for its meaning. Learning to spell, to read, and to write is a marvelous discipline out of savagery, a grand means of culture, as well as of spiritual communication.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE SYMBOL.

The Imagination, which we have designated and unfolded as the Symbol-making activity of the mind, has now run its course through what we have called the Natural, the Artistic, and the Pure (completed) Symbol. It is the divisive stage of Representation, since it turns upon the division of the Image into Form and Meaning, which division, however, goes through the process of the Ego and thus reveals the Psychosis. The Natural (or Implicit) Symbol

showed the immediate unity of Form and Symbol, as in the case where the picture of the horse and the real horse are not yet fully differentiated by the Ego. The Artistic (or Explicit) Symbol shows the separation of Form and Meaning in which both elements are wrought over in a variety of ways, yet without losing the natural purport of the Symbol. Finally, the Pure or Completed Symbol quite casts out the natural side of the Meaning, and keeps the pure Meaning of the Ego, though, of course, the physical Form is retained. Thus the Ego moves *from* its unconscious, implicit stage, which is more or less determined from the outside by Nature, *through* the dualistic stage or the struggle between Ego and Nature (or Meaning and Form), *to* the triumph of the Ego in the Sign, in which it uses the outer world simply to reflect itself.

It must be confessed that the Symbol has fared hard at the hands of modern psychologists. Often it is not even mentioned in their books, and, as far as we are aware, never receives any full treatment. Its place in the movement of the individual mind seems not to be distinctly apprehended, still less has its place in the movement of man been duly recognized. Yet it is the inner germinal principle which unfolds into Art, Poetry, History, above all, Human Speech, which is on so many sides intimately connected with the psychological process.

For any adequate treatment of the Symbol, we still have to go back to Hegel (*Æsthetik Band I. Zweiter Theil.*, p. 378, *et passim*). As far as we have been able to read, this remains the best and most concrete elaboration of the Symbol. We have, however, felt ourselves compelled to give a good deal wider meaning to the term Symbol, than Hegel does, who, in our judgment, cramps the usage of the word by confining it to what he calls Symbolic Art, and making this apply essentially to the Oriental form of Art, as contrasted with the Classic and Romantic forms of Art. The reader will note that with us all Art is Symbol-making, indeed all expression of the Ego is primarily symbolic. Hegel therefore has little or nothing to say of the Implicit Symbol, or of the Sign, which, however, he touches upon in his very brief Psychology. Still we have no intention here of finding fault with the great thinker whose work on this subject is indeed epoch-making, and has not yet been overtaken by the new psychological movement.

2. More surprising still is the neglect of the Symbol by educational psychologists. An examination of certain recent text-books (not all, to be sure, as that were impossible) shows no appreciation of it, and hardly the mention of it. The Herbartians (this name is given by themselves to themselves) have been our great stimu-

lators in educational Psychology, but they seem to keep marvelously shy of the Symbol. Would it not be well for them, with their well-known energy and ability in exploiting their subjects and themselves, to give us a little of this finer flour instead of grinding up such an awful grist of "apperception" and "correlation," good things in themselves undoubtedly, yet not quite the Universe? Of the other rather noisy school of the present time, that of the physiological psychologists, nothing perhaps can be reasonably expected, since it is not probable that the Symbol will be discovered for a while yet in either the white or the gray matter of the brain, or be found ensconced in a nerve center or brain cell; especially is such a discovery difficult till the psychologist understands what the Symbol is, and has found out beforehand what he is going to find.

3. This neglect of the Symbol on the part of educationists becomes almost startling when we consider the fact that the primary branches of education (the three R's) deal wholly with the Symbol. The infant in its first act of learning begins with a Symbol of some kind, and its education is the acquisition and employment of Symbols. Language spoken, written, printed, is a Symbol; the figures of Arithmetic are Symbols. Thus the child in learning to speak, to write, to cipher, is trained in the use of Symbols; the

school is primarily a training to a mastery of the Symbol.

Thus the child has, first of all, to get control of the Symbol in order to develop within, and become a member of a social order without. It has to enter specially the Sign-world, and live and communicate therein. This primary Sign-world of the child we may classify tentatively, for the purpose of a brief survey of the total field.

(1) The voice-sign, which is used in speaking, and is organized into language (phonic).

(2) The letter-sign, which is used in writing and printing, and so is the first element in learning to read print or writ (graphic or alphabetic).

(3) The number-sign, whose Form must be mastered and whose Meaning must be acquired in learning to cipher (mathematic).

These three Signs of the School (phonic, graphic, mathematic), constitute an order which may be internally connected. Already we have unfolded the voice-sign which is sound laden with the meaning of the Ego and thrown into Time. Likewise, we have considered previously the letter-sign which is the spatial fixing of sound (see preceding account of the Sign *passim*). The number-sign expresses quantity, which is a complete abstraction, on part of the Ego, from all sensuous properties of the thing; the expression of that abstraction in a Sign is

the numerical figure, through which the Ego begins to deal with itself as the supersensible activity, wherein it rises out of the realm of the senses.

It is manifest from looking over the first branches of a school curriculum that the Symbol, or more particularly the Sign, is the primal element of Education.

4. The Symbol, however, reaches far beyond the school proper, has in fact an almost inexhaustible subject-matter, though the order of this can be and must be compassed by the Ego seeing therein its own process.

The kinds of Symbolism, the styles thereof, are very diverse, differing according to the nation, the age, and also the individual. The most striking general distinction is that between Oriental and Occidental Symbolism, both of which have been characterized and ordered in the preceding account. The Symbols of the Hebrew Bibles, how varied, subtle, and abounding! The study of these biblical Symbols is important both for religion and literature; their proper ordering and unfolding would be an interesting chapter in that new book on the psychology of the Bible which, if not written, is certainly writable.

In the Occident the individual writer often develops his own peculiar style of Symbolism. Dante is the greatest of all the Symbolists; a study of the Divine Comedy compels the study

of Symbolism, which is the very life-blood of that poem. Wholly different is the symbolic manner of Goethe, especially in the Second Part of Faust, in which the poet has created, one can say, a symbolic world of his own out of antecedent materials, by drawing upon Classic, Christian, and Teutonic Mythology, as well as by introducing a great variety of lesser forms, such as allegory, personification, epigram, even down to the riddle and pun. A new application of the Symbol for educating the child was made by Froebel, who therein went back to the root of human culture, and reconstructed a fresh symbolic world for the beginners, the little ones, by means of his Gifts and Occupations, and more particularly by his Play-Songs (*Mutter-und-Kose-Lieder*). Thus the Symbol is directly applied to Education, which through it is seen to be closely allied to Art, Poetry, Religion, all of which seek a symbolic expression. Froebel saw the play of children to be really a natural Symbol, which could be transfigured into a reflection of the spirit whereby the child might be elevated into participation in the highest and worthiest things of his race. Not exactly a poetic symbolist like Dante or Goethe, Froebel is the great educational symbolist; he sends us back (along with the child) to the primordial symbolic act of the Ego, and out of that unfolds the education of the human being.

5. The distinction between Imagination and Fancy has been much insisted on, especially in Poetics. We may indeed say that there is a symbolizing Fancy and a symbolizing Imagination. In general, the Fancy takes a prosaic (unsymbolic) theme and plays about it in a kind of symbolic sport, weaving around it more or less externally many little symbolic flowers; while the Imagination makes the totality, the theme itself, a Symbol.

For instance, we have seen a school report, whose content was dead prose, decorated by a lively fancy with all sorts of figures and images, a mass of green leaves, tendrils, and blossoms wreathing a dead trunk. But poetic Imagination demands that the trunk be alive first of all. So there is a distinction between poems of the Fancy and of the Imagination.

6. Imagination, the Symbol-making power, having constructed as its final act the Sign-world, gives place to a new sphere. Conceive of yourself without a knowledge of this Sign-world (or language), a wall encompasses you as high as heaven and as deep as the pit. The first work of the Ego is the getting possession of the Sign-world which environs it. This brings us to the new process — Memorization.

SECTION THIRD.—MEMORIZATION.

The Ego has made a Sign-world through which man communicates with man, and which, therefore, renders a social order possible. Every individual Ego is born into this Sign-world, and must get possession of it, must use it, and finally must create it again. In fact the entire sphere of the Symbol is for the purpose of communication, but we shall keep in mind specially the Sign, and indeed the Word, which is the supreme manifestation both of the Symbol and the Sign.

This process of the Ego in mastering the Sign-world we shall call Memorization. It is not a good term for the purpose, we memorize objects in simple Memory, which activity we have already considered; then the word *memorizing* is apt to be misunderstood, being applied mostly to the mechanical phase of Memory. But after

some search and a good deal of waiting, no better term comes to the front, and so we shall take it and try to make it do its duty in its present sphere. First of all, then, Memorization must be grasped not simply as a committing to memory, though it be that too; it means the internalizing of the whole symbolic world and likewise the employing and the producing of the same. Every human being at present lives in such a symbolic world, and must get control of it, nay, must make it; to be sure, it has been made for him, but it must also be made over by him.

Here we shall call to mind the apperceptive side to Memorization. The Sense-world we have already seen apperceived under the head of Apperception; but the Sign-world, our new reality, creation of the Ego, we must also see apperceived, internalized, ordered. The sensuous object has been transformed into a Sign which is the name, a thing of sound; but the Ego must learn to understand the meaning of this sound-sign, must internalize the same. That is, the Ego must now apperceive an object with both Form and Meaning, both of which constitute the Symbol, or more particularly, the Word.

The Memorization of the Sign-world, especially of language, is the basis of all communication between man and man, as well as of all participation in the movement of the race. Let us take a common illustration of its process — the

newspaper, which prints all the important matters, events, deeds which take place on the globe daily. It first transforms the things of sense into Signs, which make up its printed page. But in order that the Ego get at what lies in these Signs, it must not only have learned them previously, but also must now reconstitute them, and thereby reach the external world. Note, then, the process: the journal before you through its staff of workers has had to perceive the outer Sense-world quite round the globe (occurrences, men, actions, in general the news); then it has had to transform all this into Signs (print); finally the reading Ego takes it up and reproduces that entire Sense-world as observed perhaps by hundreds of reporters over the earth. To all of which the magic key is the knowledge of the Signs, which enable every human being to participate in the daily doings, thoughts, feelings of total humanity.

But not only the Present can be thus taken up and transferred through the Sign; the Past is symbolized and imparted in the same way. A library of books is a grand storehouse, a kind of universal Memory, holding the contents of many minds and of many ages. Through the Sign (writing or printing), the fleeting thoughts and deeds of men are caught and held fast, and then are brought together in this treasury of the Past. The Ego, having memorized the Sign, which is

the magic key, can unlock all the wealth of a thousand men's activity scattered through Time, and use the same quite as its own. By means of the Sign the race gets a Memory in which every individual may share, of course through Memorization of the Sign.

Great, therefore, is the Sign, the instrumentality by which man lives the life of his race in the Present throughout Space, and by which man lives the life of his race throughout Time. Thus he is indeed a whole man, realizing the ideal end of all individual discipline as well as of civilization.

Man has made the Sign-world, and it bears the imprint of his Ego, as God has made the world of nature, which bears the imprint of the Divine Ego. In Sense-perception, we may recollect, the Ego, in cognizing an external object, rose to a recognition of the Ego as creator. In Memorization, the Ego recognizes the Ego as the creator of the Sign, whose Meaning is really its own, itself; the Ego must know the Sign, make the Sign, and know itself as maker of the Sign, which last is the completion of the present sphere.

As a kind of preparation, let the reader grapple with the following statement. When the Sign (name or word) has the Meaning only which the Ego has put into it, this Sign (or name) is no longer particular nor does it represent any-

thing particular, but is universal. The tree (as a name) designates all trees, it is a class; but tree as an object of vision or an image is particular merely. So, when I make a name for the particular, I universalize it. For the Sign (name) makes the particular thing *insignificant*; the Ego has put into the outward form its own meaning; the sensuous particular tree quite vanishes into the universal tree, or the thought of the tree. In naming the tree, the Ego has imposed itself upon the sensuous object and made it an idea. Another Ego can recognize the process of Ego in the name, and thus recognize the object, the tree.

Why is the Sign (or name) made by the Ego universal, applicable to all trees? Manifestly the particular element is set aside, disregarded, negated; the Ego has put its own Meaning into the thing and made it a Sign; the Ego thus has taken away its distinctiveness, its separation as particular, annulling its limit as a sensuous thing.

The process of Memorization is that the Ego reach through the Sign and return to itself as object; the Ego throws off at last even the shadow of the Sign, and beholds itself purely. It is not only the Meaning, but the Form as well; it not only makes the Sign but knows itself as Sign-maker. When the Ego sees itself in the object and as the creator thereof, it is thinking — it is genetic, universal, creative, or re-creative.

When it puts what Meaning it pleases into the Sign (tree), it makes the same, hence tree is universal, having the creative Ego in it as Sign, so that it ideally creates all trees. Tree as percept or image is particular, even as outward spoken Sign; but tree as thought or the thought of the tree is what creates all trees.

The sound or word becomes limited or particular also, being different in different tongues; accordingly the Signs (names for tree) change, but the thought in all these Signs (names) is one; to the English, German, French, the thought of the tree is the same, creating ideally all trees; it is hence generic, universal, while the names or signs vary with the limits of the nation, though inside these limits the name is common, or, as is often said, universal.

Thus Thought is reached by means of the name or sign; we think in names or words, still we must rise out of the simple particular word to that which creates it. Language is the beautiful temple of imagery and of poetry, but it is only a ladder to the heaven of Thought. The pure Psychosis of Thinking makes fluid the crystallized word and breaks down the limits of the image or the symbol. The Ego in Thought is self-recognitive, it must recognize its own form as the thinking principle; cognition, or implicit Thought, must rise to recognition, or explicit Thought.

The preceding remarks are a preliminary dash at Memorization, which it is well for the student to follow even vaguely, before he makes the main ordered attack. As already indicated, this sphere of Memorization has also the movement of the Ego, which falls into the following stages:—

I. The Symbol-learning Ego, which is to get possession of the world of Symbols, into which it is born and which is the condition of itself as a social being.

II. The Symbol-employing Ego, which is to utilize the Symbol, especially the Word, by speaking and hearing, and thus become in itself the complete process of both receiving and imparting — which process always involves the reproduction of the Word.

III. Communication of Ego with Ego and with the totality of which it is a member, through the Symbol. The community now advances into the foreground; it has to appropriate, and finally to create the Symbol or the Word, which becomes itself a community or a system of speech.

The process of Memorization thus manifests the Psychosis, being the inherent movement of the Ego in the present sphere. The Ego must first appropriate the Symbol (or word) *immediately*; then the Ego uses the same, projecting it out of itself into the world, showing itself therein divisive, which divisive state is still further manifested in the speaking and hearing sides of the

one Ego and of many Egos; finally these many individual Egos, separated and outside of one another, are united by Communication into a community, and become spiritually one through the Symbol or Word.

Herewith, however, Memorization has run its course. The Ego has acquired, employed, and created the Sign; this Sign has also revealed the Ego to itself as Sign-maker. The Word has now told to the Ego the secret of itself, as it were, saying: You are the creative principle not only of me but also of all that I represent, namely the objective world. Having come to such a consciousness of itself, the Ego grasps itself as the creative process of the Thing, and therewith passes into the realm of Thought. The Word, too, has reached its end, having guided the Ego to Thought out of the realm of the Image. The Word has made the Ego think, though it is not itself Thinking.

I. THE SYMBOL-LEARNING EGO.

We have already unfolded the Symbolic Realm, of which the Ego is now to be seen in the process of taking possession. One phase of the Symbol is the Sign, with which we wish to deal specially at present. Note that this Sign-world has been made into a world of things existent, not as percepts with their own sensuous

meaning, but as percepts to which a new meaning has been assigned by the Ego. Hence it is a world very distinct from that of pure Sense-perception, though it has to be perceived too. Every percept in any wise sensed, be it seen, heard, even tasted and smelt, has in the present sphere a new *sense* derived from the Ego. Thus we all live in a grand symbolic environment transformed by the Ego from Nature and manifesting a mental content. Of these Symbols (or more definitely, Signs) the most important and the one embracing all others essentially is the Word, spoken, heard and seen, the unit of speech and the vehicle of human intercourse.

This Word has its origin in many souls, and is sprung of their united soul-life, however humble. No one man has yet made a living language, which is a product of the common consciousness of many Egos co-operating, and is just the spiritual fruit as well as the image of such co-operation. They make something which they use in common, mirroring the spiritual medium in which they live, by which they communicate with one another, and in which they are all one. Into this world of word-signs every Ego is placed at the start, not in actual possession of it, but with the possibility of getting possession. Every born child has, first of all, to master it, ere he can utter (outer) himself and become a reality, ere he can communicate with others, or be himself

communicated with in turn. The separate individual thus overcomes the limits of nature imposed upon him by birth, and can associate with his fellows in the establishing and the perpetuating of a social order.

Moreover the results of all culture, the gifts of those lofty souls who have appeared in the past and have transmitted to the future their wisdom and character, are treasured in these Signs written and printed, even spoken in tradition. The early years of life must be spent in mastering these Signs, in learning to communicate and to receive communication not only from the present but also from the past. Thus the child is already put in touch with the movement of his race, and receives a universal human impulse through the channel of the Word. Education turns upon the appropriating of Symbols. Speaking begins in the household; reading and writing introduce the child to the school; arithmetic also goes back to the mastery of Signs. The kindergarten makes play symbolic and converts it into a grand means of early discipline; even the infant is not to lose his infancy, he must sing and play spontaneously yet symbolically, not capriciously, not in a chaos but in an order, which is, in general, that of his race's evolution.

The Symbol-learning Ego, in its process of acquiring its content (Symbol, Sign, Word), will manifest three stages which we shall call the

integrative (immediate), externalized (divisive), recognitive (unitary).

I. The new Ego is placed, let us repeat, in a Sign-world of words which must be taught to it, in general, by the environing social order. The parent gives the first instruction, which is soon supplemented by others, till the teacher in person appears, in some way supported by society just for this work. Thus the knowledge of the Sign-world is brought to the Ego from outside at first, gradually it is inducted into the means of becoming a member of the social totality. By no conscious act of will is this matter accomplished, it is spontaneous on part of the child, who integrates the words as they rise before him till he acquires the ability to express himself. His Ego must internalize the sound-sign (let it be the word *horse*), and appropriate the same. In Sense-perception he internalizes the object *horse*, from which he must pass to the spoken sign, and do the same with that. Let us briefly outline the steps of the process.

1. The sensuous object (horse) is given a name in the presence of the child, who thereby connects immediately the object and the word, or the sign and the thing signified. This connection develops later into a sentence: *this is a horse*. So all objects of sense, or the important ones, in the child's environment are translated

into signs spoken by the voice — a sound laden with a meaning. Such is the first nexus of speech, that between an object of vision, and the sound of the voice — the immediate unity of an outer Form with an inner Meaning.

2. The young Ego, having thus taken up and internalized the sound along with its content, proceeds at once to utter the same sound himself, to make it external. Thus the child speaks the word, or the sound with its meaning; that is, he separates it from himself, and projects it into the world; he has to do so, in accordance with the divisive character of the Ego. The child cannot help expressing himself, but he should be directed. The word *horse* is spoken by the parent or teacher, and is appropriated; then it has to be uttered (or outered); the power of utterance is still further developed by repetition. We often say, the child imitates the speech of others; but this imitation is to be traced back to the Ego in its separative act.

3. The word, when uttered now by anybody, brings back to the child the image of the object which was originally coupled with its sound. The absent thing can be thus made present, and the Ego begins to receive communication from other Egos through the sound-sign; the word spoken restores the sense-world. Moreover, each word begins to take its place in an ordered whole, and organized language starts into being

for the child or the learning Ego, which not only appropriates and utters single words, but commences to order them, of course after the pattern of itself.

II. The Symbol-learning Ego has so far integrated the word, which is a Sign with its two elements, namely, the spoken sound and what the sound signifies; or, we may say that the Ego has appropriated the Sign with Form and Meaning in immediate unity. But now the Ego begins to tear asunder Form and Meaning, which is a much deeper separation than that which took place in the stage just described wherein the Ego simply uttered the word undivided within itself. This present separation comes about through memorizing, hence this stage may also be called the recollective (externalized, divisive).

In the act of memorizing or committing to memory the Ego seizes the external name as distinct from what this name means, holds it at first apart from other names or signs, thus separating Form from Meaning, and repeats the Form till the latter becomes automatic and empty, and quite loses its Meaning for the Ego which is performing this act. The movement is to externalize completely the Sign and put it under control of the Ego without its Meaning.

The present process is a necessary one for the Ego which must separate itself from the externality of the Sign or Word, which is its

outer Form, in order to get possession of the same and thereby become free; that is, not determined from without by the Form but ruling it from within. Let us set forth the stages of this process.

1. The Ego becomes conscious of the division of the word into Form and Meaning through forgetfulness. It has the word, but cannot remember what the word means; or it has some meaning of its own to express, but cannot get the word. Thus through the failure of Memory the Ego finds the Sign split into its two component elements. When I recover the lost Meaning and put it back into its Form, I thenceforth remain aware that all Signs have this same twofoldness.

2. The Ego now makes the separation complete in this sphere by repeating the Form of the word, or its sound-sign till it rises of itself and is uttered independent of the Meaning. The volitional act of the mind alone is now sufficient to bring up the word; just through this separation the Ego has gotten possession of the outer Form and recalls it at pleasure; the Ego directly as Will is the master, who is able to invoke the word.

3. But not only single words does the Ego empty of content in this way, but a whole series, and furthermore it links this series of words together, in their externality, so that the same runs of itself without the intervention or need

of any Meaning. Thus the Ego has gotten immediate possession of these Forms, that is, a possession not mediated by the Meaning, and can reproduce a chain of Signs which is wholly devoid of content. But the Ego was itself originally this element of Meaning in the Sign or Symbol; thus it has completely taken itself out of its own Sign, here the word. Such is the present separation.

In learning by heart I train the Meaning out of the name or names, though when I read the latter, the Meaning comes up to me and is the emphatic thing, being really myself which I recognize. But when I have committed a poem to memory, the words or the outer Forms are the matter emphasized. The Meaning at first ignores the Word, though present; then the Word ignores the Meaning, quite casting it out. An independent chain of Forms with its own separate movement seems to be one side, a chain of Meanings the other.

Thus the Ego which put itself originally into the Sign, has quite externalized itself therein at present; self-estranged, divided into itself and its opposite the Ego appears in this psychical act. The Signs which it made and filled with its own Meaning it has veritably disemboweled, having emptied them of itself and holding them outside of itself. Such is the phenomenon usually called Mechanical Memory, inasmuch as

these outer Forms have merely an external or mechanical connection with one another. If they are set to moving, they go on like a collection of wheels in clockwork; the words of the series, be it a poem or a mere abacadabra, pour forth one after the other to the end of the line. Still this series has to be started; who is the starter? Herewith we come to the next.

III. The Ego is the starter, hence it has the whole external series of Signs under its control; when we touch the pendulum, the entire machinery of the clock (also the work of the Ego) moves and runs its course. Still we have to touch the pendulum. So it comes about that in this complete externalization of the Sign or chain of Signs, the Ego has gotten complete possession of them, has made them its own just through the act of separation. The poem is committed to memory, we say; the mind hardly needs to think of the meaning in order to recall the words; the Ego through its own fiat dominates them, having linked them into this external chain. The fact is the outer Sign has been inwardized by mechanical Memory at first it was really external to the Ego, hence not controllable, but easily forgettable. But now when it has been made external through the act of the Ego, its very externality is placed under the authority of the Ego, which thus has returned out of its self-opposition, such as we observed in the previous stage.

Life is full of the necessity of mastering many series of Signs. The alphabet is such a series, language is also; the special vocations of men depend more or less upon the mastery of Signs. The telegrapher has his peculiar Sign-world; departments of the nautical and military professions are devoted to signals; secret orders have their systems of Signs.

Note that when you have fully memorized anything, say a poem, so that it runs off your tongue without your thinking of it, the Signs are no longer out of your power; they are yours easily, without resistance. You have subjugated what was external to you in the Form; you have not only the signification, but the Signs themselves. You need not in fact read or speak them, they are as internal as yourself. Thus the Ego has gotten complete possession of the Sign, and recognizes the same to be its own, and recognizes itself in the Sign.

In this third stage of the Symbol-learning Ego there is also a process which has its three phases; these may be set apart as follows:—

1. The Ego starts the external series of sound-signs, and therein shows them to be under its own control. By an act of volition it can set them going; though they are external, they are so through the Ego, and hence have been made really internal, that is, have been appropriated by the Ego, and projected anew into their pres-

ent externality. Their movement is automatic, still this mechanical automaton has been constructed and started by the Ego.

2. Now we observe a new separation; having started the series, the Ego can withdraw itself from the same and think of something else; nay, it can start a new series within itself. It separates itself wholly from the series, and pays no heed to the same consciously, but gives its attention to a different matter, which may likewise require a series of Signs. Thus a new chain arises, which, however, demands at first the presence of the Meaning, of which the Ego is more or less conscious, while the first chain with its row of empty Forms sinks into the unconscious, and coalesces immediately with the Ego. Such is the separation and the interaction of the two series, the one coming, the other going, till the second series quite supplants the first.

But this second series is of necessity subjected to the same process as the first; it too becomes automatic, or may become so; the Ego will bid its Forms, having been emptied of Meaning, to vanish into the unconscious, there to stay in silence waiting the order of recall.

3. Thus the first and the second series of Signs after having been so completely separated by the Ego, are united in the same process, and are made one with the Ego, being internalized and ideated with the same. The Signs are now

stored away, so to speak, are ordered, possessed not only singly but in an order.

The Ego has now subjected the externality of the Sign with its series, and made the same its own; it is not only master but is conscious of its mastery, when it has overcome the separation of the Form from itself. It knows that it can internalize and take possession of all external Signs, being the lord and indeed the creator of the Sign-world.

In this last process the Ego, having constructed the machine (Mechanical Memory) and set it going, repeats its constructive act, and then becomes aware of itself as the machine-maker. It has learned the Sign, and can employ it, in fact create it if necessary.

Looking back over the movement of the Symbol-learning Ego, we observe that it has traveled through its three stages and therein manifests the Psychosis. It has, in the first place, learned the Sign and connected it with the object — the immediate or integrative stage in which Form and Meaning of the Sign are taken up without separation. In the second stage this separation takes place; the Form of the Sign (or the word) is completely externalized by the Ego both singly and in a series, wherein the mechanical element appears and the integration of the whole chain becomes external — the separative, externalized stage. In the third place, the Ego finds that this

externalization of the Sign and the series is really the mastery of both; its own self-alienation therein it overcomes, and recognizes itself to be the true possessor of the Sign-world. In order to attain to this recognition, however, it has had to travel through the self-estrangement of the second stage, and then be restored to unity with itself.

What next? Having obtained complete possession of the Sign and the order thereof, it must proceed to use the same — which fact brings us to a new phase of Memorization.

II. THE SYMBOL-EMPLOYING EGO.

The Ego is now to utilize its possession of the Symbol, of which we here take the sound-sign or the word as the best instance. I have gotten my store of language, I must next make it utter my own Self; this is a fresh act of separation in which I project the integrated word or sign out of myself into the world. So I must do, in accord with the necessary movement of the Ego. But the word will be employed not only for utterance, but also for communication, as we shall see.

The previous act of separation took place between Form and Meaning of the word, for the purpose of internalizing the same; the present act of separation sends forth the total word

from its internal state, makes it spoken and heard. It is true that the Ego both spoke and heard in the previous stage, but it did not then attain the end of speech, which must be self-expressive, indeed creative. The learning Ego was more or less imitative, taking its cue from the outside, from the teacher who gave the copy. But now the Ego must be its own teacher and learner too; it must utter its own Self, from within, though it has to employ the signs previously learnt.

When I speak the word representing some object, I negate the image with which I start; I take away its visible limit and throw it into movement, into Time, which is the external annulment yet preservation of the limit. For the sound of my voice has not extended shape, but is the negation thereof; the spatially limited image is canceled when I fling it into speech. On the contrary when I hear the word, I replace this spatial limit and restore the image; I undo what speech has done, I negate the negation and behold the object represented. Thus speech produces an interaction between the minds of the speaker and hearer, which brings about their mutual coalescence and communication.

This is now the important fact which is to be unfolded in the Symbol-employing Ego, which shows three stages: first it speaks the word immediately; secondly it hears the word which

implies the separate act from that of the speaking Ego; the two, speaking and hearing, are one and the act of one Ego, which is the completed act of the Symbol-employing Ego.

I. The Ego speaks the word, let it be the word *tree*. The Ego therein reproduces the object or image in sound, this vibrates on the air, a new, outer element, in which there is no geometrical figure, and no picture of one. The act is a negation of the spatial form of the object, external and internal, and a making it over into a moving sound which can have no such fixed limit as the image has. Such is the spoken word: an annulment of the inner figure and the projection of it into the sound-world. Let us follow this process in a few details.

1. The Ego has the percept or the image, which is its starting-point at present; this is what it will utter, or set forth in the sound of the voice.

2. The Ego next recollects the name or the sound-sign which it has already appropriated and stored away in the Symbol-learning stage. This requires an act of Memory which is separative, now the Ego has two elements: the image and the name, the object and its sound-sign, distinct yet held together.

3. The Ego makes a synthesis of the two, and the name is spoken, externalized; the sound of the voice laden with the image, which is its

inner meaning, vibrates on the air to the limit of the vocal periphery. Within this vocal periphery is a second Ego, let us say; the vibrations strike the ear and become a new stimulus, that of hearing.

II. The Ego hears the word spoken, let it be the word *tree*. Twofold is now the situation, embracing the speaker and the hearer who is supposed to understand the meaning of the word. The hearing Ego takes up the sound-sign, and from it reconstitutes the image which represents the object; I, hearing the word *tree* in known sound, at once reproduce the image of that object. What the speaker did, the hearer undoes; the one transmuted the image into sound, the other transmutes the sound back into image. Let us mark the steps of the latter process.

1. The Ego takes up the sound-sign through the act of hearing; this is the starting-point in the present case, it hears the spoken word.

2. The Ego next recollects the image or the meaning which it has coupled with this sound-sign, having appropriated and stored away the same in the Symbol-learning stage. This demands memory, which is pre-supposed in the present act. Again the Ego finds itself with two elements: the heard name and the recollected image or meaning, the two distinct yet held together.

3. The Ego brings the two into coalescence ; the heard sound, which is the word, is internalized, and thereby is transmuted into the image, which is the inner meaning of the word. Through the hearing Ego the sound passes into sense.

The hearing Ego has thus come back to the image, the point at which the speaking Ego started. Both have gone through their separate processes, yet it is manifest that both constitute fundamentally one process. The hearing Ego having the internal image must necessarily proceed to externalize it in sound, which is the spoken word. For the Ego by its very nature is this self-externalization ; **only thus** can it realize itself in speech. But this is a new phase of the Ego and a new stage of the present movement.

III. The Ego having heard the spoken word, speaks in response. Thus the Ego shows itself complete ; it responds, which means that it speaks, hears, and returns to speech. All in one it negates the image and throws it into sound by speaking, and then it negates this negation and restores the image through hearing. The Ego does both : it takes its own image and flings the same into the stream of Time, annulling the spatial limits thereof ; then it takes up this same image annulled, restoring the spatial limits. Thus it is each side and both together — the complete process of itself as Symbol-employing.

But this Ego also has its movement, which unfolds into the realm of communication.

1. The responding Ego is at first single, a process within itself, simply subjective. But this internal completeness soon shows itself incomplete, limited, indeed dependent. In order to be able to respond, it must have another Ego absolutely distinct, yet just as complete as it is, since this second Ego also must respond.

2. Thus separation, duplicity again enters; the previous duplicity lay between the speaking and hearing Ego, which, however, is one complete process of the Ego. But this completed Ego, being internal must also know itself as external, must indeed externalize itself as complete, which means another Ego. Thus we have two different Symbol-employing Egos, those which can both hear and speak the word, responding to each other.

3. These two independent individuals, each complete in himself, are therein just alike, both have the same fundamental process of the Ego. Each, hearing and speaking, responds and corresponds to the other; they are in a process with each other, they receive and they impart; the speaking half (let us call it for the nonce) joins with the hearing half and constitutes a new totality. Thus the two Egos through the Sign form a medium which is itself a process involving both, in which medium both participate, unite,

commune. We may keep up the simile and say that one total Ego gives one half of itself, and the other total Ego gives the other half of itself, and the two form the third (which is the completed Word) uniting both, being a process which interlinks both in its movement.

Thus the different Egos have not only unity, but community, are not only joined together, but are mediated by a common element; still further, this community of Egos is not a fixed state, but a living process, indeed just their own process. Thus the community becomes communication, which is the outcome and completion of the Symbol-employing Ego.

III. COMMUNICATION.

The individual Ego communicates with the individual Ego by means of the Symbol, which is or contains in itself the process of the Ego. The most complete form of this process, as has been already set forth, is found in the Sign which is the word. To the latter, accordingly, we pay special attention in the present exposition.

The community must have something in common, must communicate it, and must have a means of communication. Who makes this means? The community itself, the individual Ego cannot do it, though he can commune with himself. The language of a people is not made

by one man, but by the people themselves, by many Egos co-operating in a social order. We have already seen that the living process of the word requires at least two Egos, speaking and hearing, which process is the mean or mediating principle between them.

A society, then, has to make a language, which is in itself a kind of society or image of the social order that produces it. Language also has its organization, which is the right grammar of it, and which is patterned after the process of the Ego. Still each individual of the society has to be creative of speech, has to make the word over every time he uses it, though he has received it ready-made. The word, taken by itself, is but the external, crystallized process of the Ego, which has to make it internal and vital, before it can communicate.

We shall now observe the movement of the community making a means of communication through Signs, vocal Signs specially, and ordering them into a system of speech. First we shall regard the community as Sign-possessing, receiving and using the same; secondly the community as Sign-creating which is the making of the Sign-world; thirdly, Intercommunication, in which this Sign-world or community of Signs mediates and unites the community of individual Egos.

We have thus come to the pre-supposition of the Sign-learning and Sign-employing Ego,

namely, the community, which is in possession of the Sign at the start, yet has always to be in the process of re-possessing the same, in order to keep it alive and lasting. Hence the community has to keep doing what the individual Ego has done — learn, employ and finally create the Sign. Yet this is different from the process of the single Ego, which rises and passes away in the community while the latter endures. In like manner the process of speech endures, is continuous in the community; yet it has its process therein, with its three stages, as we now are to see.

I. We find the community at the start in possession of the great means of communication, the language-sign — a fact which we have already pre-supposed in the preceding exposition. The child has to learn these Signs, the mature man employs them in all his intercourse with his fellow-man. But that which has been hitherto assumed, must now be brought forth to light and made explicit. The individual Ego in the foregoing movement has unfolded into the community which receives, preserves and makes the Sign.

The possession of the Sign by the community, the active, not the merely passive possession thereof, is the immediate fact before us. We may sketch the activity involved in such possession.

1. Every community receives the Sign (or

Word) and has to take the same up into itself. It inherits language, preserves it, and then transmits it, all of which requires an active and organized endeavor.

2. Every community not only takes up, but also employs, externalizes the Sign, which has been transmitted to it and appropriated by it, using the same in its own way and for its own behoof according to the needs of communication.

3. Every community not only uses the Sign as handed down, but transforms the Sign more or less, and begins to assert itself, in the matter of language, as free, as limit-transcending. It employs the old Form (or Word) to express the new Meaning, yet it will transmute the old Form, when this gets to be inadequate. Through this partial transmutation of the Sign we make the transition to its creation, which is the next stage.

II. The community creates the Sign, not only renewing it but making a new one. This does not mean that the community at a single fiat or in a given period produces a totally new language. It is, however, always creating Signs, cannot help doing so; it is at the same time keeping and using what has been transmitted to it from the ancestors in the way of Signs.

The community, therefore, transforms itself into Signs, throws itself out of itself and looks at itself, indeed reads itself transformed into Signs.

All its happenings, opinions, thoughts, even its scandal it mirrors to itself by Signs. What else is the newspaper? The community's daily life (perchance the world's) is first observed, then is put into Signs (say printed Signs) in which it holds itself up before itself.

The Sign-creating community, in order to mirror itself adequately, will transform itself into a system, or we may say, a community of Signs, into which it organizes itself in the present sphere, creating three kinds of signs — the Sign of the Image, the Sign of the Symbol and the Sign of the Sign.

1. We have already seen how the world of externality, visible nature, is taken up by the Ego and becomes the Image. Still further, this Image is projected in sound and thereby becomes a spoken word, a Sign through which the Image is communicated from Ego to Ego. Thus the sense-world, passing through the Image, gets its Sign.

2. The community begins to express its inner life by creating the Sign of the Symbol. As already set forth (p. 281, etc.) the Symbol, specially the explicit Symbol, is the external Image with an internal Meaning given by the Ego. The Image of wrestling is applied, first to body, and then to mind; in the latter case it is specially symbolic, and utters what is internal. The Symbol with its outer Form and inner Meaning is

transformed into the Sign, which is here the Word, whereby the soul-life of man is communicated from soul to soul, and the inner world gets expression.

3. We have already seen the Symbol passing over into the Sign (p. 343); in like manner we are now to behold the Sign of the Symbol moving into the Sign of the Sign. The Ego (of the community) makes the Sign and puts therein its own Meaning; but this is not all; the Ego makes a Sign which expresses just this activity of itself in making the Sign.

Language communicates not only the outer and inner worlds from mind to mind, but also shows itself doing the same. The Ego speaks not only the word but speaks the word *word*, the Sign of the Sign; thus the Sign is made to designate itself, and the word not only expresses something different from itself (as tree or thought) but also can turn back and express itself in the process of expression. Herein we behold the movement of the Ego itself in its self-separation and self-return, the very image of the self-conscious act.

Every time the Ego uses the word *word*, it indicates not only the Sign, but also indicates itself (unconsciously at first) as the maker of the Sign. The word has now itself as its own content, or the Form of the word is its Meaning. The word turns back upon itself, and takes itself

up into itself, shows its own process throughout, and thus becomes the Sign of the Sign.

Here we come to the organization of the word — grammar with its manifold adjuncts. In the present connection, however, we can only note that the community has brought forth a grand system or community of Signs to express its outer and inner worlds, which system finally expresses itself. Thus the word has the word as content, and the Form of speech speaks itself as its own Meaning.

The community has now inherited, preserved, and created an organized Sign-world, or a community of Signs. What next?

III. Intercommunication — the community of Egos communicates through a community of Signs, which mediates each Ego with each and with the community. Note the sides and the reconciling mean; the community of separate or particular Egos on the one hand, the community as an organized whole on the other, the community of Signs (an organized totality of speech) as the mediating or intercommunicating principle. Here again we shall have the process, that of Intercommunication, which will manifest itself in the movement of the word.

1. The first act of the communicator is that he must make his percept or image *common*, or universal. This is done by the Ego annulling the spatial limit of the object (imaged or con-

ceived) by means of speech. The process of the speaking Ego has been already given (p. 406); at present we are to note the spoken word, which, being flung into a moving externality, whose essence is Time, has its limit thereby annulled, so that it is no longer this fixed, limited, particular thing, this tree here and now, but all trees everywhere and at all times. Just through speaking the word *tree*, its particularity as object or image is canceled, it is made *common*, the property of the community and the basis of intercommunication. The hearing Ego takes up the spoken word and restores the image. Thus the mediating principle is the word, or the making universal what is particular, through speech.

2. But this word, having been thrown into externality by speech, is itself limited, particular, as against other words, and it has this meaning as against other meanings. It is, moreover, the product of this community as against other communities, each of which has or may have its own sound-sign. *Tree*, *Baum*, *arbre* are the different sound-signs which an English, German, or French community respectively would give to the same object or image. Thus language is particularized into many languages. The community has its common Sign, but this is limited by the limit of the community. The Ego, however, must transcend this limit also; thereby it enters a foreign Sign-world, and appropriates the

same, in the act of learning another tongue than its own.

3. That is, there is still a community of Meaning in all these separated, particular Forms, which Meaning the Ego can reach and identify, because it is its own, indeed itself. Thus the Ego asserts itself as universal, transcending the limits of its own particular community, and attaining to that which is common to all communities.

What is it that is common to all communities? We have seen that the spoken word, after being made common, or universal, drops back into the particularity of the community, taking on its limits. But there is still a common principle in all these different words; they are identical in being particular Forms to express the same Meaning. But what is this common or universal Meaning which particularizes itself, in order to utter itself as common or universal? It is the creative process of the Ego which we have already seen passing into separation and difference, and then returning to unity with itself. The Englishman and the Chinaman go through the same process in thinking *tree* though their words be so different for *tree*.

The process of the Ego is not only universal but is the Universal as such, which separates itself into particularity, then cancels this particularity and thereby returns and restores itself as

Universal. The concrete Universal is just this process, which is that of the Ego, to which the word leads but which it can never fully give, since the word is the limited and the particular in itself. Still if it cannot literally express the process, it can always be made to suggest the same, whereby it becomes living and reflects the Psychosis. The word therefore calls into activity something higher than itself, namely its own creator, the universal genetic act — Thought.

It is manifest that we have now reached a new field, beyond Memorization, beyond Representation. We have transcended the Image in its last outcome, which is the Sign or the Word, and the Ego begins a new career. The Word is not Thought but the Sign of Thought. Its function is to set the process of the Ego going; it is the external form of that process, but is not in itself the process, and never can be. Representation (the second grand sphere of the Intellect) has shown the movement of the Image from being a simple copy of the external object, to being the Sign of the Sign or the externalized Image of the process of the Ego itself.

But when the Ego moves through its own process to grasp the object and not through the word, it is thinking; that which it sees in the object must be finally itself, its own process. The word provokes this activity, forces thinking to a degree; to be sure, there must be an ade-

quate response on the part of the Ego addressed. The word also expresses Thought, is the transparent outward form thereof; still, in order to be comprehended, the Thought must be re-created after the word.

Accordingly, when the Ego grasps itself as the process of the thing, it is thinking (etymologically thinking is probably *thinging*, creating the *thing* over in the mind; for example, when you *thing* yonder window or tree, you must re-create it as object through your Ego). Let us trace this transition from the Sign (or Word) to the Thing. We have seen that the Ego created a Sign-world (language), the pure external form of its own process. Now this Sign-world is real, is Thing, whose very function is to bring the process of the Ego home to itself. The Ego, therefore, has created in the present case the Thing (or object) which is the real image of itself in its own process, and which, accordingly, throws back to the Ego its creative act.

So the Ego, in creating the Sign, which is its own pure movement externalized in an object, finds itself not only to be Sign-maker, but also Thing-maker — the Sign being itself a Thing made by the Ego just for the purpose of reflecting itself back to itself. The Ego now sees itself as Thing in the Word, it knows itself as the genetic act thereof.

The realm of Thought has now dawned and

over it we may cast a momentary glance. The Sign or the Word represents all Things; we have seen the Ego transforming the outer sense-world and the inner mind-world into Signs, especially those of language. The whole sweep of the Macrocosm and the Microcosm has had to be made over into Signs for the purpose of Inter-communication. But the Ego has found itself to be not only the maker of the Sign, but also of the Thing in the Sign or of the object signified. With this knowledge of itself gained through the Sign or the Word, it has next to travel through the whole realm of Things and recognize itself as the creator thereof. It does not create them at first hand but creates them over after the original creative fiat of the primal Ego.

This new mastery of the world, both inner and outer, will call forth a new process of the Ego, which will reveal the movement of Thought. For Thought also will have to complete itself through the process of the Ego, before it fully recognizes itself as the creative principle of the Universe.

A few observations may be appended to the preceding ordered development of Memorization, giving in a brief, discursive fashion, some of the points therein set forth.

1. The student is to grasp the word as a process, which is indeed its very life. This process

is the mean between the Egos speaking and hearing, the mean of communication, in which both share, having the same in common. When I speak the word *window*, I annul the Image by throwing it out of me into time; the other Ego hears it and restores the Image, returns to what I started with. This is the real life of the word.

2. The Ego in speaking negates the limit of the Image, so that the word has not the limit of the Image, and hence is universal, all-common, applicable to all Images of that kind. The word *tree* applies to all trees, since its being limited to this particular tree is canceled by the very fact of the uttering of the word.

3. Because the word is universal, with limit removed, it can be taken up by the hearing Ego, which otherwise could not break through the limit of the Image directly. I must take away the fence around my own Image, ere the other Ego can enter, which it does with my consent, or through my act. On the other hand I cannot force my Image with its limit upon the other Ego, for the latter must reproduce my Image through its own act, before possessing the same.

4. In both these cases the Ego shows itself as free, self-determined even in the matter of speaking and hearing the word, or of imparting and receiving the Image. Furthermore both Egos must be creative in this process, in the

one case creating the word, in the other creating or reproducing the Image. Limit-transcending also both Egos show themselves; the one breaks down the limit of the Image and makes its meaning universal in the word; the other is not confined to this act, but reverses it and restores the Image.

5. The play of negation should also be considered in the present activity. The limit is always negative, it negates at least the indefinite extension of the object. But we have seen the Ego negating the limit of the Image, that is, negating the negative. Still further, the second Ego restores the limit of the Image, that is, negates the first negative by a second, and therein completes the cycle of the process of the word. Here again we come upon that which has been called "the negativity of the Ego," suggesting its innermost movement and essence, to which allusion has been already made (p. 220).

6. The Ego, in creating the Sign, creates a new realm of objects, which culminates in the word; this again culminates in being the externalized process of the Ego, and thus reveals the latter to itself as the creator of an objective world. The Ego now grasps itself as the creative principle of all objectivity; therein it returns to the sense-world, not now to perceive it simply and to reproduce it as extended (Sense-perception),

but to reach back of it and to see its creation. This is Thought. In Sense-perception, therefore, the Ego merely accepted the world as given and tried to sense it; but in Thought the Ego must see the world in the act of creation, must repeat, if you choose to say so, the genetic movement of the Divine Ego. Still, Thought itself has to go through a process of self-unfolding in order to attain this highest view of things.

7. What the function of the Image (Representation) is, becomes now manifest. It is a mean and mediatorial; it mediates the mere sensing of the outer object in Sense-perception with the creative process thereof in Thought, moving more and more toward its goal through Copy, Symbol, Sign, till the Word reveals Thought to the Ego. Verily the Logos still reveals to the world its Creator.

CHAPTER THIRD. — THOUGHT.

The third stage of the movement of Intellect toward the complete comprehension of itself is what we shall here call Thought. In the two previous stages there was noted a continuous deepening of the mind into its own essence, which it has now attained. From time immemorial Thinking has been recognized as the supreme act of intelligence. What, then, is Thought? A brief preliminary definition may here be thrown out: Thought is the process of the Ego recognizing itself to be Object. All Thought rests upon the fact that it is what the Object is, and the Object is what it is.

Already such a definition comes before the reader as difficult to grasp; there is something intangible about it, the mind glides off without being able to get a hold. But just therein lies

the nature of Thought ; it is not a thing of sense, nor is it an image ; it has no limits on the outside, none indeed except what it posits from the inside.

In Sense-perception, I see the window as present to my vision ; in Representation, I image the window, though it be absent ; in Thought, I think the window, be it present or absent. The latter is not a view of it without, not a picture of it within ; the Thought of it is just that which constitutes it a window. Suppose that I think the window as a transparent piece of matter, whose purpose is to let light into an inclosed space, yet to exclude cold and rain ; thus I penetrate the Thought of the man who made it, I recognize his purpose, his Ego ; him, the maker, I penetrate also in thinking his Thought. The mere sight of the window or the image of it, are external in comparison ; the essence of it lies in its Thought.

When I grasp the idea and purpose of the maker of the window, my Thought knows his Thought, or Ego recognizes Ego. Thus the Ego has reached itself in its pure form, and apprehends itself as Object. Looking back we see that the whole movement of the Intellect has been to recognize itself in the objective world. In Sense-perception the Object as percept was made internal from the outside and then projected back into externality ; in Representation

the Object as internal image underwent various transformations till at last it became the word, the externalized form of the Ego itself; in Thought the Object is the process of the Ego, whereby the Ego has become universal, that is, self-limited, its only bound being itself. In trying to think, therefore, the Ego of the Subject is always seeking to find the Ego of the Object; the process of the one identifies the process of the other as its own.

It may be said that, in thinking the window, or the house, etc., we are dealing with a class of objects which we know that man has made, and into which he has put his Ego. How is it, then, with the things which man has not made, the things of nature, for instance? The same holds true. If I think the tree, it is not a percept or an image, not any external or internal copy; I must define the tree, I must think its Thought, that is, the Thought which created it and made it distinctively a tree. In other words, my definition must be genetic, else it will not give the true Thought of the thing. Nature is the creative manifestation of the Ego, of the Divine Ego; the right Thought of Nature is the recognition of the Divine Ego. The architect of the house and the architect of the world are both Egos, which the thinking Ego must identify with itself in order to know them.

Throughout Imagination we noted the sep-

aration of the Object into Form and Meaning; the image as symbol divides itself in this manner. But Thought overcomes the division; the sides are one, the subject Ego (as Form), is the object Ego (as Meaning or Content). Still the separation is also present though overcome; the unity of Thought is just the transcending of the division and of the finitude of the image.

Thought also makes signs for itself, but these signs are freed from the limits of the signs already considered, which were the products of the Imagination. The chief sign is the word; the word employed by Thought to express itself must have the characteristic impress of Thought. The image must be transcended, and, if possible, abolished. Take, for example, the word *Thought*: the sensuous or imaginative stage of it has quite vanished, though it be Saxon and not Latin. Thought takes no flag to think nationality with, but thinks the thing itself, which is just the Thought of it as Object. Thus Thought seizes the sign of itself directly and uses the same for self-expression. With the sign of Thought, therefore, I have to think, and not with an image, nor with an illustration, nor with any other impure form not yet free of its physical substrate.

And just here a warning in regard to illustration in psychology may be properly given. It is absolutely necessary for beginners, and is

often helpful to the practiced student ; still it has its danger. We should always remember that the illustration of the Thought is never the Thought itself. People often keep the former and lose the latter ; the scaffolding is necessary in building the house, but should not take the place of the house. In the end we must think the Thought purely, and not be held fast in an illustration of the Thought, which always has something in it different from the Thought.

The great difficulty with the expression of Thought is that it is liable to drop back into the image, and thus become ambiguous. If I say, *I have weighed the matter*, no one can tell whether I mean a mental or a physical act ; but if I say *I have pondered the matter*, there is no ambiguity in English, though in Latin the word *ponder* might be double in meaning. Hence in our tongue a purely reflective or philosophical set of words has arisen. In fact, just this movement of human language is the movement of the Ego. There is the first immediate, unreflective stage, in which the sensuous element alone is present (*weigh*) ; the second is the double, metaphorical stage, as in the two meanings of *weigh* ; the third is the purely reflective stage (*ponder*).

Still, Thought is not going to get rid wholly of doubleness, and of ambiguity ; that were indeed to get rid of all difference. The Ego is twofold by its very nature, is twofold in its oneness, as

we have often seen. Hence the word *Thought* is used and has to be used in two senses, which, however, the mind of the reader must always identify. On the one hand, the world is Thought (objective); on the other hand man is Thought (subjective); Thinking is the act of uniting and identifying the two, of recognizing Mind and Being as one in their absolute difference. Indeed this Thinking is also Thought, and is so named.

Philosophical speech cannot, therefore, wholly get rid of ambiguity, or the double-meaning; on the contrary it must, in the proper place, assert the same, and show it as the necessary outcome of the movement of the Ego. Still the mind is one and must at last unify the most obstinate dualism.

Just this is the work of the Psychosis. Though speech drop helpless into difference and ambiguity, the reader must rise above it in the pure activity of his spirit; he must himself be Thought thinking Thought, and thus make himself the nexus of all dualism. Such is the Psychosis, always the last word of Psychology, the solvent of all separation and restorer of unity.

The relation of Thought to the word can be still further set forth. Thought thinks purely, it has no need of an external sign, not even of the spoken word. Speaking is the external manifestation of the sign; Thinking thinks itself and is its own sign. The word when thought,

is different from the word when spoken; speech has breath, sound, externality, difference, separation from Thought; but Thought as such is purely internal, and its final form is the Psychosis. To be sure we may think in words or names derived from the outside; but the destiny of the word is to lose its externality and become Thought.

Still, on the other hand, Thought is completely objective, it is indeed just the true Object as distinguished from appearance. While the Ego, in moving from Sense-perception toward Thought, has become more and more internal, or subjectified, it has at the same time become more and more objectified and real. To take a well-known example, what is this real object called house? Not the brick, not the mortar, not the wood, the glass, the iron; all these are commanded by a higher power to come together and make a house. What is this power? Evidently Thought, in this case the Thought of the architect; and if this Thought could be in any manner extracted from the house, the latter would tumble to ruin.

Such is the emphatic point in Thinking; it knows itself to be the real essence and nature of the Object. When I think Space, I must grasp it as an object and also as phase of my Ego; I must identify it with myself. Thus Thought is subject-object, not as the Ego simply (see Intro-

duction, p. 30) but as the Ego which has posited the non-Ego or the objective world, and thus it now knows as itself objectified. Accordingly we observe that all knowing is ultimately self-knowing; the subject Ego identifies the object Ego as itself, and so reaches the knowledge which is given by Thought.

All men think, but not all men know themselves as thinking. They may see through the reality before them, but do not see through themselves seeing through that reality. They are Thought, but not Thought thinking Thought. In psychology Thought has to think Thought, and behold itself going through its own process. It is thus truly self-knowing; it not only knows itself, but knows Self to be Object, and so translates Object into Self — the act of Thinking. On the other hand, the Ego, to complete its process has to translate Self into Object — the act of Willing or Volition.

If we now look back and observe the previous stages of Intellect, we shall find that all along we have been thinking, though perhaps not fully aware of what Thought is. In Sense-perception the image was affirmed to be present in the mind but not consciously separated from the percept; that is just the thinking of Sense-perception. In Representation, the Ego separates the image from the percept (or internalized object of sense), and beholds it as distinct; just that is the

thinking of Representation. But in this third stage of Intellect, Thought is to seize that lurking Thought, namely itself, and to make it explicit; it is not only to know but to know itself as knowing.

Thus the Ego returns to itself in the process of Intellect, after being alienated in Sense-perception, which took the Object as external and alien to the Ego. In Representation the Object has become internal, but is the copy of the external Object, or is laden with the form of externality, till the Ego frees itself in Thought, when it has itself as its own Object. Then we can say that the Ego has attained freedom, having liberated itself from its foreign element.

At this point we begin to catch something of the movement and significance of our science. Psychology is an evolution of the Ego ever separating from itself yet ever returning into itself in larger and larger cycles till it embraces the Universe. Hence, a corresponding involution of the Ego, also a deepening of it takes place, which is the process of its self-completion. A psychology is not, therefore, a collection of facts simply, in some possible external classification; the movement of the psychological fact is the main thing, the movement into and out of itself into another psychological fact, whereby their unity is eternally active, not fixed and dead.

In accord with the preceding view we may

state that Thinking is the rise out of the particular into the universal. It is the One in all particulars, binding them together not by an external bond or class, but by the movement of Thought itself, which is just their unity. All the particulars of a window are held in solution in the Thought of the window; in fact this Thought is what created them. Thought is thus the generic or universal, which not only connects the particulars, but is their creative principle. Hence the true unity of a series of particulars is not a crystallized mass or class, but a living process of Thinking.

The particular, therefore, being thought, vanishes into the universal, which fact we can look at in three stages. (1) When I think the window, it is what all windows are, universal, all-common (*allgemein*). (2) It is creative, is what makes all windows, and without it no windows could be made. (3) The Ego recognizes that creative principle to be itself — identifies it, and thus thinks it, wherein it knows itself as Thought thinking Thought.

The statement may be once more repeated: all Thought is what the Object is, and the Object is what it is. In this introduction to the third stage of Intellect, the reader can easily count half a dozen repetitions of the same idea with a few different turns of variations; still it is not easy for the mind to hold. It cannot be imaged,

it cannot be remembered, except as a hollow formula of words; it must be thought that Thought is objective. The mind must grow into the doctrine, the idea cannot be stormed. The verbal statement of the loftiest truth is hollow and worthless unless filled at once with the activity of the spirit, which is just that truth, whatever it be. As already said, the Psychosis must supplement the division, the formula, the word.

Thought we have called the third stage of the Ego in the unfolding of the Intellect. This stage is that of unity and of identification in general; it makes one the Mind and the Object as in Sense-perception, yet it retains ideally their difference, as in Representation; thus it preserves the fundamental psychological fact in each of the two preceding stages, and unifies them in a complete form of the Ego. The process of Thought is to develop the identity between Ego and Object, or between itself (Thought) and the Thing. This identity between Subject and the Universe it is the movement of Thought to make explicit out of its immediate, implicit condition.

The movement of Thought grasping itself as the process of the objective world will pass through three stages corresponding to those of the Ego.

I. The Understanding — in which Thought shows itself as identifying the Object with itself

immediately, that is, more or less externally, without penetrating to the real division of the Object or of itself.

The Understanding does not see the movement of the Ego in the Object, but unconsciously takes the same for granted and proceeds to identify the Object with itself, always coming to it from the outside.

II. Ratiocination — in which Thought shows itself as the differentiating principle of the Object; it divides within itself and unfolds through division into the external forms of itself into which it puts the Object. Ratiocination is Formulation — Thought creating its own Forms, and uttering (uttering) itself in its own pure externality. When Thought ratiocinates, it puts the Object into the form which it creates out of itself.

Ratiocination does not externally divide the Object (as does the Understanding), but posits its divisive form within the Object, yet as the external form of itself. Still the supreme form of externality, the *summum genus*, it cannot posit, rather the latter posits it, and therein subordinates it to a higher.

III. Reason — in which Thought grasps Thought as the process of the Universe as Object; it generates the *summum genus*, is the return to itself in its own pure process out of the Forms of Ratiocination. Thought now recognizes the

Universe as itself and itself as the Universe. Finally it is the Psychosis of the Psychosis.

Naturally the meaning of this sweep through the world of Thought (in three huge strides) will not be fully understood by the student till he has studied the details of the forthcoming exposition. Still it gives an outlook, doubtless indistinct enough; it plainly bears, however, in its movement the suggestion of the Psychosis, which is now to become explicit and has to give an account of itself. But only at the end of this whole psychological movement can such a promise be fulfilled.

So we shall seek to realize Thought, the great goal not only of Psychology, but of culture, of life itself. The man who truly thinks the object, who penetrates it with Thought and sees it as a process of Thought, is the mighty man of this world, mighty in wisdom. For he communes directly with the soul of all objectivity, and if he can also make himself its mouth-piece, he is the seer, the poet, the philosopher. But now let us begin to thread this last yet subtlest labyrinth of the Ego — a toilsome, patience-trying journey, but not without hope.

SECTION FIRST.— THE UNDERSTANDING.

To understand a thing is usually held to be the first step in all Thinking. What does it mean in a general way? The mind holds up before itself the thing either in Perception or Representation, and identifies some phase thereof with its own previous knowledge. You understand what I am telling you now, when you make it your own, make it the same (identify it) with yourself. The difference between you and me in this matter is pre-supposed; just this difference you must cancel by an act of the Understanding.

Such is the realm of the Understanding in general, and its fundamental predicate or category is Identity. All the words employed in this activity of the mind—sameness, equality, likeness, comparison, resemblance, unity — are essentially

terms of the Understanding, though they may, of course, be carried forward into other mental activities. Still the Ego has Difference also in its very constitution, hence this opposite term will always be lurking about somewhere in the operations of the Understanding, in spite of, nay on account of its stress upon Identity. Thus a corresponding set of opposite terms has to be introduced, resting upon Difference, which terms must also be regarded as those of the Understanding.

Thinking now grasps the Thought of the Thing in an immediate act, without the mediation of reasoning. Understanding is immediate Identity, that is, not mediated through Ratiocination, or the Difference. It finds the likeness in things and unites them by such likeness into classes. It goes deeper and finds the similarity in the organs of living things (plants and animals) and unites them into species, families, orders organically. It seizes the essential as distinct from the unessential, and thus can identify the essence of things apart from appearance. Law, Force, Cause, are some of its terms, especially in Natural Science; it reaches out beyond the phenomena, the realm of the diverse and the manifold, into the realm of the One (or Identity) in which all diversity of the sense-world is canceled. The Understanding employs Abstraction to attain the counterpart thereof in Generaliza-

tion. Discrimination it uses, and even Definition, though not in the deepest sense.

Among the fields occupied by the Understanding, that of Natural Science is prominent at the present time. The work of Comparison, which brings objects together, and unites them by likeness and unlikeness, has been carried specially into Philology with great results. In the processes of Natural Science the Understanding is at work elaborating a term or category which expresses the unity in the many diversified facts of observation ; it is seeking the one inner principle of them all, which principle is at last just itself. In the change of appearances, it finds the permanent, the self-identical, the Law which holds all multiplicity.

Undoubtedly there are several different senses of the word Understanding, and even of its terms above mentioned. There is always the shallow and the profound use of the same word. A great book may be written some day, arranging in due order all the categories of the Understanding by their fundamental principle, and linking them together in an inner movement of Thought. Meanwhile we shall make the following gradation of this sphere, in which the general movement of the Ego manifests itself.

The Understanding, then, must be seen as a process — the process of Identity as immediate ; the Ego in the Understanding unites immediately

what is distinct. In its movement toward Identity, it presupposes the different; but this Difference is not yet posited from within, not yet developed. The Understanding, however, has its own kind of Difference, which we here call Distinction, and which the Understanding brings into the object from without. The stages are as follows: —

I. Apprehension — the first seizing and identifying of the object by the Ego.

II. Distinction — the Understanding brings division and discrimination into the object for the purpose of unifying and identifying the same.

III. Classification — the ordering of Distinction into higher wholes, which process of Identity finally reaches the Genus.

When the Understanding has reached the Genus, its process of Identity (or Identification) is brought to a close, since the Genus at once moves into differentiation and brings forth species and individual. Manifestly this is the opposite movement from that of the Understanding. Here we catch a glimpse of the next sphere of Thought — Ratiocination.

A word now upon the importance of the Understanding. It works specially in the realm of the Particular; it seizes the world of detail, of appearance and multiplicity as it lies before us, and seeks to order it, to think it in its way.

In utter separation and distraction the facts and events of existence are whirling confusedly before us, divided in Space and Time; how shall the Ego ever put them together into something like a cosmos? This is the work of the Understanding, primordial, a most important, stupendous work, never to be underrated. No wonder that the Englishman, most practical of mortals, rarely gets beyond the Understanding in his philosophy. The Understanding is the first condition of a regulated life and ordered activity; indeed it is largely the condition of Occidental civilization. Still it is not the entire Universe of Thought, rather is it the beginning and preparation thereof.

I. APPREHENSION.

This word means literally the taking hold on the outside, which was originally (in Latin) a physical act. From this it passed to an analogous mental act, which designates the first effort of the Understanding toward identifying the thing with itself. Apprehension is not a perception merely, though we may endeavor to apprehend a percept. It is the primal notion of the thing, the first penetration of the object by the Ego, seeking to unify the same with itself. The act is here immediate, unconscious, spontaneous, being more a feeling of identity than a

knowing thereof; the Ego herein feels itself reaching beyond itself as mere subject, seizing instinctively the object as its own and identifying the same with itself. Such is the prelude to the full work of the Understanding which is to follow. Yet this prelude has its process also, being itself a manifestation of the Ego.

I. The immediate seizure of the object as such is the starting-point. If you wish to understand this window, you must first go out to it and seize it directly, without stopping and without reflection. Whatever the object be, percept, image, concept, it has to be seized by the Ego *immediately*, taken possession of externally by a simple fiat of the mind — the primordial act of the mental conquest of the world.

II. This immediate appropriation of the thing is followed by an act of separation. You have seized the window as an external object, let us say; now comes an inner identification of it, which involves its division into what is and what was. You recollect that you have seen a window before, or something like it; in order to identify this with that, you have to have the two before you. Such is now the dualism or separative act involved in all Apprehension, even the simplest.

III. The identification and the ordering of the appropriated thing with the content of the Ego.

That is, the apperceptive act of the Ego now enters and co-ordinates the object, whereby the latter is truly unified with and possessed by the Ego; present is united with the past, and the object as a simple whole is taken up by the Ego.

Such, then, is Apprehension; the Understanding in its process of Identity, has seized the thing or object as a single unit, undivided within itself, and has identified (made identical) the same with the Ego. But we have also noted that, in order to seize the object in this simplest, most immediate way, we have had to identify it with something else not itself, namely the Ego or some content thereof, and so have been forced to take up Difference in the process of Apprehension.

But now a deeper phase of Difference enters. The Understanding begins to put its own distinctions into the object; having found out in the process of Apprehension that the object is different from itself (the Understanding), and has been mastered and identified, it will show this mastery over Difference by imposing the same upon the object. This new sphere of the Understanding comes up next for exposition.

Apprehension, though it be simple, implicit, undeveloped, without real distinction in itself, shows the character of the Understanding as a phase of intellection. The individual passing

through the world of sense, has not only to see and perceive, but to apprehend; the object insists upon being apprehended, and the Ego insists upon apprehending. For the object has just this identification with the Ego as its destiny or end; and, on the contrary, the Ego must transcend its limit, and be one with the object, wherein lies just its true Self.

A quick Apprehension (which is incipient or immediate Classification) is always an important power, in certain situations it is all-important. To seize the fact at once in its essence, and to co-ordinate it on the spot, is the instinctive identity of the realm of the Understanding; its suddenness makes it Apprehension. Still this has also its limitation; it seeks for Distinction, and demands in its very nature to be mediated. Not without cause has Apprehension come to be regarded not only with anxiety, but as anxiety; a lurking fear runs through its meaning, since it has the uncertainty of impulse and lacks mediation with the rational principle of the Ego.

II. DISTINCTION.

This is the second stage of the Understanding, which has already evolved itself out of the first, through the inner movement of the Ego, the latter being inherently the divisive, indeed the self-divisive. The Understanding still identifies,

but it has discovered that it must distinguish in order to identify, even in the simple act of Apprehension.

The Understanding, having found Difference in itself when it apprehended the object, and also the mastery of Difference in the same act, proceeds to project Difference into the object, that is, it puts its own divisions and distinctions into the World of Things. This is the general fact about the realm of Distinction, which we are now entering.

Distinction has, therefore, already been implicit or involved in Apprehension. The act of Identity presupposes the object as distinct from the Ego, is in itself an act of separation; it must distinguish the thing before identifying it. Hence the unfolding of a complete act of Identity calls up Distinction. The Understanding, having to identify that with itself which is other than itself, posits this otherness in its own movement; that is, it posits Distinction.

Thus in the realm of the Understanding rises division, analysis, separation, dualism, rises just out of its movement toward Identity. It divides up the object in a thousand ways; having once started, its divisive tendency seems infinite. Indeed the Understanding can quite lose its unifying power, and become purely analytic, separative, critical. The present age is not a synthetic one, its spirit rests largely in this

divisive stage of the Understanding, though the very purpose of dividing the object is to identify it more completely. The mind in such a state is divided within itself and against itself, it has attained absolute unrest.

Now in this realm of Distinction, the counter movement sets in, and separation begins to separate from itself, and thus to cancel itself. The negative result cannot stay with itself, just because it is negative and hence self-undoing. In Distinction also there is a process of the Ego whose stages we shall mark and designate as Abstraction, Discrimination, and Classification.

I. Abstraction is the Ego in its immediate act of separating and distinguishing. This power goes back to sensation even; the five senses, each with its own bodily organ, requires a corporeal separation. The eye cannot give the fragrance of a flower, nor the ear its color. Such is the most primitive form of Abstraction — the sensuous — and also the most immediate, since the Ego acts therein without volition and consciousness. But it also acts with conscious purpose in Abstraction, dividing the object and separating some property from its totality. Every man may subject a piece of wood to his own Abstraction; the carpenter, the scientist, ship-builder, the kindergardner, the magician, will each regard a tree from his own

point of view, which abstracts some quality of the object and puts its stress upon that.

The immediate, separative power of the human mind may, therefore, be named Abstraction, being that activity of the Ego which takes away (abstracts) some property, element, or part which belongs to the total object. The Ego has to abstract in order to obtain the simplest knowledge, the Ego itself being divided within itself in order to know itself. It must also divide the object in order to know the same, that is, to identify it with itself. Hence the Understanding specially must abstract in order to reach its Identity.

On the other hand, the process of Abstraction is seen to pre-suppose a total object, one that is identical with itself, as yet undivided. For it is Abstraction which first makes the division. Hence Apprehension, which is the seizing of the object in its simplicity, as a simple whole, goes before Abstraction, which is the first step toward complexity. Thus the Ego, as it is self-divided, must divide the entire objective world in order to overcome the same and reach forth to a knowledge thereof.

Such is the kernel of the meaning of Abstraction, around which is gathered a great variety of usage. We hear of abstract thought, which term seems to designate thought as distinct from the percept and the image. Then again we hear

of abstractions in a contemptuous sense, evidently as distinct from the realities of life, and from the concrete world. It must be confessed that there is some ground for the discredit into which Abstraction and its culture have fallen. Plainly it cannot give the whole truth of the object; it picks up some phase or property, more or less external, and deems that the vital matter. And all separation is really negative, negative to the entirety of the object.

It is manifest, therefore, that Abstraction cannot reach the completeness of Thought, or even of the Understanding. It cannot rise to the genetic movement of the object, which is that which Thought grasps; at most it leads to an external combination of properties which is commonly called Generalization, and which will be considered later on. Still, Abstraction has its place in the activity of the Ego, which has to divide even the sensuous object before the senses can perceive. Abstraction cracks the shell of externality by its separation, and opens the door to knowledge.

If we note carefully the process of Abstraction, we find that it separates the one property or attribute of the object, holds fast to that, and disregards the rest of the object; it takes from, clings to, and throws away. But how about that which is thrown away? It too is some part, phase, or attribute of the object; moreover, it

is also separated from the totality. When the Ego passes over to it, and holds it fast too, then it is as much a thing abstracted as the first. Thus Abstraction has come to an end; it no longer simply takes away the one, but also takes up the other, the second part or attribute, which it ranges alongside of the first. The distinctive act of Abstraction has thus passed over into a new act, which is a twofold or duplicated Abstraction, yet with sides related.

II. Discrimination we shall call this new act of the Ego. It is still Distinction, but deepened; there are now two properties or parts which are held together, yet kept asunder. Each side of the Distinction has equal validity, is looked at, and even judged by itself. The one has as much attention as the other; they are carefully distinguished, and therein are treated just alike. A man of Discrimination is, first of all, impartial, even non-partisan, keeping both sides in the balance of his mind.

Abstraction is one-sided, partial; Discrimination is two-sided, and thence becomes many-sided. From this window-pane I can abstract one property, say hardness, and leave all the rest out. But then the rest of the window-pane becomes an Abstraction; it too is separated from the hardness, which is for it likewise the rest of the window-pane; both are therein alike. In other words, Abstraction, in rejecting the

second phase or element of the object, makes the same abstract as well as the first, calls forth just that which it threw away. It thus contradicts itself and passes into the higher act of Discrimination. The object cannot remain one-sided (abstract) without contradicting its nature; just as little can the Ego, which is inherently self-dividing, and keeps both sides, subject and object, in every act of consciousness.

Discrimination is not confined to the twofold, though that is its basis; it just as well embraces the manifold. The window-pane has not only hardness, but also transparency, brittleness, figure, etc. All these properties being abstracted, are held by the Ego in act of Discrimination. They are so many units, separated, mutually externalized in the mind; thus the single object has reached a vast multiplicity through the distinctions of the Understanding.

Still all these diverse properties of the object are held together in Discrimination, which is thus a bond uniting the twofold or the manifold. It is an element or principle which combines the two distinct things, and which is the common ground of agreement. But thus Discrimination, whose function was to hold asunder the parts and attributes given by Abstraction, is doing the very opposite; it is not only holding them asunder (which is also the holding them together), but also it has shown itself the ground of their agree-

ment, their point of union. The Ego recognizes the new stage of the process and gives it a name.

III. This is Comparison. In the ordinary sense of the words, we discriminate objects and then we compare them; we bring them together by likeness or unlikeness. Of two windows, we abstract a property from each, say form; then we hold the two in separation, we discriminate their forms; then we put them together by the common property, we compare. Some property thus is made the uniting third between the two, or medium of Comparison, which is the mediating of the distinct objects. The stress is now laid upon that which unites, and not upon that which separates.

In the act of Comparison, the Ego is returning to Identity. It still keeps the distinction between object or objects, but it places alongside the same their oneness, or their agreement. It cannot rest in Discrimination, but proceeds to combine what it has discriminated. In a multiplicity of objects it notes the common element, since the Ego itself is just this common element in all separation. It repeats itself in observing the same attribute in different things; this repetition is its assertion of self-identity.

As before remarked, Comparison has become an important category in the science of to-day, but it is often very superficially applied. Hence arises the question concerning the basis of Com-

parison. What attribute is to be taken as the medium of comparing languages, for instance? Similarity in the external form of the words will not do; two languages may have certain forms of speech quite alike, yet be of wholly different origin and character. So the essential medium of Comparison must be found before a truly comparative science is possible; the agreement must not be superficial and accidental but inherent and necessary.

Herein it is plain that the point which unites, the mediating principle of Comparison (*tertium comparationis*) has itself become divided, though its purpose was to be the unit in which all was to be unified. Distinction has entered just this identity upon which Comparison was founded, and the latter now, instead of uniting, will drive asunder the manifold phenomena which are to be compared. Thus it is manifest that Comparison has changed, is divided within itself. The new demand is that the mediating principle be internal, that the agreement between the objects compared be essential. Herewith however we pass into another domain.

Distinction, which began with making Abstractions from the total object, then holding them together and asunder in Discrimination, then uniting them in a medium through Comparison, has run its course, and reached that which is internal and essential as the ground of

unity into which it (Distinction) passes. The Understanding again asserts its underlying principle of Identity. Of course there will still arise Distinctions, but they will be essential Distinctions; that is, they will be grounded and unified in the one fact of essentiality.

III. CLASSIFICATION.

Herewith the Understanding has reached its third and highest stage, which we shall call Classification, inasmuch as all Distinction is subordinated to a higher unity called the Class.

That is, Distinction still exists, but is subordinated to the principle of Identity. Classification is not the immediate seizing of the object and identifying it with the Ego, which act we saw in Apprehension; this is rather the comprehension of the object mediated through the process of Distinction. Classification, therefore, is the union of the two preceding stages of the Understanding, and it arises directly out of Discrimination and Comparison, passing from the equality of the various attributes to their subordination. That is, Distinction, hitherto paramount, must now come under unity or the Class.

Classification is a most important fact in the development of the mind. Without it we would be overwhelmed by the multiplicity of the world;

its infinite division and subdivision would have no counteraction, and would cut up the Ego into microscopic particles. Man begins to master the diversity of nature by binding it up into classes, and keeping them, when so bound up, ready for use. Thus he easily handles in bulk what would otherwise be an endless task.

In classifying objects the Understanding is reaching out for their creative principle, for that which differentiates them, yet restores them to unity; the striving of it is for the one which produces the manifold, yet remains therein itself. Classification also has its movement, always going more and more toward the organic out of the external. This movement begets a vast number of categories which mark its shadings; we shall select three sets in which the process of the Ego reflects itself.

I. There is, first, that which we shall call Generalization, which term we shall confine to the external Classification of objects by some mark or property which is seized by the mind immediately. In all languages of civilized peoples are such classes expressed in a word, as a forest, which is made up of many trees, an army, which is made up of many men, etc. Something in common, which is apparent at once, causes a number of particulars to be grouped together and to be expressed in a general term. The work of the mind is instantaneous, immediate. To be

sure, we have to know the purpose of the class before we can classify; the Senate is a collection of men united in a certain purpose (say law-making), which I have to understand in order to form the class.

In like manner the so-called abstract nouns are formed. We observe the color red in a number of objects, in the flower, insect, coat, etc.; then we form the abstract term redness, which is the product of Generalization. Through it we reach beyond the sensuous particulars into the supersensible act of the mind. Thus the Ego proceeds to master the multiplicity of the external world; it subjects the same to some attribute which the objects, or a group of them, have in common.

The important part which Generalization plays in the formation of language is manifest. What is separate and particular, it joins together into a whole of some sort; yet in order to seize the separate and particular, it must divide. So the double character of the Ego manifests itself in Generalization, it differences and identifies, shows analysis and synthesis, or decomposition and recomposition, in the same process. Still the purpose is to bind together the sheaf, though we have to collect separately the straws. Thus the Ego, thrown into the world of multiplicity, begins to order it at once, by seizing the scattered straws (on the wheatfield of Time and

Space), binds them into sheaves, puts them into a shock, then into a stack.

Philosophers have discussed the question much whether language originates in proper names (which is the particular) or in general terms or appellatives. The disputants on each side are about equally divided in number and authority (Hamilton's *Metaphysics*, p. 497). Now it is easy to demonstrate each half provided the other half be disregarded. On the one hand, language does move with the Ego from the special to the general, from the percept of the senses to thought. But whence the special or particular with which it starts? Evidently it is obtained from a total of some kind by division, which the Ego makes. So the question as to the origin of language is quite like most other kinds of origin: the starting-point is really the end and the end is the starting-point. A discussion of the *Primum Cognitum* will turn out somewhat as that other famous discussion did: Which was first, the Egg or the Hen?

What is amusing, both sides use the same fact to illustrate their respective theories; they take the child beginning to speak. "The child calls all men by the name of papa;" that is, it passes from the particular man, its father, to the general man (*Locke et alii*). On the other hand, it must have the general, man, first, in order to apply its particular man papa to the same

(Leibnitz *et alii*). A third way Hamilton thinks he has found, stating that the child proceeds from the vague to the definite; but this is really a going from the general to the particular.

Now the truth is that the child is a total, though undeveloped Ego, and must show in its mental activity the total process of the Ego. The child unquestionably particularizes, it goes from the total to its parts, from the general concept, man, to a particular man. Equally certain is it that the child generalizes, has the element of unity, and rises from the particular man to the general. Both are simply phases of the one process of the infantile Ego, which would not be at all with only one of its sides. Even the human body shows a similar doubleness in what has been called its bi-lateral symmetry. Suppose we divide it at the line of junction of the two sides, what becomes of that process which is called life? Such is also the effect of dividing the Ego, namely, the loss of its activity, of its process, which is not division alone, but also unification; a point which has its significance in education.

We have now classified the external world of sense by external marks, grouping objects into classes, and rising into abstract terms which reach beyond the senses. The Ego with its distinctions thus appears as classifier and adjusts the world to its categories; it no longer takes

some external sign, but seizes the essential element in objects and makes that the ground of Classification.

II. Hence we have the internal and essential as opposed to the external and accidental; the distinction between Essence and Appearance is now to enter the objective world and classify the same. There is a vast quantity of terms expressing the manifold shadings of activity in this field; we shall take three which reflect the movement of the Ego in a general way: Cause, Force, Law.

1. When we ask for the cause of the existent thing, the Ego has separated it into its present form and appearance, and those which it once had. The wet in the road was caused by the rain last night; the rain is the source, origin, cause. Thus the whole world divides itself into Cause and Effect, which, however, are held together by the Ego—the Cause being the primal, essential element, without which there would be no Effect.

Such is the immediate or material Cause, the passing of one form of existence into another externally. Undoubtedly it is a great advance for the sensuous mind to inquire of the present appearance, Whence? *Felix qui potuit causas cognoscere rerum.* The spirit refuses to rest in the moment and what it brings, but seeks a total even of the senses; the immediate will not satisfy,

it must be mediated somehow, though in the most superficial way. Hence the idea of causation, which separates the world into Cause and Effect, which goes on deepening till it reaches the idea of self cause (*causa sui*).

The Cause is the primordial, the original; the rain causes the wet. But what compels it to rain? The vapor is driven together, is condensed and then follows the precipitation. The active Cause is itself caused and compelled to its Effect. Thus behind or into the Cause enters the notion of Force.

2. Force is the moving principle in Cause, which thus divides into the moving and the moved. Such is the new separation; the world we found separating itself into Cause and Effect, but Cause we find separating itself into Force and its Manifestation. The real separative energy which produces the phenomenal world we now seem to have reached.

Force, however, having manifested itself, ceases, its realization is just its negation. The energies of nature which produce the thunder shower, vent themselves, and are gone; their appearance is their evanishment. But what is this evanishment? Force no longer manifests itself, it has returned to identity with itself, which is its passivity or potentiality; when it differences itself, and becomes other, then it manifests itself, is active. But this identity has

within it mediation, being no longer immediate; it has been mediated by Manifestation, and is no longer itself, having canceled within itself the difference.

The identity into which all manifestation, difference, multiplicity is canceled, yet which has the same as its content, is now the result.

3. This is Law, which is the permanent, that which is like to itself, but which contains all the multiplicity of the world of appearance. Law is the Identity which has its own Difference within itself, which manifests itself in all Manifestation. Force, in manifesting itself, passes into its other and vanishes; Law, in manifesting itself, manifests its other as itself and endures just in Manifestation, endures through all the change of appearances.

Law has within itself the world of multiplicity, difference, manifestation, as ideal, not posited, not real; when we speak of the laws of nature, we mean that which is permanent in the fleeting phenomena, the necessary inner unity which is in all appearance. Difference is in the Law, hence this is the Law of (or over) the Difference, which Law is Identity. Law of attraction expresses, first, the identity of all bodies, their oneness; yet this oneness manifests itself through Difference, which it has canceled. The statutory Law has Difference within it, the command and the punishment for violation. That is, the negation of the

Identity is met by a negation. Thus it has (1) the command, which is Identity enforcing obedience and conformity; it has (2) the difference or the negative, which is the violation; it has (3) the penalty, which is the negation of the negative. Still further, the conception of a world-justice is the complete conception of the rule of Law. The good is immediate identity with Justice, or the Divine Order; but if the deed be negative, it is to be brought home to the doer by Justice, which thus cancels the negative act, and returns to identity.

Law, therefore, has simple Identity, then has Difference, then Difference canceled. So it completes its cycle; it rests not in multiplicity, not in change, but cancels the same and is the fixed and unchanging amid change.

The limitation of Law is that it has no perfect return to Identity with self. It negates Difference which is opposed to Identity, negates the multiplicity of appearance which is opposed to Unity, but it remains negative in its negation, it does not become positive, and posit Identity as such with its Difference. So it is that Justice punishes the criminal act of the man, undoes his deed, without touching his Ego, his self-identity from which the deed springs. The law of attraction never brings about a complete unity of bodies, they never reach the center; else indeed matter would be self-centered, having the com-

plete self-return — Ego. The Law of Change is the Identity which cancels Change, yet leaves it Change still; the unchanging element (Law or Identity) in Change is just Change. So Law, having transcended the External of Appearance and made itself the Internal, the Unchanging, drops back into the External in its negative action. After all, Punishment in Law is external, it strikes from the outside what is outside, something deeper must reach the real Individual. The Identity of Law must become positive, must posit the Appearance, and not negate it; Identity must differentiate itself and remain with itself in its Difference. Thus we get beyond Law into a higher Law, which reaches Difference from within.

In fact, the distinction between Internal and External has run its course; the External has forced itself into Law and shown its own necessity, its own essential nature. That which was outside and contingent has gone inside, or rather the inside has become outside just as well; the realm of manifestation, of difference, of multiplicity, has shown itself to be essential also, it is not to be put down even by Law, by the absolute power of Identity.

Accordingly Classification enters a new stage. It first took some external sensuous property and subordinated multiplicity to that; then it seized some form of the Internal and reduced all ex-

ternality and difference to that inner oneness and Identity which swallows up the individual object — Cause, Force, Law. But Law has produced mere external conformity, and it, the Internal, quite loses the Internal; its Classification (subsumption of the particular object) is from the outside at last, being external to the thing subsumed. Now the world of particularity or difference asserts its right to be subordinated from within; it must be classified according to its nature; Difference is not now a mere appearance, the shadowy reflection of the inner essence, but is itself essential too. Identity has reached the point of classifying its differences.

III. This kind of Classification may be called the organic; it organizes the particular object through the latter's structural totality. The animal has sensation and locomotion, this is the fundamental fact of its organism, which gives the class animal. Thus all objects which have sensation are unified, show Identity in their structure; sensation is the Identity of the animal body, its unity. Still this Identity is differenced, divided, is at every point of the organism, which, though separated, asserts its unity by sensation. The body affirms Identity against the other or the external object at every point.

The animal organism having declared its unity by sensation now differentiates itself into two great Classes — Vertebrates and Invertebrates, in

which the Spinal Column, or just that central unification of the organism through sensation divides itself. Thus it will be seen that the Identity which makes the one Class, divides within itself and forms two sub-Classes, each of which manifests the unity of the Class, though in different ways. Thus the organism divides, while still maintaining its oneness in sensation. Still further the Vertebrates classify themselves by dividing their unity according to its varied manifestations.

We have now reached a point at which the Identity divides itself and yet maintains itself in the division; the unity manifests itself by multiplicity, but this multiplicity constitutes the unity. The structural Idea differentiates itself, yet in all the differences and particulars, the structural Idea is what makes the class, is what gives the basis of Classification. The Ornithorhynchus is said to have the beak of a duck, but the body of an otter; its organic totality must classify it, not the beak.

Very important is the Structural Idea as the basis of Classification in literature. A great poem is an organic totality, which must first be seized in its fundamental fact or thought, in the point where it is one and identical with itself; then it must be seen differentiating itself into its parts, which are organic members; that is, each member must show itself as a member of

the whole, having the unity in itself, though it be but a part. The identity of the work of art passes over into its own distinctions, which constitute the one vital organic Whole.

Thus Classification has become Organization; the One, the Idea, separates itself within itself, creates its own multiplicity, forms itself into Classes which are just itself. Classification cannot be said to subordinate now; multiplicity, the objective world, is not put into Classes from the outside or from the inside by the Understanding; it classifies itself, that is, organizes itself. The process of unification is carried up to the genus which unfolds the species and the individual out of itself.

With the Generic as the self-unfolding out of the One or self-identical, we pass beyond the sphere of the Understanding proper, whose category we declared to be Identity. In the last stage of Classification, the Understanding organized the Difference into the Genus; it recognized the members as organic, did not cancel them into mere uniformity, but into the Genus. But the Genus must generate, must create Difference, and this is no longer the Distinctions of the Understanding, which it finds in the world and reduces to unity, but the creation of the Genus, its self-diremption into its own species and individuals. Such an act, however, lies beyond the Understanding, which can at most

classify into a Genus, but cannot proceed generically.

Historical. The philosophy of the English mind for quite three hundred years has been chiefly a philosophy of the Understanding in contradistinction to a philosophy of Reason or of the Idea. Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, down to Mill and Spencer, all the great names of English Thought, belong to the kingdom of the Understanding. To the same belongs essentially the Scotch school also, yet with an intermingling here and there of more ideal elements, and with a deeper religious instinct, which calls a halt to the negative, skeptical side of the Understanding. The English mind deals with the practical, demands utility, must see the immediate use of the principle as an organon of some sort to meet the present need, which is indeed pressing.

In other words, the Understanding is the handmaid of the Will by its very nature, and so appeals to the very essence of English character. If Thought ever reaches the point at which it seeks to justify itself to itself, the Englishman will ask, What's the use? I can't make a steamship with it, or rule India by such means; *cui bono?* He must have a thought which serves his Will, serves it directly and in a hurry; such is his life and his inmost consciousness; the English are the great will-people of this earth. Still the function of philosophy is ultimately to make

Thought transparent to itself, to grasp itself as its own end and not as the mere instrument of the Will.

Yet the Understanding in recent times has pushed itself forward to the point at which it begins to see its own limits. Even in Nature it is found that abstraction, comparison, experiment, classification, look to something upon which they all depend, and of which they are a more or less faint reflection. There is at present a class of English writers, who, starting from the Understanding, take delight in driving it into a corner and breaking it upon its own bounds. From this and other indications, the hope rises that the English mind, just through the practical Understanding, may yet ascend into the realm of the speculative Reason and create a true philosophy.

In American Thought there is essentially the same substrate; its philosophers so-called have been British mainly, manifesting for the most part a transplanted British mind, being men of the Understanding in so far as they have philosophised (which is not much). But a new thread or many threads are at present being woven into the American philosophic fabric, chiefly from Germany, whereof we cannot here give any reckoning.

The grand Anglo-Saxon interrogation is, What's the use? The conception of self-end

is indeed hard for us, quite alien, yet it is ever-present to the philosopher in all his wanderings through the two worlds, finite and infinite. He must, of course, duly value the Understanding, not despising it and its work by any means, but he must transcend its limits and behold it passing into a new sphere.

SECTION SECOND. — RATIOCINATION.

The first thing which the Ego finds in Ratiocination is the object differentiating itself from within, unfolding itself into its species and individuals. Thus the Ego conceives the Genus, which is itself the act of Conception; the creative process of the Ego grasps the creative process of the object, finds the same to be its own, finds itself to be the generic principle of the object.

Accordingly, the Ego moves forth to develop out of itself the Form of all Objectivity, which will take many particular Forms (these we shall hereafter see as Judgments). It will proceed to create a world of Forms, into which it puts the objective world (by an act of Judgment). The Ego will ratiocinate the entire realm of externality, will translate the same into its own Forms, which, however, it has evolved out of its Conception of the object as generic.

Thus the Ego judges in Ratiocination, it subsumes the object under itself (the Ego), under its own Forms, whereby the objective world falls into a vast multiplicity of Judgments which must not only be organized into classes, but mediated one with the other. The mediating Judgment thus arises and produces the Syllogism.

We may here state in advance that we use the word Ratiocination for expressing the general process in which Conception, Judgment and Reasoning are the three stages. These three terms are familiar from books on Logic, but they are seldom, if ever, treated as one movement of the Ego, which manifests the Psychosis, and therein unites them not only with one another but also with the total process of Psychology.

The word *genus* is connected with *generate*, *genesis*, *generation*, and goes back to an old Aryan root which means to create. Its nearest equivalent in Latin is *gens*, which, in the Roman social order, was conceived as the primal creative unit, out of which families arose and then individuals. Every Roman had three names; that of his *gens* (or *genus*) was the central one, that of his family (*species*) was at the end, while his individual designation came first. Caius Julius Cæsar was of the Julian *gens*, the name of his family was Cæsar, his personal name was Caius. Thus every Roman individual showed in his three names the triple process of Conception:

the genus (gens) differentiates itself into species (here families) which bring forth the individual. The Roman Ego, the great form-maker and law-giver, formulates its own process in naming itself.

The Understanding, having unfolded into Classification, has reached the Genus as the most concrete identity of the object with itself. But the Genus, when reached, at once differentiates itself and becomes species and individuals, which are now posited by the generic process from within. Thus begins this new sphere, that of Ratiocination, which has in it the Difference, yet as posited by the Genus, which is in itself the side of the Unity or Identity. The Difference in the sphere of Ratiocination, therefore, must always show whence it came, must show what posited it, namely the Genus. Yet, on the other hand, the Difference insists upon being different and not identical, it is going to have its own career, its own process; its essence is to differentiate, not to unify.

If the Understanding be the process of Identity, Ratiocination is the process of Difference. The Ego in the first case identifies with itself the object or some separate phase of the object; the Ego in the second case differentiates the object, posits its inner Difference and puts the chief stress thereon. I say I understand the word, that is, I identify its meaning with myself in

my knowledge; I unconsciously separate its meaning from its form, and disregard the latter. Yet the word has just the differentiation into meaning and form; Ratiocination takes it up and unfolds it; when I seek the *rationale* of an object, here of the word, I wish to see it develop generically into its Difference, into form and meaning.

The Understanding also, as we have already noted, separates and discriminates, but not generically; it makes more or less superficial distinctions in the object, taking what it wants and disregarding the rest; it differences from the outside and not from the inside, the Genus being self-differencing.

Accordingly in Ratiocination the Difference has become explicit, inherent in the object, while in the Understanding it was implicit, brought to the object from the outside. The process of Thought as ratiocinative is uttered (outered), externalized, expressed into Form, which is, however, the Form of the inner generic activity. Ratiocination is Thought formalized; the latter now creates its Forms, which are indeed different from it and opposite, yet are made into a mirror for reflecting back to it its own process.

Herein, of course, we trace the work of the Ego, which always has in itself separation and difference. The knowing Ego must separate its

knowledge from itself in order to know, and to find its divisions. Such is the emphatic point now, but in Ratiocination the Ego will manifest its unity also, it will hold its divisions together within itself. We shall have, therefore, a movement of differentiation, and yet a sub-movement of unification. The Ego will show itself as One in its deepest distinctions. So all forms of Ratiocination have the Copula, implied or expressed, which is the binding mean of the differences.

Ratiocination has also its process, being the activity of the Ego in uttering itself in its own forms. This process will unfold from its germ in Conception to its complete reality in Reasoning. Therein we behold what is ordinarily called Logic, or the logical movement of Thought in its formal, separative aspect. The Ego will now differentiate its own logical Forms, which thus become its content also in the ratiocinative process.

Starting from the Genus, or the unity reached by the Understanding, we shall see it unfold into the triple process of Ratiocination, which from this point of view is the movement of Difference.

I. Conception — the Difference implicit, internal, yet showing the process within itself.

II. Judgment — the Difference explicit, externalized, showing itself as twofold, externally united by the Copula.

III. Reasoning — the Difference is now medi-

ated, through the Middle Term, which, however, is itself external, and thereby shows the process as threefold. Thus the ratiocinative process has revealed the mediation of the Ego, but still as formal and external.

By scanning the above process, we observe that Ratiocination is the evolution of the Middle Term for mediating the extremes (Difference) of the Ego. Judgment is the Difference of the Ego posited; Reasoning is the attempt to harmonize the two sides by finding the reconciling term. This unfolding of the Copula or binding-word reveals itself in three corresponding stages. (1) In Conception the Copula is unexpressed, yet present in the immediate act of the Ego which unites in itself its three terms. (2) In Judgment the Copula is expressed, explicit, and binds together the Individual and the Generic, or the Subject and the Predicate, yet this bond is external also, as it is simply that of being, for example, *John is a man*. (3) In Reasoning the Copula is developed into the Middle Term, which renders the Syllogism possible.

As we are now in the realm of division, we may as well make a further distinction. It has been already set forth that Ratiocination unfolds the process of the Ego externalizing itself into its own Forms; thus there are present the two sides in every stage; the inner activity or process of the Ego and the corresponding outer

Form or Product. Herein again the Difference shows itself as essential. Note, therefore, the distinction as well as the connection between (1) Conception and Concept, (2) Judgment and Proposition, (3) Reasoning and Syllogism. Logic as the Science of the external Forms of Thought puts its stress upon the latter series — Concept, Proposition, Syllogism. But Psychology, whose essence is the movement of the Ego, puts or should put its stress upon the former series — Conception, Judgment, Reasoning. Still the two sides must be united by the Copula which also has its stages of unfolding in Ratiocination.

Thus in each of the three stages of the ratiocinative process we behold a triple division, which we may call in general, the inner activity or Meaning, the outer Form, and the Copula. All three are in implicit unity, yet are unfolding into separation, in Conception; all three are explicitly separated in Judgment, yet joined immediately by the Copula; all three are fully separated yet joined mediately by the Middle Term in Reasoning. In the movement of each as well as in the movement of all we are to see the Psychosis, which therein begins to find its own complete formula, and which has insisted from the beginning that each single act of the Ego reveals the total process of the Ego.

Indeed Ratiocination is the express formulation

of the Ego ; the Ego formulates itself, makes itself into its other (the external) which nevertheless bears its complete impress. But Ratiocination leaves the Ego external, while this is internal also ; it formulates the Ego, but this act of formulation must also be formulated, must indeed formulate itself. Herewith, however, we pass out of the sphere of Ratiocination.

Looking forward and taking a sweep over the whole field of Ratiocination, we observe that the Ego manifests the Psychosis, moving through the three stages of the process in Conceiving, Judging, and Reasoning (Syllogizing). The Ego in the first stage conceives the object as Genus differencing itself through itself, which is the conceptive act. The Ego having thus conceived the object and identified this object's differentiation with its own, proceeds to judge, that is, to subsume the objective world under its own differentiation, which is its Form of Judgment. But this Form of Judgment manifests itself in many particular Judgments, with difference, opposition, conflict. So there rises the intermediate Judgment between the two differing Judgments with its Middle Term, the total process of which gives the Syllogism.

But the mediation through the Syllogism is imperfect, being a Judgment and having all the imperfection of a Judgment, which subsumes the object under the higher or the highest (sum-

num genus), but cannot subsume or mediate this highest. The Syllogism has, therefore, no final or absolute mediation of the objective world; the Syllogism cannot indeed mediate its own terms, or itself; thus it calls for a new process, that of Reason. At present, however, we are to unfold in detail the process of Ratiocination.

I. CONCEPTION.

Already the Understanding sought to reach the true Conception of the Thing, to think the creative act which made the same. But it came to the Thing from the outside, and elaborated its material in that way; still it attained, through its category of Identity, unto the Genus. But the Genus at once divides within itself by its own creative activity, and we pass into our present sphere. When the division of the Thing becomes internal for us, we have found its rationale, and behold its unfolding through itself. To be sure, we are to recognize this self-unfolding and to make it ours too.

Such is, in general, Conception; it starts with the Genus or the Generic, which differences itself into the Particular, which last returns and unites with the Generic and becomes the Individual. This is the movement of Conception, which is the immediate form of Ratiocination; the separation is as yet internal, implicit, ideal, not yet posited

and real. It is the potential form of all reality, it is the Ego as pure Subject; it is Thought which now seizes its own creative germ and unfolds it into all Being.

Conception must, therefore, be grasped on the side of its creativity. It is just that which produces and produces out of itself. It is the grand generative principle in the Universe, whose essence is to unfold through itself. To be sure, the modern usage of the word Conception seems to have bleached out this vigorous sense, which the word has in old-English writers and which is still preserved in the Bible. The Conception of Nature is fecundation, by which the object is to reproduce its kind, is the Genus which must particularize itself and thereby bring forth the Individual. The conceptive act of mind is creativity, which is the original fiat of the Ego, when it divides within itself and becomes object, yet remains with itself and is subject. All through Psychology we have seen that the Ego must create the object in order to know it in any way.

The spiritual elements which go to make up the process of Conception are the Generic (Universal), the Particular (Specific, Species), the Individual (Singular). While Conception, to be Conception and to perform its act, must have these three elements in it, they are not now in a state of separation, they are on the contrary one,

and one process. Still they are implicitly different, are indeed just the Different in itself, which is to become explicit.

The true Conception is the Ego, and we may take an act of mind to illustrate the three elements — Universal, Particular, Individual. (1) The whole mind acts in reading the sentence before you, if it be read with a knowledge of what it means. This is no part of the mind, but the totality which acts and determines itself in a given direction. Such is the universal element. (2) Yet the whole mind acting, must take a specific direction in reading this page; your mind specializes itself, is not the pure Universal, which is merely possibility of a certain direction and tendency. In such case your mind has become Particular (not a part), which is the element of separation, finitude, the determined. (3) But in this Particular the total mind manifests itself in getting out of the same and returning to itself. Otherwise it would lose itself in particularity, in division and details. Still further, the mind in being particular, remains its entire Self; so, in reading this page, it shows its individuality, it is different therein from other individuals who may read it or not.

Conception is not Perception nor is it the act of imaging; it goes beyond both these mental stages to the ideal activity which is the essence of the percept or the image. It is true that I

have to reproduce the percept in order to have it; I have to annul the outer extended object and then create it in order to perceive it or to sense it in any manner. Likewise the image can be obtained only through a reproduction or re-creative act.

What is it to have a Conception of anything? It is to grasp the creative element thereof, that which produces, co-ordinates, and unites all the details. The Conception of a plant is the general principle (the Generic) of the vegetable organism unfolding into particulars through itself; the Conception of Hamlet is the seizing of the fundamental fact of his character, out of which rise all his thoughts and acts, which again combine and constitute his individuality.

It is evident that Conception is not only general but genetic, it creates its particulars, its externals. Conception is the germinal Idea, which divides within itself, expands and clothes itself with the details of its existence. The Conception of the triangle is the grasping of that which makes the triangle inclose space by three straight lines. The Conception sees the triangle creatively, moving forth into being out of its generic Idea and taking on the particular form of the triangle through its own necessity. The image of the triangle does not create it, the Conception does.

We shall now behold Conception conceiving

itself, unfolding itself into its own creative process. As already stated, this has three stages, which show the Ego grasping itself in its own internal movement — the Generic, the Particular, the Individual. The outcome of Conception is, therefore, the Individual, who, however, must have the whole generic process in himself. The individual man reproduces himself as individual physically, he also has the universally human in him, though he must be this particular man too ; finally his Ego in every act of itself is just this process. So the Individual is the concrete reality. These three stages we shall now look at in detail.

I. *Conception as the Generic.—Universality.* The Generic is derived from the physical process, the Genus, while the Universal expresses the mental process in its purity. Still we shall employ the Generic in the latter sense also, since it suggests more directly the creative element in Conception.

The Universal remains a very abstract term in spite of all we can do, so we shall try to keep it alive by co-ordinating with it the Generic.

Already through the Understanding the Genus has been reached ; the Conception of the Genus is essentially the Conception of the Universal as the original creative act which moves forth into division and particularity.

1. Primarily it is the absolute identity with

itself, undifferentiated, immediate; the negation of all otherness, and outsideness, the simple primordial unity which involves the annullment of all Difference. Such is the conceptive act grasped in its original simplicity and oneness.

2. Yet to be this simple unity it must cancel Difference; that is, it must have Difference in it, though canceled; thus Difference is a potential element, overcome indeed or not yet unfolded. The Universal, therefore, must be grasped not merely as the simple unity with itself, but as the possibility, the very source, of all multiplicity and concreteness. It is the idea of the concrete world, not yet realized, but which is to be realized.

3. When the Universal passes into reality, which is its other or negative, it is not lost, but it preserves itself thereby; it goes along with itself in its separation from itself, and remains universal in all Difference and Particularity. It is the Creator who remains himself in his Creation; in fact, he realizes himself first through his Creation, is his own completeness therein. Hence this process is often represented as the love of the Father toward His children, since He relates Himself to them as to Himself, or, we may say, He goes over into them, makes them in His own image. In like manner, Natural Science has conceived of an original germ-cell of all being, wherein, however, the main fact is

that Conception is trying to conceive Conception.

Undoubtedly the central thought of the Universal is its generic, creative principle, which has to make the Universe. In the religious imagination this is that principle which was in the beginning — when “the earth was without form and void;” it had all multiplicity in it, yet undifferenced, uncreated; it was pure identity with itself, in which the Universe lay unborn, ideal, potential, yet conceived. But its essence is to create; it could not even be identical with itself, unless it could posit Difference, or the World, and therein go along with itself into reality.

The act of Conception is creative, let it again be affirmed, and repeats the original act of the Creator. Every true Thought of yours is primarily conceptive, that is, it generates the Thing or Object as the original primordial Idea generated it in the beginning. When you think truly (grasp the Conception of the Object), you think the thought of God after Him. Very true, as we have already found, is that utterance of Malebranche about “seeing all things in God;” higher and truer is thinking all thoughts in God.

The whole movement of the Understanding (to take another glance backward) was to reach this concrete Universal which is creative, the Generic, the Genus. To be sure the Understanding found another kind of Universal externally by

Abstraction ; certain qualities it abstracted from objects and united in an abstract term, say redness. But this act is not creative, it remains abstract, hence it may be called the abstract Universal, in contrast with the concrete Universal which unfolds from within and is creative. Upon this abstract Universal is founded the view of the Nominalists with their apothegm: *Universalia sunt nomina*. But the Universal is inherently genetic, and so generates that which is different from itself, namely the Different.

II. *Conception as differentiated.*—*Particularity*. It has been already stated that the Universal must differentiate itself in order to be identical with itself ; it is the undetermined which must determine itself, even as identical with itself ; it is the original which must originate, the Genus which must separate itself into its species. The Universal must become special (species), and its species are two : the Particular and itself as different from the Particular.

The relation of Universal and Particular is not that of the Whole and the Parts. These are simply posited alongside of one another and are externally related, not internally generated ; if the Whole created its Parts, differentiating itself into the same, then it would be the Universal. The creative power of the Conception must be present.

The Particular is the sphere of separation,

of the multiplicity of being, of quality. It is immanent in the Universal (or Generic) which has to move into the Particular in order to appear at all. Fundamentally, however, the Difference is dual; the Genus of Conception divides itself and is twofold, or has two species and two only: the Particular and the Universal. But the Genus of Nature falls into multiplicity and has many species or may have; Nature, being externality, can only show an indefinite approach toward the Ego or the complete Conception, an approach by many stages. Yet even Nature often shows a tendency to bifurcate in its divisions, as Vertebrates and Invertebrates, Plants and Animals, Phænogamous and Cryptogamous Plants, Man and the lower Animals, etc.

Thus the Universal differences itself into the Particular, which is the world created, the realm of manifestation. But this Particular is at the same time universal, the Creator goes with himself into his creation, and we call it his; though it be distinct from him, even the distinction is his. So all particularity returns to the Universal, seeking to identify itself with its origin. Every particularized atom of earth seeks to return to its center, as the soul seeks to return to the Divine.

We have already noted how the Understanding, taking up the Particular in some form, reaches, through Abstraction, what we called the

abstract Universal, as distinct from the true (or conceptive) Universal. Yet the Understanding even in this act of Abstraction is certainly seeking the true Universal, but with its category of Identity can get only the Common, can only generalize. On the other hand the Ego in Conception universalizes. Let us note the process.

1. The Particular, being held against the Universal, reduces the latter to the Particular; that is, the limit which the Particular puts upon Universal, must make the latter also limited, particular.

2. Thus we see the Particular dualized, specialized, with two species. Yet both these species are particular, indeed constitute all particularity; thus they are at bottom one which is the Universal.

3. So the Particular, in asserting itself completely, universalizes itself, passes over through its own inner necessity into the Universal. It cannot stay by itself and truly remain particular; it has to return to the Universal as to its creative form; it shows itself as derived, not independent, not the total, else it would not be particular. Such is the process of the universalization of the Particular.

We may look at some examples. Suppose the particular act of a man to be negative, wrongful; the law, which is the Universal, must bring it back to itself and negate it. Theft, mur-

der, crime are punished by the State, which is the Universal in action. The law is that the deed must be returned upon the doer; sometimes this is a statutory law administered by civil authority; but in dramatic poetry, especially in the Tragedies of Shakespeare, it is shown to be a principle of the Ethical Order of the World.

The whole Universe, as particularized, created, asserts itself in every particular atom. This little speck of dust will seek to return to the Universal if separated from it; it longs to be with the Whole, to be the very center thereof. This is the law of matter, showing itself in the phenomenon of gravitation.

Every Particular, therefore, must return and share in the Universal, its source, in order to be at peace and harmonious. If the Particular refuses to be at one with its creative principle, it becomes the center of discord, conflict, rebellion — a state of things which is set forth in many a song and story; it is indeed the grand theme of literature and religion.

The Creator makes the Particular, his counterpart, his other, different yet one with him; in fact, just this last is the great problem. Will the creature assert himself or the Universal? The Rebellion of Satan, the Fall of Man, the War in Heaven are huge mythical reflections of this primordial fact of human consciousness.

We may once more call attention to the distinction between generalization and universalization. The first is the product of the Understanding and takes place outside of the Particular; the second is the act of Conception unfolding the movement of the Particular itself. The grand behest is, Universalize your deed and your thought, and see what becomes of them. Kant has applied this process to the conception of Duty, and makes it the foundation of his famous Categorical Imperative.

Hereafter we shall find the Particular to be the Middle Term of the First Syllogism. We can now see the reason: it lies between the Universal and the Individual, and is the middle or mediation of the two extremes.

The Individual in Conception has arisen out of the process of the Particular, which is in the present case universal also, while being particular. This new Particular is not the one just described as the different from the Universal, but is itself universal too; thus it is the Individual.

III. *Conception as Individual.* — *Individuation.* This new Particular arrived at is not the former Particular, as separated, divided, or as the species, but all separation is now canceled, since the Particular is in itself universal. Such is the Individual (the word etymologically means the non-divided, or negation of the divided

which is the Particular). Grasping the movement more closely, we must see that the Universal or the Generic not only particularizes itself (species), but also particularizes the Particular, negates its special particularity and makes it the Individual. The Genus, or the generic act, not only brings forth the species, but through the latter passes into the Individual, which is the realized product of the whole process of Conception. Every Individual both of Nature and Mind shows more or less completely, according to its remoteness from the Ego, just this process.

The triangle has reality only as an individual triangle; yet this Individual must have the Universal, or the Idea of the triangle; also it has the Particular, or is a certain kind of triangle. The Genus or the Conception of the triangle differentiates itself into many species of triangles (scalene, isocles, etc.); yet this particularity must be overcome, and show itself as Universal, one, single, the Individual, which has in it the total process of the Conception, and hence is real.

But the supreme manifestation of the Individual is the Ego, Person, which not only has division and individuality within itself, but is that which divides and individualizes itself, and becomes therein the pure conceptive process which grasps itself as such process. The Ego or the Subject is fundamentally Conception, its move-

ment follows the act of creation, and it identifies itself with the same. Conception at last conceives itself and its own process; thus it is the self-knowing Ego, which conceives the object too, creating the same anew after its own process.

Still it may be said that every individual thing is a reflex of this Conception. A clod as a single thing has limit, has separation from every other clod, and also has separation from its Universal, the Earth. Still it is always seeking just this Universal of itself; though it has its limit against the Earth, yet it is one with and through the same in gravitation.

The Universe (Universal) is made up of Individuals; every real object will show in some phase the process of Conception—Universal, Particular, Individual. Yet, these three do not really exist in separation, they are one and belong in one process; still they could not be one and a process, unless they were three. We have seen that the most external individual thing of Nature, a clod, a stone, a speck of dust, has this threefold process, though in the most external way. Life shows it in a much higher form; Ego, Spirit, God reveal it in the highest.

But the Ego as Individual is not only the process of Conception, but is *in* that process as well; whereof let us note the stages.

1. We have just seen how the Particular

returns of itself to the Universal, and so gets negated as simple, separated Particular against other Particulars, thereby becoming Individual. That is, the Individual has in it the total process of Conception as immediate, internal, and is thus asserting itself -- Individuality, which is the fact that the Individual is universal.

The same thing may be stated in the form of the movement of the Negative. The Universal negates the Particular, which is the limited or negative; thus the Universal negates the negative, and brings forth the positive, the real, here the Individual, which therein manifests "pure negativity," which term, as already repeatedly noted, designates the innermost essence of the Ego.

2. The Individual, going through the process of Conception, is not only universal, but is also particular, wherewith we come to a new kind of particularity, which is the particularity of the Individual; this we may name in a general way Particularism. The Individual we have seen to be in himself the complete process of Conception; thus he (or it) is one total self-including Individual against other ones of the same kind. So we behold a realm of mutually excluding Individuals, each in his own inner fortress, a particular Individual versus other Particulars of the species. Manifestly this is the sphere of Difference, Separation, specially Particularism.

The manifestations of Particularism assume many forms, partly good, often bad — selfishness, partyism, denominationalism, and many other *isms*, even nationalism vs. nationality, which may be compared with individualism vs. individuality.

But Particularism too is subject to the process, specially to the process of the negative, it being limited and negative. It grinds itself to pieces in the mill of its own conflicting Individuals, till they come to Recognition, each recognizing the other to be itself and one with itself in essence.

3. The Individual, still going through the process of Conception, finally posits himself as Individual; he is what the other is, and the other is what he is; he is now truly, concretely Universal. Or, the Individual now conceives himself as Conception; he has become the Conception of the Conception; he is the Generic generating himself as Generic; he recognizes himself as Universal. The Individual in the first stage above was the simple immediate process of Conception, which has now unfolded into the conceptive process seizing itself as process.

Conception has herein gone through its entire movement, as Universal, Particular, Individual, and the Individual has not only Conception, but has conceived of itself as Conception. This self-return is the final act of Conception as

internal; it knows itself to be universal and utters itself as such. That is, the Individual now externalizes its own Conception, which new act is the act of Judgment. The Individual as Conception utters Judgment of itself, whose content must be just the thought to which we have attained, namely, the Individual is the Universal (or Generic); its conceptive process is the creative principle underlying all things. No human being can utter a Judgment without this pre-supposition.

The outcome of Conception is, therefore, that it has brought forth an Individual who utters himself to be universal, which is truly the universal Judgment, Judgment of himself by himself. *I am a man*; such is the primordial Judgment of the individual Ego concerning itself; it (the Individual) is the Generic (the genus, homo). Yet this genus must be dualized into its species, made up of the two sexes (man and woman) before the individual of the species (either man or woman) can be conceived and brought forth; the woman is *homo* or the Generic as well as the man. Thus in the present case the individual is mediated or united in the process of the genus through the species (here the sexual pair or the family).

It will be again interesting to note that every Roman individual born into the social order, bore this triple process in his name. He was Publius

(individual) Cornelius (genus, or the Cornelian gens) Scipio (the specific family of the genus). The individual in Rome did not really exist till his complete process was designated. Also the first two names (Publius Cornelius) are an implied Judgment, namely the Individual is the Generic. Our names are different, the Individual and the Family appear in them, the genus has dropped out.

Historical. The use of the term Conception in the preceding exposition differs from that current in the psychology of to-day. The Concept is said to be obtained from Abstraction, Comparison, and Generalization; thus the abstract term is found through an external process of division and combination, whereby things similar are brought into a general whole, which is the Concept. The reader will note that all this is but a phase of that which we have called the Understanding.

The foregoing account has put stress upon the genetic element of Conception. Such meaning is not alien to English usage; the reader must have often seen (we hope) the biblical phrase: she conceived and bare a son. What kind of Conception is this? The physical genetic process, not the mental; yet the one is derived from the other by analogy; so we may freshen up the usage and *the conception*.

Throughout all the literature of Formal Logic,

we find much employment of the terms, Universal, Particular, Individual. They have unquestionably a very important formal side, but a more important psychological side. Here, if anywhere in the world of Thought, there is need of the Psychosis, the unifying principle of the Ego, since division, analysis, abstract definition have run riot, sometimes with protest, but generally without restraint. The result is, Logic has been discredited through its empty formalism.

It is manifest that Logic cannot be redeemed except by restoring its psychological, or rather psychical side. Many have seen this, and some have attempted the task. Of these attempts the best in our opinion is that of the philosopher Hegel (in the third part of his larger Logic under *Begriff*), to whom we owe much in the preceding exposition. Still even in the case of Hegel we shall have to transcend limitations. He obscures his treatment of the subject by forcing it to be logical in name, whereas it is manifestly psychological in fact; Hegel himself says his *Begriff* is Ego, Spirit, Self-consciousness (p. 13), and also intimates that the considering it to be such "would make the comprehension of it easier." But he does not follow out his own suggestion, so that his exposition seems to be a tissue of the most unreal abstractions hanging in the air like fine-spun gossamers. Yet they pertain to the most concrete thing in the Universe,

namely the Ego. Doubtless many a reader will deem our own treatment as sufficiently abstract; still we are incessantly holding before him the reality of it all, which is the process of the Ego, of which he has in himself an ever-present and important example. Hegel was evidently too anxious not to get his philosophy mixed up with Fichte's Ego, or the principle of subjective idealism, so that he comes near to throwing the baby out with the bath (*das Kind mit dem Bade ausschuetten*).

Still further, the word *Begriff* in German seems to be even more perverted and ambiguous than is the English word *Conception*. To such difficulties may be added special tangles in Hegel's expression, and, as it seems to us, obscurities of thought, though these have a tendency to sink out of sight, when the sweep of the whole begins to get visible. Partially true, yet not altogether so, is the statement, that, in order to understand Hegel, you must know beforehand what he means. This, however, is only saying that the reader must bring along his apperceptive stuff, else he will not apperceive Hegel or any philosopher.

Still we strongly recommend the student who wishes to grasp the unfolding of this most important phase of the psychological process, to grapple with the exposition of Hegel above cited. If the student's endeavor be honest, not

prejudiced beforehand, nor indolent, he will bring much away with him, though much will probably remain behind (such at least is our case). Still we think that we see far enough to see an inherent defect in Hegel's treatment of the subject, which defect is summed up in the statement: he lacks the Psychosis. He leaves the nexus with the process of the Ego obscure, he does not bring into the foreground the creativity of his *Begriff* (Conception), he unfolds with the keenest dialectic his Pure Thought, but does not (for us at least) connect it with the reality. Doubtless he had all these matters in his mind, but they remain implicit in his exposition. Hegel must, therefore, be developed through himself out of himself.

II. JUDGMENT.

In the sphere of Ratiocination, Judgment is the second stage, as Ratiocination is the second stage in the process of Thought. The divisive principle dominates in both stages, yet in different ways. We saw thought as the Genus separate itself within itself and become species and individuals, and thus enter the sphere of Ratiocination. Then we saw Conception from its immediate unity unfold into Difference, which became the Universal on one side, and the In-

dividual on the other, these two being the essential terms of Judgment.

Let us mark more closely this last transition. In Conception the Generic (or the Universal) unfolded into the Individual; the reality of the Generic is the Individual, which is thus itself the Generic. The Generic is not the abstract Universal without its realization in the Individual, which is, accordingly, the Generic realized and active. Thus the Individual in Conception is derived from the Generic, but therein also returns to the Generic, or is the Generic. Such is the process: the Individual being posited by the Generic, now turns back, as it were, and posits the Generic as distinct. This is the act of Judgment.

The fundamental utterance of the Judgment is, therefore, *the Individual is generic*; being sprung of the Genus, the Individual has the character of the same and is generic, is creative, is the Genus. That which the Individual is in his deepest nature is the self-creative; in Conception just that fact was the implicit one, which there unfolded itself within itself (subjectively); but in Judgment the same fact is made explicit, is uttered, is posited in the world. That is, Judgment is the Individual declaring himself to be self-creative as his fundamental attribute. For the Individual being a Generic, arising from a Generic and returning to a Gen-

eric, must utter himself as such, *outer* himself, and become real.

We may say that the Individual is born in an act of Judgment; in Conception he is yet unborn, a possibility, an abstract unrealized Generic. In Judgment the separation takes place which makes him an Individual existent, he is posited in the world. Not merely the individual body, but the individual Ego is now born; its division within itself and its self-identification in the act of self-consciousness is the fundamental Judgment, or the Ego as a Judgment. Indeed the Ego is always in the process of being born; you are being born in Judgment every day.

The individual man, being born, has sex upon him, is generic through the act of nature. The individual word or name, being born, has also sex upon it; that is, language is sexed, the names of things in most tongues have gender, and therein manifest themselves as the generic or universal. The word springs truly from an act of Conception, and is the individual which shows, often in its linguistic form, its gender or its generic character. There is a tendency in the English tongue to get rid of sex, thus obscuring what may be called the creative element in the word. The term *individual* (the reader may have noticed) we use with a *he*, *she* and *it*; this important word is of all genders, yet of none distinctively. But originally every single name

of person or thing is sexed in accord with the process of Conception.

The Individual having uttered itself (or himself or herself) as generic, having posited itself as distinct from the previous Individual of Conception, which was simply a result, must have a new expression of its new Self. For it is now the self-producing; also the Generic must have a new term for its new relation to the Individual, since it now manifests the innermost essence of the Individual, whereas previously in Conception it unfolded the Individual. So Judgment has its own terms: the Individual is Subject and the Generic is Predicate.

Subject and Predicate, therefore, are the Conception uttered, the unborn Thought is born in Subject and Predicate, which twofoldness is simply Thought itself differentiated. I say, the conceived Thought has to propel itself into a Judgment, as the infant has to separate itself from its mother and come into the world. Thus we see that Conception is realized in Judgment; that which is immediate, implicit, potential, becomes real, explicit, differenced in Subject and Predicate. Judgment is the severing of the umbilical cord in the Thought-bearing process; the analogy is as old as Socrates, who deemed himself an obstetrician of the Ego, and therein compared himself to his mother, who was a midwife.

Still further this utterance of Conception in Judgment employs the word, the sign which has just this meaning — namely to be the utterance of Conception in Subject and Predicate. All Thought must, accordingly, realize itself in the word, in language. Thought is unborn till it incarnates itself in Subject and Predicate. Here too Grammar gets organized; there are words, articulate sounds with meaning in them, given by a stage of the Imagination; but the organization of language (which is Grammar) is based upon Subject and Predicate. For Thought has now uttered itself and created its forms of utterance; it can be found by Thought in these forms.

In Subject and Predicate, Difference lies posited; they express just the differentiation of Thought into its two opposite elements — the Individual and the Generic, or Subject and Predicate. Yet there is also Identity here, a connection expressed in the Copula. The Subject (subjection) is that which is put under something; the Predicate is affirmed of something. Both are thus subordinated; really each subsumes the other in their common process, and therein are alike; the Subject is the Predicate, both are implicitly identical, hence the Copula utters identity. Still the explicit fact of Judgment is the separation, the difference in it.

This identity of Subject and Predicate is not,

therefore, expressly mediated in Judgment, but is implicit, and is to unfold into an explicit form. The two extremes, Subject and Predicate, in their movement will develop a mean; the Copula will evolve itself out of a mere connecting link into a mediating term, on a par with the other two terms. This will give the Syllogism in Reasoning.

The process of Judgment is, therefore, through Difference toward Unity, which is finally uttered in the middle term of the Syllogism. The Difference of the two-fold in Subject and Predicate is the explicit phase of Judgment while the Identity is as yet in germ, but is unfolding. More and more will Subject and Predicate demonstrate their unity. Of this movement we shall note three stages, which are the Stages of the Ego: immediate (undivided); conditional (divided); definitive (integrated).

In fact the most fundamental Judgment of all, the Judgment of Judgments, is Ego is Ego. Here is the separation into Subject and Predicate, also the Identity is affirmed. The primitive Ego of Conception is not yet real, but only conceived; the Ego must disembody itself into subject and object, before it can conceive itself as itself, and be the real Ego. This has Difference within itself, yet also affirms Identity. It is a Judgment, and utters itself in Subject and Predicate, for the Predicate affirms objectivity of the Subject,

makes it real. Unless the Ego were the other of itself and still one with itself in the other, it would never be a Judgment, nor be able to construct a proposition. Subject-Object utters itself in Subject-Predicate, and is Judgment.

Popular speech often takes Identity to express Difference, for instance: Woman is *woman*; in which the distinctive meaning is thrown into the intonation or gesture. Repetition has the same effect: There are teachers and teachers; one is very different from the other. Thus the Ego employs its own fundamental Judgment: Ego is Ego, putting Difference into Identity by its own immediate psychical act.

The fundamental form, however, in all Judgments is contained in the statement: The Individual is the Generic (or Universal). Every Judgment is an act of recreating the object and uttering the same. When I say, *the window-pane is transparent*, I, this self-conscious Individual, recreate the thought of the window-pane and utter it in a Judgment. Already in Conception I might conceive the thought of the window-pane, or the process of the Ego in creating the window-pane; in Judgment, however, I, this Individual, am myself Judgment, am the Generic, and must utter myself as generic, creative. Hence it comes that I, being the Individual which is generic, and knowing myself as such, can declare that the Individual is the Generic throughout the

universe. Hence it comes too, that I can say that the window-pane, which is an individual object, is transparent, for transparency is its generic principle, or that which makes it a window-pane. In making such a judgment, I am affirming myself as the basis of every Judgment; I am the self-knowing, self-creative principle, the Generic; here I am the Judgment creating Judgments. Unless I were such, I could not even say or think that yonder window-pane is transparent; unless I grasped myself as the individual which is generic, I would have no universal Form of Judgment, and could express no special judgment; I could not make the simplest proposition.

But as the case stands, the Individual as self-conscious Ego can grasp every individual thing in existence, and judge the same, that is, subsume the same under its own Form, under itself; then it can express such formulation in judgment. Herewith rises the present stage of the Ego; man must go forth and judge the world, subordinating it to his Form; he must create anew the entire realm of individual things, transforming them into Judgments. The movement of this new fact we shall here outline.

I. *Immediate.* Such a Judgment simply affirms existence; both terms are terms of being, direct, immediate. *The rose is red;* Subject and Predicate are held asunder as distinct entities, yet united by the Copula which expresses being.

The Ego in this Judgment declares the world as immediately existent (as in Sense-perception), which is indeed the first Predicate that can be applied to the individual object, inasmuch as the Ego itself is, first of all, immediate.

Yet the immediate Judgment is in the process of the Ego, and will of necessity show the same; it soon finds that it has to be mediated, indeed has already been mediated. The Ego will bring its own divisive element into the sphere of Judgment, which will therein show separation within itself.

II. *Conditional.* Such a Judgment declares in some form that the immediately existent depends on something else, is not immediate. *If this is so, that is so;* the second proposition depends on the first. In this way dualism enters the Judgment, which becomes thereby the utterance of doubt, questioning, probability, uncertainty, contingency.

Thus the Ego in Judgment separates itself from the immediate world, questions it, doubts it, and finally declares that something lies behind it, on which in one way or other it depends. It is the determined, which has a determining cause or essence, whereby it is mediated. Therein the Immediate Judgment has moved through the Conditional Judgment and has become a mediated Judgment, which is the following:—

III. *Definitive.* Such a judgment is the Defi-

inition as Judgment. *Man is rational*; there is no condition in this Judgment, man as man is nothing else. It is an immediate Judgment, yet it has been mediated through the Conditional Judgment which has been negated, overcome, in order to bring it forth. Dualism, doubt, contingency, negation are all in it, yet as annulled. It is the highest form of Judgment, having in it the complete process of the Ego as a Judgment, and being the third stage of this process. When I utter the definition of an object as a Judgment, I put into it the threefold movement of the Ego.

Yet not explicitly, for I have not the three sets of terms for such an utterance. These, however, are next to be unfolded, forming the Syllogism, whose process is Reasoning. That is, the implicit Judgment is to be made explicit.

III. REASONING — THE SYLLOGISM.

As the outcome of the preceding stage, we have a world of Judgments; all things are destined to be brought under that form of the Ego and to be uttered.

Now each Judgment is single, stands by itself, is particular; the result is, a vast particularity of Judgments, separate, struggling, discordant. The strife of Judgments, which are uttered by every human being from his own factory, fills the

earth with noise, conflict, even war. Such is the realm which we may call the particularism of the Judgment, a realm of multiplicity, division, finitude.

Now begins the tendency (in accord with the nature of the Ego) to unify this multiplicity, to overcome this particularism, to mediate this conflict, of Judgments. Such is, in general, the mediatorial act of Reasoning; between two different propositions it seeks to find the middle term; between two hostile Judgments it looks for the reconciling word. Reasoning searches for, finds, and utters the intermediate Judgment which brings together two extreme Judgments. This, formally expressed, gives the Syllogism.

We have already noted the Judgment, *man is rational*; a second distinct Judgment would be, *John is a man*. It is the simple act of Reasoning which finds the middle term *man* in these two distinct propositions, and unites them in a third called the conclusion: *John is rational*. An instance of the Syllogism can be seen in these three propositions expressed in the given order.

Now all these propositions, and all possible propositions, or Judgments, have the one fundamental form, *the individual is generic*. But the individual Ego makes many particular Judgments, and there are many individual Egos always in the same business; hence that realm which we designated as the particularism of the Judgment.

Still, in all this multiplicity and diversity of Judgments, there is a unity, a single form and a single activity, which we have just stated. Reasoning seeks to bring out this unity of Judgments in a Judgment, to externalize this implicit element which lurks in Judgment.

It is manifest that Reasoning is mediation of the difference of Judgment; still this mediation is external, imperfect, being through a Judgment which also has difference in itself by its very nature. But it will have its process too, which will correspond to that of the Judgment. Hence the Syllogism will show the following stages:—

I. The Immediate Syllogism.

II. The Conditional Syllogism.

III. The Definitive Syllogism.

The two premises of the Syllogism, its two basic Judgments, are picked up, assumed, not proven, hence are not mediated in themselves, though they mediate the Conclusion. Therefore they contradict the very nature of the Syllogism, which has for its object to mediate, to prove. On account of this difficulty, the Syllogism will try to prove itself by itself, will try to prove its own premises, but will break down in the trial, and reveal its limitation. The Syllogism is not self-proving, not self-determining, and therefore cannot adequately express the movement of the Ego.

Hence the Syllogism is finite, and goes to

pieces by its own inherent contradiction of itself. It has to assume its major term, or its *summum genus*; but whence did this come? The Syllogism cannot tell, and yet it hangs everything on this outside assumption. Ultimately the *summum genus* has to generate itself, it must be generic, self-creative, but all this clearly lies outside of the domain of the Syllogism.

At this point we begin to make the transition into the following sphere, that of Reason, which has returned to the starting principle of Ratiocination, namely the Genus, given to it by the Understanding. Ratiocination has unfolded from the Genus to the Summum Genus, beyond which it cannot reach; it has formulated Thought, but Thought, being formulated, insists upon breaking through the Form and asserting itself as the Form-maker; it has developed the "Laws of Thought," but again Thought insists upon making the Law as well as obeying it, being Law-giver as well as subject to Law. Thought as Reason is the Summum Genus, or the Genus which creates itself and its own terms; it is not only the Syllogism, but the Syllogizer making the Syllogism.

Ratiocination is essentially the Logic of Aristotle in its varied transformations. We find in logical treatises, amid other material more or less adventitious, these fundamental divisions: Conception, Judgment, Reasoning. Such is the

heart of the ordinary Logic. But it is grasped formally, that is, externally; this is, however, but one side of it; the very name indicates the limitation: Formal Logic. Its treatment leaves out the inner process, presenting mainly the divisions and the external definitions; the genetic movement of Conception vanishes in the fixed form. Complaint has always been loud that Logic is empty, meaningless, a dead cabinet of hollow shapes. Only too true; it lacks the Psychosis, which must be supplied to give it life and unity. Such is the vital help which our science can give to Logic.

But these logical Forms are not to be thrown away, they are of supreme interest, and have been inwoven into the very fibre of Human Culture. Indeed they are just the Forms of the Spirit, yet in separation from its reality, from its process. It was the great idea of Aristotle to find these Forms and to order them out of the vast mass of speech. Plato had indeed the Conception and the Genus, Aristotle gave the Judgment and the Syllogism, and so completed essentially the formulation. Later logicians have varied the matter and added a good deal, still the old substructure remains.

We have not unfolded the Forms of Judgment and Syllogism, as that would carry us too far into the field of Logic proper, though it would be an enticing theme to rehabilitate those Forms,

and bring back to them their lost soul by means of the Psychosis. The student may be able to work out the problem for himself.

At the passage out of Representation we noted that the Word, the highest product of that sphere, called forth Thought, though it was not Thought. In like manner, the Syllogism, the highest product of Ratiocination, calls forth Reason, provokes it, demands it, though it is not Reason. Thither, accordingly, we must now pass.

SECTION THIRD.—REASON.

The Ego in Reason is still Thought, but Thought in its highest stage. Reason is Thought recognizing Thought as the creative principle of the Universe. Reason is Conception, not as simply unfolding into its own process, but Conception knowing Conception as the absolute process. Reason, too, is a Syllogism, not, however, as a mere external syllogistic form, but as the Syllogism which syllogizes, which creates the Syllogism out of itself, and is thus the genetic syllogistic act.

The formal Syllogism, having to take its premises from the outside, and being unable to prove them in itself, breaks down through its own inner contradiction, inasmuch as the Syllogism was just that which insisted by its very principle upon demon-

stration. But it has shown that in the end it cannot demonstrate, it does not prove the main thing to be proven; it is hardly more than a hopper which has to have the grain given to it in order to grind out any flour. The total process, self-determination, it cannot unfold nor image. It falls back upon the *summum genus*, which is really the absolute creative principle within itself, the generic principle or primal conception not simply as subjective but as objective also; the *summum genus* is truly that genus whose primordial differentiation is Subject and Object, or Ego and the World. So far beyond itself has the Syllogism forced us.

Ratiocination showed Reason externalized, with the moments of its process fallen asunder, yet seeking to come together through a mean of some kind. The mediation, however, was external, outside the thing itself. But Reason is the self-mediated, is the total Syllogism within itself, whose major term is the *summum genus*, that greatest term which creates its own terms. Ratiocination has discovered that which ratiocinates, the Syllogism that which syllogizes, Reasoning has found Reason. Underneath the ratiocinative process was the creative principle making it, yet separate from it; the Syllogism has taken up into itself the syllogizer, and both have become one act. The Ego, having recognized itself as the maker of the Syllogism, whose

principle is mediation, has found its own complete process.

Thought has, accordingly, unfolded into Reason, which is Thought self-conscious, knowing itself as the creative element in the object. To take a former example, when I simply think (or conceive) the window, I enter immediately into the purpose and meaning of the mind that made it; I grasp the genetic act thereof and make it mine. But the Ego in Reason not only thinks the window immediately in grasping simply its creative process, but thinks itself as the thought of the window; Thought knows Thought as the creative process of the object.

To the rational man the world is rational, and he identifies it with his Reason; that is, he thinks it as a Thought. If he shows that he has wholly lost the power of grasping the world about him as Thought, he has lost his Reason. He may show that he does not possess the thought of a window as already given; he may nail a board over the window of the school house and shut out its light. We say at once that his own light is shut out, he is not rational, he no longer comprehends the thought of a window, but destroys the same. Man has to see, up to a certain point, the rational order about him, and adjust himself to it through recognition; otherwise he has to be put out of the rational world into a mad-house. Let him use any common object, say this chair,

in an irrational way, let him sit on it upside down in earnest, he will seem insane.

Reason is truly Thought which knows itself as all existence; it is Thought recognizing the Universe as Thought. It seizes the totality, being itself the totality; it is Person, Subject, Ego, which is individual, yet not the all-exclusive, but the all-inclusive individual which is universal recognition, having its own universal Self as the object to itself.

From a somewhat different standpoint we may look at Reason: it will never rest satisfied with the partial and the particular, but carries the same at once up to the total and the universal; it will not take the link without the chain; having a segment it completes the circle. It is the supreme activity of Intellect, which transcends all limitation, yet posits the same as its own; it is truly the eternal process of the Spirit and of the World, which through it become one order and harmony. From the related, Reason unfolds the self-related, from the determined, the self-determined, from dependent being the independent. It is free Thought which has itself as its own content.

With such designations the student will have to grapple, though they be somewhat vague and intangible at the start. They must be re-thought, or rather re-created by him; he must go through the creative process of Thought himself in

thinking, above all in thinking Thought. Let him not follow indolence or bad advice, and dismiss the whole as profitless subtlety or perchance as dangerous sophistry; even if it be a devil, let him conquer it, and not run off. So much by way of exhortation, needful in these days, when impatience with and neglect of pure Thought seem to be obscuring the speculative nature of man.

All Thought, indeed, knows the object as itself; but at first such knowledge is implicit, is unconscious, we may say; that is, Thought at the start seeks unconsciously to identify the object with itself. In the Understanding, the Ego as Thought takes its own identity, and proceeds to reduce the world to that in some form; through abstraction, division, generalization, classification, it brings together what is separate and scattered into a unity. But this unity is external and the act of bringing together is external, is not immanent in the matter so brought into unity. In Ratiocination the Ego proceeds to master the external element, by taking it up, and positing it and elaborating it fully; Ratiocination works over within itself the different in all its forms, seeking to mediate the same with itself. But Ratiocination, as well as the Understanding, shows itself inadequate to give the complete inner process of the Ego, being rather the outer, formal, finite movement there-

of, in which at last the Syllogism both falls asunder within itself and lies outside its own creative act. But when the syllogizer syllogizes himself, the Syllogism being he and he being the Syllogism, we have entered a new sphere.

Thought rises to Reason when it recognizes its own process to be the process of the object. The total Conception of the Ego sees the total Conception of the World, and identifies the two sides. This identification of the double process is now just the process, through which the Ego as Reason is next to pass. Here we reach the standpoint of speculation or philosophic vision: Creative Thought seeing Thought creative is the speculative act of the Ego. The final and most perfect bond between man and the universe is the speculative, veritably their true and lasting reconciliation.

The movement of Reason is, accordingly, the movement of this speculative bond or mean, which is to connect the two processes of Subject and Object. This speculative bond or middle term is itself to unfold into the complete process, which is to mediate between the two extreme processes already indicated. The movement of the Ego in Reason, as it unfolds into the third or mediatorial process, which makes the final identification between itself and the universe, passes through the following stages:—

I. Intuition.

II. The Dialectic.

III. The Psychosis.

Before proceeding to details, we shall throw out some hints concerning these activities in advance. There is, first, the intuitive act of Reason, in which the speculative bond is not yet explicit, in which the Ego grasps the object immediately, and identifies the same with its rational Self, without conscious division; the process is implicit on either side, the intuitive Ego is not differentiated within itself, nor is the intuited object; still less is there developed as yet any mediatorial process; the two sides are identified immediately in speculative vision. But next, in the dialectical act of Reason this implicit paradisaical unity between the Ego and the All is broken up, the negative (or the Devil) enters, the struggle between finite and infinite opens, which is really the work of the Ego insisting upon being born into the world and conquering the same even in a state of opposition. The result of the dialectical movement is the mastery of the Negative speculatively; both sides, subject and object, show themselves to be processes, and the Negative annuls itself into the Positive in both. Hence both are identified as one by the Ego, which identification of the two is the third act in the process of Reason, which we call the Psychosis. In the Psychosis the Ego makes its final identification between

Subject and Object, or between itself and the Universe; it becomes aware of itself as the grand mean (the true speculative bond) between two processes, and this mean is itself a process, or rather the process of all processes.

I. INTUITION.

The mind or total Ego now *sees* the Totality, sees it *immediately*. Such is the fundamental fact of Intuition, which, however, does not exclude all mediation, but only the ultimate mediatorial process. We drop back to the stage of Perception and grasp the object; yet this is not the object of Sense, but the object of Thought. Intuition is, therefore, the union of perceiving and thinking; though it takes the form of Perception, it has the content of universal Thought; it is the supreme Sense which looks directly upon the Totality.

Manifestly the first characteristic of Intuition is immediacy. Just as Sense-perception was an immediate seeing of the particular sensuous object, so Intuition is the immediate seeing of the Universal, the Spiritual, the Perfect. It does not pass through the process of Reasoning for its result, at least not explicitly; for Reasoning cannot give that which Intuition sees. In the process of Reasoning, the highest, which is the *summum genus*, has to be given; whence did it

come? Reason (not Reasoning) alone can tell, of which Intuition is one form of activity. God, the True, the Beautiful, the Good, the Universe, the Ego, cannot be proven by a Syllogism; they are indeed the presupposition, or rather the origin of the syllogistic process.

Still there is much mediation implicit in Intuition. It has the entire movement of the Ego back of it, from Sense-perception on, and many mental acts may be analyzed out of it, perhaps all. But just this analysis is not Intuition, indeed destroys it as Intuition, dividing its unconscious unity of vision, and making it something else. Intuition is a process, but is not conscious of its process; it is an outburst, a spontaneous unpremeditated cast of the glance into absolute Truth. The Ego, being self-conscious and separative, can recognize it, but it cannot adequately recognize itself.

But while Intuition is the immediate act, what it beholds is really the self-mediated, the self-related, the great Totality. The Universal must be self-related; if it were related to any thing else beside itself, it would not be universal. In like manner the Universal or the Totality must be self-mediated; if it were through another and not through itself, it would not be the Totality; it is immediate, yet it is also mediated, and mediated through itself. Here, then, we can observe the limit of Intuition in general; it may

seize the Universal, the Totality, God, the World, not as self-mediated, but as immediate. It leaves out to a greater or less extent, the difference, the determinateness, the process; in general, it does not include the most important fact of mediation, at least the true value thereof. Intuition, therefore, as immediate vision, sees what is really self-mediated, but does not see it as self-mediated fundamentally. Thus Intuition cannot adequately reach Thought in the final process of Reason; Intuition, though it may deal with the Negative, at last throws the same outside of itself and so never attains the complete mastery thereof.

What is the result? Intuition, as a phase or activity of the Ego, must unfold out of itself in its immediacy and pass over into a mediated form of the Reason. The Ego, finding its limit, transcends the same; being the self-mediated or the self-determined, the Ego must finally grasp the object or the Totality as self-determined, and show the process thereof, which is essentially its own. This will be truly the process of the Universal, which is indeed the universal Process or the Universal mediating itself. Such is the outlook over Intuition, it moves of itself into the dialectical form of Reason, which is the second stage of Reason, whose positive characteristic we shall find to be the mastery of the Negative.

But before we leave Intuition, we must note

its development, which will pass through three stages.

I. The Intuition of the Objective World; the immediate seeing of the process in Nature, which is itself the external and immediate.

II. The Intuition of the Subjective World, in which the Ego sees the Ego organizing itself in all its activities and making a science of itself.

III. The Intuition of the Universe, or of the Divine Order of the World, in which the Ego beholds the Universal Ego and its Forms

I. *Intuition of the Objective World.* The Ego at first goes forth and beholds the process of the object immediately, though the unconscious implication here is that the Ego itself is this process. It turns instinctively to the thing and seeks to fathom that, to get the meaning, the process thereof; it strives for an immediate insight into the object, which is of various grades.

The intuiting Ego, looking out upon the reality does not simply regard the object in its sensuous limits, but connects it with its environment, and elevates it into a totality, which is its ideal counterpart. I behold the window, I think it and understand it, even reason about it; still when I fully intuit the window, I do something more; I have to connect it with the room which it ventilates and lights, with the house of which the room is a part, perchance of the street on which the house stands in rela-

tion to other houses. Indeed with whatever object I have to do, I must put it into its rational order, which I have to grasp by Intuition at last, however much I may study. This is the seizing of relations which are near the object — relative Intuition.

Higher is that Intuition which sees the completed cycle or cycles in nature, or in life, or in history. The first need of man is to grasp the cycle of the day, then of the seasons; the water flowing down the river must return to the fountain head; even the migrating birds move in cycles, going and returning. Intuition grasps this necessity of nature, sees it as law, and as its own law too. Experience tells us of these single cycles; but Intuition beholds them as universal, not as an inference from without, but from its own insight, its own self-knowledge.

Then we have scientific Intuition, which is not merely developed from the study of details, but is the spontaneous act of the Reason also. It is said that Cuvier needed only a bone to reconstruct the whole animal, he would build out of the one bone the skeleton, the flesh, the habits, and even the animal's environment. In the one part he saw the total; in the small segment the whole cycle of the animal. Undoubtedly this skill presupposed great knowledge and study; but a naturalist of greater learning than Cuvier may not have his Intuition of the whole, this

vision of the totality suggested by one particular. Just one particular and the whole springs up before the mind: that is Intuition. Darwin, too, has this scientific Intuition (sometimes it is called scientific Imagination) which can seize a vast chain of evolution through one link; then he can go to work and prove his Intuition by reasoning, by induction so-called. Newton's case of seeing the movement of the physical universe in the fall of an apple is not unknown.

Sometimes the scientific man drops back upon his inductive syllogism, denies the higher intuitive Reason. Very different was Goethe, the naturalist. He saw that the multiplicity of the plant had its unity in the leaf, this leaf he unfolded into the total cycle of plant form. He discovered the intermaxillary bone by scientific Intuition; but the scientists denied its existence for a quarter of a century, though it is now found always in the jaw. No doubt there is a danger here, the vision may become fantastic and see what does not exist.

In like manner an event may suggest a cycle of events; we have already alluded to the affair of the Diamond Necklace, which, to Goethe's mind, foreshadowed the French Revolution. A gesture, a look, a word may be a part which, to an intuitive glance, will reveal the total man, or the complete action. Most people have some share of intuitive power, must have, if they are

rational; the rare spirits make it an all-seeing power. It is also claimed more for women than for men.

Cuvier's bone was a very small part of what he saw; the rest was himself. The total animal was his own, made by him, created as God created Eve, from a bone. His Ego unfolded it out of itself, though he never saw the animal, though it does not now exist, inasmuch as it belongs to some past geologic epoch. It is manifest that he possessed the animal without the bone, his was the total order of which the bone or even the animal was but one manifestation. That order was his own Ego. The contemplation of Nature led to his own Self. And this is the highest fruit of physical science, very rarely plucked however, because so high: it leads man from the particular to the universal, from chaos to order, from Nature to the Spirit ordering Nature by way of the Intuitive Reason, and not by that of the inductive syllogism, which, however, has its place.

II. *Intuition of the Subjective World.* The Intuitive Reason, in seeing what is total and complete in Nature, is brought back to itself and then finds an order corresponding to what it saw outside of itself. Really it has discovered itself in discovering the objective fact; it went forth to seek the external and found the internal. If it has adequately explained Nature, it has even

more adequately explained itself, inasmuch as whatever it knows, it knows only through its own activity. All external knowing must be likewise an internal knowing, for that which knows is the Ego, and that which is known, in order to be known, must be translated into the Ego. If there is anything outside of the known, like the so-called unknowable, surely we can know nothing of it, can say nothing concerning it, cannot logically call it even by the name of unknowable. For if we affirm that a certain realm is unknowable, we have to know a good deal about it, in fact the whole nature of it, to say so.

The Ego now sees itself as the process, specially as the threefold process of itself. Self-consciousness we have already called this stage, whose movement is the Self or Ego rising to a recognition of itself as the universal process, which orders not only Nature or the outside world, but itself. Thus the Ego comes to the Intuition of Self, for, even though it be a process, it must at last intuit just this process.

That is, the psychological movement, as hitherto unfolded, has gone forward until it has reached its ground in the Intuitive Reason, or the Ego intuiting itself as the organizing principle of the Subjective World, which is indeed itself. Thus the Ego sees itself immediately as the self-organizer. In Sense-perception the Ego really beholds the sensuous object in Space and Time as itself,

annulling the same and then recreating it in order to perceive it. In Representation the object is already the Ego's own, but as image, this being also a reproduction by the Ego of its own internal content. In Thought generally the Ego beholds its own process in the world as a whole; in the present form of Intuition, which is a stage of Thought, the Ego beholds itself as the process of the Subjective World.

Throughout the foregoing exposition, the appeal has always been made to the Ego that it intuit its own process, that it see itself organizing the minutest psychical detail. The reader, therefore, is familiar with this intuitive procedure, since he has been exercising himself in it more or less implicitly from the beginning of the present psychological movement. Now, however, he has come to know himself as such intuitive activity, and through it as the organizer of the science of mind.

The Ego as Intuitive Reason has now traveled through Nature and Self, the objective and subjective spheres, and finds itself one in both, and indeed both as one and itself. It sees itself as the active unifying principle which joins together the external and internal worlds; it beholds the twain, the twofold, the grand dualism united in the Self, which is the self-active, self-knowing Ego looking upon and identifying both worlds.

At the same time, the Ego has difference upon it, is this particular finite Ego. Still, in order to be Ego at all, it must see the Ego as universal; it must intuit the Universal Ego as its own counterpart, completion and true essence. There could be no individual Ego, unless there was an universal Ego, which the former, in order to be itself, must behold as universal, the self-creating, self-realizing energy of the Universe, the infinite Person or Subject-Object.

III. *Intuition of the Universe, or of the Divine Order of the World.* Not the physical Universe is here meant, but the Universe as Spirit and the realization of Spirit, or as absolute subject-object. This is the highest reach of the Intuitive Reason, which now looks upon the pure Idea and its Forms, communes with the Divine Ego and its manifestations directly, immediately. The Ego in Intuition beholds (intuits) the Universal Ego, or the Universe as Ego realizing itself and manifesting itself in its own eternal shapes. That is, we are now, in this psychological development, to rise to the Divine and participate in the same by Vision; the individual Ego is to see not only the Godlike, but to share in the Vision of God.

We may say, in passing, that the word *Intuition* is sometimes applied to sensuous Perception of the object; not so here, though this too is a kind of Perception; but the object is now very different from that of the senses.

The Ego in Intuition will also have its process, intuiting first the most immediate Form of the Divine Order in Justice, thence passing to its Forms of Manifestation in the Beautiful, Good and True, and finally beholding the Divine Ego itself in the pure Form of itself.

1. Justice. The Intuition of Justice as a principle of the Divine Order of the World, has shown itself in all ages, is indeed the very foundation of a Social Order. Man is to get his own, good and bad; he is to have his deed returned to him, which return of the deed takes place through this Order in some form; such is the grand primal human discipline, through which man can associate with his fellow-man. Justice declares primordially that the individual shall live an universal life, or take the penalty of not so living. Every Ego must intuit Justice, must recognize and realize in himself the Just, in order to exist in an institutional world.

The State has its end in Justice, to give to each his own (*suum cuique*), specially to give back to the doer his deed. Such is the ideal purpose of the State, not by any means realized or perhaps realizable; so above Institutional Justice we can still often see hovering the hand of Divine Justice. Particularly is this last the beloved theme of the Prophets and the Poets. See Isaiah, see Homer; the latter in his *Odyssey* portrays Divine Justice meting out to those per-

fidious Suitors their own deeds just through the man whom they have wronged, Ulysses. In Shakespeare the king, the head of the State and the fountain of Institutional Justice, has done the work of guilt ; still Macbeth and Claudius are to have their deeds brought home through what the poet calls God's Justice, which is verily a principle of the Divine Order of the World.

But the poet's, the prophet's, the artist's expression of this Divine Order is a new manifestation of it, realized in objective shapes, and reflecting it back to man that he may behold it anew and know it beforehand. Man must have Justice, before he can portray Justice. Justice is the first, immediate realization of this Divine Order of the World, which founds society and presupposes of every individual that he have some Intuition of it directly. Still he is to have more, he is to see it projected into new Forms which again he must intuit.

2. The Beautiful, Good, and True. Such is the division in the sphere of Intuition, yet all these divisions are manifestations of the Divine Ego, reflecting its order and harmony, in a three-fold manner — in the sensuous object, in the deed and in the word, through artist, saint, sage, touching respectively the feeling, the will, and the intellect of the Ego which intuits them.

(1) The Beautiful images the Divine Idea (or Ego) in a sensuous shape, which, however, must

be seen not merely by an act of outer Perception, but of inner Intuition. Not the mere external look can reveal the Sistine Madonna to the Ego; an internal vision is required, an Intuition of the Divine manifesting itself to the senses in Art. We behold it immediately and call it beautiful. The artist is he who thinks (so to speak) through the sensuous form, and utters his conception of the Divine in that way.

(2) The Good images in the deed the Divine Order, which is seen to be furthered by such a deed, or perchance brought forth and realized. Here we may see a division into means and end; the Good is the act which has as its end the fulfillment and realization of the Divine; it manifests, therefore, the Divine as the Will. The Human Will doing the Divine Will is the great terrestrial manifestation of the Good.

(3) The True is the utterance of the Divine Order in the Word. There are many kinds and grades of Truth; here we restrict the term to the meaning just given. The Intuition of the True is not reasoned out, but expressed immediately by the sage, seer, poet; he sees the grand reality of the Universe and utters the same in his immediate form. The Word is the highest of these finite manifestations of the Divine, taking up into itself and setting forth anew both the Beautiful and the Good, and creating, in its final organized utterance, a Bible.

The Beautiful, Good and True have now run their course. They are all seen to be finite manifestations of the Infinite, terrestrial forms of the celestial, the limited Ego intuiting the unlimited through the limited. Thus they all reveal a grand breach or division between Form and Content — a finite form expressing an infinite Content. The Word, however high and holy, still falls short of uttering the Holy of Holies, which it finally utters to be unutterable. The Ego, however, is, by its very nature, limit-transcending; so it transcends this limit of the Word and of all Art and Expression, till it stands face to face with the Infinite itself, or the Divine Person.

3. Intuition of the Divine Ego. Such is the point which the Intuitive Ego has reached; it beholds the soul of the Universe as Person, it sees the Creator of the Divine Order of the World. The Beautiful, Good, and True were divine manifestations, but the Ego now beholds immediately the Ego which manifested itself in them, sees through the Creation to the Creator and communes with Him.

Hence it is that Dante ends his great poem with the Vision of God, he can no longer utter that which is unutterable; the poet has attained the blessed goal of his long journey; no more art, no more song, but Vision. Somewhat in the same fashion, yet less distinctly, does Goethe

bring to an end his universal poem, *Faust*, in the Mystic Chorus singing: The Indescribable is here accomplished (*Das Unbeschreibliche Hier wird gethan*). That is certainly the end of all description, and so the song ceases.

Already we have found that our simplest act of knowing implies the Divine Ego as Creator of the World. All cognition is essentially recognition; in the first stage of Sense-perception, we cannot perceive a sensuous object in Space and Time without the presence of the Divine Ego in the object; in fact, that is just what we unconsciously see and identify therein. But now we have traveled through the psychological process till the Ego intuits the Universal Ego creating the Universe, creating the very object which it once externally perceived. The fact that the Divine Ego was implicit in the object made it possible to be perceived and identified by an Ego. Thus the psychological process has led us up to the Intuition of the Divine Person as Creator.

At this point we may just note the parallelism of Psychology with Religion, which also promises that its true followers "shall see God." The individual Ego, unfolding through itself while seeking to know the objective world, finds its complement and fulfillment in the Universal Ego, which it at last beholds immediately. The religious consciousness, developing through inner

experiences usually, reaches its culmination in the Intuition of God.

Still the religious consciousness is not, even in this lofty sphere, free of the opposite, of the grand dualism. It is not blasphemy but the statement of a fact, a fact vouched for by the saints of all ages and climes, by St. Francis as well as by Luther, that the Intuition of God has its counterpart in the Intuition of the Devil, who is also seen face to face. Thus the Negative slips into our intuitive Eden, as the Serpent once slipped into Paradise.

But, dropping the imaginative, poetical and religious forms of utterance, we may come back to the purely psychological way of stating the case: the Ego as Intuition, being immediate, finds itself limited therein and must be mediated. The intuitive world puts the Negative outside of itself and thus falls into dualism, separation, finitude. The Ego, however, cannot exclude the Negative from itself, but must take it up, and master it completely and finally, giving in its process the universal form of such mastery. This is the Dialectic, next to be unfolded, which may be named the utter and final rout of the Devil and all his legions, if one prefers to read the matter in that way. Just as the religious consciousness demands that the Evil One be overthrown, and gives its formula for the same, so the psychological consciousness demands that

the Negative be mastered, and that the process thereof be formulated in its pure activity.

II. THE DIALECTIC.

The difficulty with Intuition is that it leaves out mediation; it can really give no account of itself, has no account to give. It sees and proclaims, those who listen must see too, or remain outside the vision. When I can construe or prove my Intuition, it is no longer Intuition; the prophet, the seer, the poet is not a reasoner. The result is that the True, the Beautiful, the Good, the Universal, the Divine, merely as intuited, remain abstract, undeveloped, quite helpless against the assault of the Negative, which is outside of them.

The next thing is that the Negative be taken up and put inside of them, and thus made a part of their process; thereby they are determined within themselves, and become truly concrete. The movement of the Ego, by means of which the immediate or intuitional stage of Reason is mediated into the complete process of Reason is called the Dialectic—a word transmitted to us from ancient Greece.

The Dialectic starts with the Particular, the Finite, the Negative, in which it shows contradiction; this contradiction, however, dissolves itself in its very nature, or the negation negates itself and brings forth the Positive. Such is the result

of the total movement of the Dialectic, which thus determines the intuitive ideas of Reason within themselves, making them concrete and a process. In this way the Dialectic is speculative, positive, the living principle of all inner determination; through the Dialectic the Ego wins the mastery of the Negative, making it over into an element of its own movement. As the outcome of the Dialectic, we unfold into the principle of self-determination, including all outsideness.

Abstruse enough are these statements, and the reader is probably crying out for examples. But the trouble is that the example itself must be dialectical, and so requires in advance just what is to be exemplified. Let him, however, take the idea of the Negative, make it universal, and see what becomes of it. Must it not negate itself?

The Ego as dialectical Reason is negative, separative, just the opposite of the simple identity of Intuition; it enters the realm of dualism, of finitude, which, however, is to annul itself through the process of the Dialectic. Intuition may be deemed a kind of Paradise, into which the Devil slips under the form of the Dialectic. This too has its movement until it unfolds into the pure process of the Negative.

I. First of all, the Dialectic has to deal with the Immediate in one form or other, mediating it and showing it to be a phase of a process. The

immediate sensuous object before me, yonder cloud for instance, can only be known in truth as a part of a process. Already we have often noticed the first stage of the Ego to be immediate. Its dialectical movement begins when the Ego determines itself as the other of itself, as its own opposite and object, as it does in consciousness. It is thus the Different in itself; as such, it must differ from itself, and therein annul the difference and return to unity.

Hence the Ego is really the Dialectic, which is its innermost process of Self. Its three stages, so often introduced in the course of the present book, are connected dialectically. First is the immediate stage, which is that of simple, undeveloped identity; this in turn becomes mediated through Difference. Pure immediacy is untrue, though it be the starting-point; everything is mediated. This is the fundamental fact with the Ego itself in all its manifestations. It sees itself as process, and it sees all things in the process. To be sure, it is not mediated from without, but from within, that is, self-mediated. The Ego as Subject is not only dialectical, but is the Dialectic itself, annulling its own immediateness and through its own movement becoming self-mediation.

II. The object also is dialectical in its innumerable forms, which make up the realm of finitude. The intuitive Reason, in its Intuition

of God, necessarily calls up the grand dualism between the Human and Divine, between the Finite and the Infinite ; with these last thoughts the Dialectic specially occupies itself. The finite world is the distinctive arena of dialectical manifestation, in which the finite, is to show its own inherent nature by making itself finite, by bringing itself to an end, that is, by annulling itself and therein revealing itself as a phase of the infinite process.

The Ego as subject, being limited by the object, knows itself as finite, but as finite it also knows that it must come to an end, negate itself and pass over into its opposite ; through this inner process of itself it transcends its finitude and becomes infinite. But this Infinite, being opposed to and hence limited by the Finite, is therein itself finitized ; so we have to affirm that the Infinite as opposed to the Finite, is itself finite. But the Finite by its own necessity must end itself, and become again the Infinite. Now this second Infinite which has unfolded itself through the Finite is not the same as the first or immediate Infinite, but is really the process which takes up into itself the Finite as a moment or element. In like manner, the Dialectic of the immediate Finite shows the latter annulling itself and passing over to its opposite, the Infinite, and thus again forming the process already described.

Such is, in general, the Dialectic of the Finite and Infinite, each of which has shown itself constituting a process; thus they make two processes which, however, are to be identified as one. But this identification is itself a process of the Ego, the third mediatorial one, which is the final mediation of the two opposites of the Universe, namely the Finite and the Infinite. But this is a step which will be considered later on.

In the two manifestations of the Dialectic above given, the Immediate and the Finite, we may spy out a common movement. The Immediate annulled itself and passed over to the Mediated, yet this too annulled itself and became the Self-mediated, or the process. In like manner the Finite comes to an end through itself, and goes over to the Infinite, which, however, annuls itself as the opposite of the Finite, and forms the process with the same. In both these dialectical movements there lurks a common principle; what is it? Annulment, or the Negative with its process, which we may in general call negativity.

III. This common principle, the Negative, is itself dialectical; indeed the Dialectic is essentially just the movement of the Negative which is now to be looked at as it is in itself, in its own process,—the whole constituting a brief science of negativity.

First of all, there is the simple Negative,

which may be called immediate, which manifests itself in change, in destruction, in limitation of every kind. As before said, it is the immanent principle in the world of finitude; it is the demiurge whose work is to make all things a fleeting show of reality. But, in the second place, the Negative, to be true to its principle, must negate itself; destruction destroys destruction at last, the fire burns itself out and is no longer fire. We see, therefore, that the Negative is inherently self-negative; even Satan, in the legend, tortures not his foes, but his followers, who are himself. In the third place this negation of the Negative is not to remain a negation, is not to be merely self-destroying, but must advance to the Positive; the negation of the Negative must be made through the activity of the Ego the grand affirmation. Or morally considered, repentance is not simply to annihilate the bad in man, but to bring forth the good. Such is the dialectical process of the Negative in its completeness.

Let us turn the matter over again. The Negative at first negates something, which is its immediate act; then it negates the negation, which is itself, and remains negative therein; finally it reaches the Positive by negating the Negative, and this Positive is the process of the world eternally going on and not a dead result. Let us grasp the thought of change and see what

the total process of it means. At the start we say that all changes, all is transitory; yet even thus change itself must change, being included in the all; but if it changes, it must be other than change, it must be permanent. Thus we cannot think change, without thinking it as the abiding process of itself; for if all changes, one thing surely abides, and that is change.

This dialectical movement of the Negative runs deep all through the modern world, which is largely a world of negation, seeking somehow to found itself upon doubt, denial, skepticism, agnosticism. But the man who declares that he cannot know, is already self-negating, for even such a declaration can only rest upon knowledge: he knows that he cannot know. The movement of the Negative has found its completest poetical expression in the marvelous drama of Faust, which draws its theme from the heart of the century, and reveals the mastery of the Negative.

If we have entered into the soul of the preceding movement, we have reached the insight into what may be called the *duplicity of the Negative*, its inherent twofoldness, yet oneness; it is the insight into the nature of that spirit which denies and destroys, yet which thereby brings forth new life. Mark well the person who is stoutly affirming the Negative; is he not already in an act of self-contradiction? He will always get cut in two by his

own statement. John says all men are liars; yet John is a man; what, then, is John but a liar? His own negation turns back and involves himself, and also negatives his statement. A so-called philosopher affirms that man cannot know truth; how then can the philosopher know it to be true that man cannot know truth? In his very utterance he has to imply the opposite of what he declares, he has to negate his own negation. The universe rests upon affirmation, not upon negation, which negation could itself not be unless it were affirmed.

The grand result of the dialectical movement is to make explicit and to bring to consciousness this *duplicity of the Negative*, and therewith to prepare the only way for its mastery. Subtle, elusive, Protean in its transformation, yet having one shape at bottom, the Negative can be seized and made to show its native form by the Dialectic. Unquestionably all negation is twofold and manifold, double-faced, self-contradictory; but it can be caught, like old Proteus, who is its Homeric prototype, and can be forced to tell the truth which lurks in all finite appearances; to the world's lie in every shape, it can be made to give the lie. Yet this is not all, for such a result would only be negative still; the Dialectic must sweep forward to the Positive, and thus reach the concrete process of Reason. Here is, indeed, the central point in philosophy, the

point at which it becomes the most practical of all disciplines. Moreover, here is the final test of the psychologist. Were he to come into our hands for examination, our first and last question would be: Do you comprehend the *duplicity of the Negative*? And can you handle it as your implement of Thought? Only too often, we fear, the questions themselves would not be understood, not to speak of the answers to them.

Again it may be stated that the grand outcome of the Dialectic is the mastery of the Negative speculatively, which means spiritual mastery over delusion, appearance, denial, untruth; finally it means the soul's triumph over mortality and finitude. Death is answered by the Dialectic; it is not a mere evanishment into nothing, or even into the Beyond; it is the death of death, the real end of the Finite, which is the infinite life, not the unreal end of the Finite, which is a mere passing away. To employ again the preceding formula, Death is not simple negation, but negation of negation, which remains not a negative but is a positive result. This is what is involved in the mastery of the Negative — immortality, and the Ego is the immortal master.

Undoubtedly this dialectical play of the Negative has been in bad repute among certain people unwilling or unable to think it out to its end. It

has been regarded as the source of all sophistry, mental deception, and moral confusion, as the puzzling labyrinthine net spun by the father of lies to tempt and to entrap the too eager seeker of truth. We have been exhorted to shun the dialectical maze and to fall back upon intuition, faith, or other forms of the immediate activity of the Spirit. Still the courageous thinker feels that he cannot run away from any shape of Thought; it is just his call to master Thought through Thought; to flee the fiend is to rush into his embrace. So the dialectical movement of the mind has occupied the greatest philosophers of all time, and its mastery is the final test of their greatness.

Historical. The history of the Dialectic would be the history of the inner movement of Thought. Particularly does it unfold and play an important part in the Greek world. It is not too much to say that ancient Homer, though the language of philosophy had not in his day been developed in Greece, had his way of looking at the Dialectic, and that way is mythical. Already allusion has been made to the story of Proteus, the Old Man of the Sea, who can transform himself into everything on land and in the water, yet who is and remains the One in all his changes, and this One is universal mind or spirit which knows past, present and future, and tells the truth. Nor can we forget those two

mythical shapes embodying the dualism of existence, Scylla and Charybdis, which have come down through all literature as a vivid illustration of the Dialectic of human conduct, and which the hero is to pass through and master, ere he can return home.

This mythical Dialectic naturally becomes explicit in the course of time, the work of Imagination transforms itself into the work of Thought. The early Greek philosophers began to catch up shreds of the dialectical process; Zeno, the Eleatic, employs it in his famous proposition which seeks to disprove motion. The Sophists elaborated it, especially on its negative side; the result was, they transmitted the evil-sounding word *sophistry* to the future. It is the secret fermenting principle in the irony of Socrates, who used it in part to refute the Sophists; he, therefore, must have felt its positive element. The irony of Socrates develops into the Dialectic of Plato, who is its greatest ancient expounder. Plato is different in his different dialogues, at times he seems purely negative in his Dialectic, then again he gives glimpses of its positive outcome. But he has transmitted to us the name and the thing, for which reason he is justly held in veneration as one of the greatest teachers and benefactors of mankind. The work of Aristotle is not distinctively dialectical, but rather analytic and separa-

tive; in the movement of Thought he separates Form and Content, and elaborates the Forms of Thought, which constitute the so-called Formal Logic. Hence it comes that Logic gets to be more or less external to the total process of Thinking, while the Dialectic is just the totality of Thought creating its own Forms in its own act.

In modern philosophy the negative element in Hume's skepticism furnished the starting-point for Kant, according to the latter's declaration, and the great German movement opens, extending from Kant to Hegel. The dialectical character of this movement comes out especially in Kant's Antinomies of Pure Reason, which unfold into the Dialectic of Hegel. For the Antinomies of Kant have essentially a negative result for Thought, which result Hegel transforms into a positive, again negating the Negative in the completest manner, and making the Dialectic the inner moving principle of the most gigantic system of Philosophy yet constructed among men. Psychology, when it reaches Thought, has above all things to take into account the work of Hegel, which must still be regarded as the latest and highest manifestation of human Thinking. Yet, it is not the finality, it too is in the total process and is to be transcended. It is not, however, to be refuted or abolished; it is to be taken up into the next higher stage

and become an active element thereof, just as Hegel himself resumed into his Thought Spinoza and Kant, and even Plato and Aristotle, whom he especially studied.

The outcome of the Dialectic, as already stated, is the mastery of the Negative, which serves it up to itself, and brings forth the positive result as a process. We may call it the movement of pure negativity, in which negation is turned back upon itself by itself, and is made the grand nexus of the Universe, which is therein always becoming its own other while remaining itself. Or, it is the primal creative Conception, which must create finitude, and so must create with it the Dialectic, which annuls the Finite into the infinite process. But this nexus must not only be, it must be conscious; not simply implicit but explicit; the nexus must recognize itself as nexus, as indeed just the process of identification. Thus the Ego passes out of the Dialectic into its last manifestation, which is the Psychosis.

III. THE PSYCHOSIS.

Throughout the present work the appeal has often been made to the Psychosis, which has shown itself to be the unitary principle running through and binding together all mental operations. It is that which has connected the minut-

est psychical act with the total sweep of the Ego ; it has been the mediating bond between all the divisions of our science. But the Psychosis has been hitherto more or less undeveloped, suggestive, not self-knowing ; now it has reached the point at which it is to become aware of itself as the final and supreme activity of the Ego.

We may call it the process of recognition. Through the Dialectic, the Ego came to know the Finite as a process and the Infinite also as a process, and to recognize the two processes as one. But this act of recognition is just the mean which unites the two, and identifies them with itself. That is, the Ego sees the process of each to be its own, itself, which is the one process in both, yet the separate process which unites both. This is the Psychosis, which is also a process, showing the Ego dividing itself into the two processes and then identifying them with itself in a third process.

The Psychosis is in general the recognition of the process in all things, and the complete identification of the same with itself. It recognizes the movement in the object and in the subject, in the world and in self ; then it recognizes both movements to be one, and this one movement to be its own. The Ego in the Psychosis is thus not only recognition of unity in subject and object, but it recognizes this recognition as itself, as its own process, which is thereby

the mean supreme uniting the grand dualism of the Universe. The Ego identifies its identification of the two sides as the final principle of their mediation, and it must not only identify, but grasp itself as the identifier, or mediator.

The movement of unity which was immanent in the Dialectic as positive result, is explicit in the Psychosis, which mediates all separation; it shows difference, finitude, negation, annulling themselves and making the nexus with the whole out of the partial, the limited, the finite.

The Psychosis at the highest is creative Thought creatively (that is, through the process) thinking creative Thought in its pure activity. The Ego in the Psychosis is not only a positive process — this it would be already through the Dialectic — but it is the process in all processes and recognizes itself as such.

At the end of the dialectical movement we attain the concrete Ego, at the end of the Psychosis we attain the science of the Ego. For the Ego having reached the Psychosis, has its own process within itself and knows itself to be the same; all its knowing is finally the recognizing its own process in the object. With this recognition of its concrete Self as the ordering and mediating principle of the world, the Ego has attained its highest power, and brings the science of Psychology to a close. The Ego, as mediated subject-object, identifies this as the moving

soul of all things, it is the idea which takes on reality.

The foregoing statements give many turns and repetitions to the same thought. They are utterly empty, unless filled with the content of the Ego by the Ego of the reader. He must emphatically make the Psychosis in reading of the Psychosis. The word is mere sound, till it be filled with its meaning, and here the meaning is Psychosis, which is the pure act of the Ego thinking its own process.

The Psychosis is, in general, the mean process, which mediates the two processes of subject and object. The stages of the Psychosis as this mediating process we shall briefly designate.

I. The Ego as Psychosis knows itself as the unitary movement in all Psychology, as that which makes the mind one in all of its manifestations. Thus it gives the movement, the organizing principle, the Method. As Ego simply, it is the threefold process of Conception; but as Psychosis it is the mean which connects all particularity and multiplicity into unity.

The fact need hardly be told the reader that the Psychosis has been the Method moving through and organizing the present book from the start, the form-giving principle whose activity is its own content or subject-matter. This Method is that of the Ego itself, not derived

from Natural Science on the one hand, nor from some metaphysical system on the other. Our science must have its own Method taken from its theme directly, which is the Ego; indeed, just this is the source of all true Method and Organization.

II. The Method is that which orders and organizes; that which is ordered and organized is the System. The Ego as Method is the active Form, yet just this activity of the Ego is the thing ordered, or the Content, which constitutes Psychology proper or the science, the System of the Ego.

The Ego has division, separation, special activities, or faculties so-called; there would be no mind unless it specialized itself into distinct acts. These manifold determinations of the Ego must be ordered, not from the outside, but from the inside, by the Ego itself; thus arises the System. All true systematization is the work of the Ego, as Psychosis, or as Method; it takes the vast details of the science, the chaotic phenomena, random experiments, scattered observations, and arranges them by its own rule, which is its own process. Mere external classification of mental activities is not scientific, is more or less capricious; the inherent Method of the Ego must be seen winding through all the activities of the Ego and unfolding them into a System.

So we have the Ego as Method, as the subjective creative principle; also we have the Ego as System, as the objective ordered series of facts. The sides have shown themselves different, and have fallen asunder, hence arises the danger that both Method and System may become external to each other and to their common generative principle, the Ego. Thus both Method and System, especially in the science of mind, may drop down into the sheerest death-dealing formalism, and mechanical abacadabra. Soul-destroying is such Psychology, and we have the result so deeply longed for by a certain school of Psychologists, namely, "a Psychology without a soul."

But the rescue from such a lamentable outcome of our science is at hand. Though the Ego as Psychosis, as the science of itself in the very activity of self-knowing, must drop into difference and separation, into the formalism of Method and System, still it has in itself the power of its own salvation and indeed of all salvation. The Ego as Psychosis must return to itself, and thus mediate itself through the Psychosis.

III. This is the Psychosis grasping itself as Psychosis, the psychological process recognizing the psychological process as the inner principle of subject and object and of their unity. We may call it the absolute Psychosis, which knows itself

to be soul of both Method and System as well as the actual process of their unification.

If we look back a little distance over the road traveled, we find that the Ego in the Dialectic attains the positive processes of both itself and the object, and posits implicitly their unity. Now this implicit unity is made explicit and unfolded into the process of the Ego in the Psychosis, which is essentially the development of the mean process between Subject and Object. The Psychosis as Method revealed itself as the active moving principle in all things, as their process ordering and organizing them; the Psychosis as System showed itself as the ordered whole, in which the process is manifested as result. Finally the separation between Method and System is overcome by a new Psychosis, which mediates the two sides in a common process, and restores them to a new unity. The movement of the Psychosis is, therefore, to disrepute itself into two sides, both of which are processes by themselves, which however unite in the third, which is the Psychosis of the Psychosis, or the absolute Psychosis.

This last Psychosis has in it the recognition of itself as the soul of all objectivity as well as subjectivity, and posits the unity of the two, not as repose, or as something fixed, but as the process which identifies the two processes. This is the final Psychosis of Man and the Universe, recog-

nizing itself as the nexus, and also as the two sides which are to be connected. Therein we have reached up to the principle of absolute mediation.

The objective world the Ego recognizes as the process of the Ego, yet not the product of itself. The Ego does not create it primordially, yet creates it over again ideally in recognizing it. The Ego knows nature as a process, as a conception realized, which is the act of the Universal or Divine Ego. Thus the human Ego, recognizing its own process in the object, knows the same to be posited not by itself but by the creative Ego, which objectifies itself as the world's process, and recognizes itself in the same as Psychosis. Herein the Ego rises to a recognition of the Divine Psychosis, recognizing in it the Divine Recognition of the Self, as previously it rose to a recognition or a seeing of the Divine Ego through Intuition. But the Ego has transcended the sphere of immediate Intuition; it has mastered, taken up, and mediated the Negative through the dialectical process.

With the Divine Psychosis we have reached the last stage of Psychology proper, the point at which it goes over into a different science. The Universal Ego as Psychosis is not immediate, but mediated and mediatorial; in fact, it is just the process of absolute or Divine Mediation. It is the Son, the Mediator as such, who has to

go through the Dialectic of all Finitude, and thereby master the Negative in all of its shapes, manifesting at last the culmination in the death of Death, which is Eternal Life. The Father we may reach through Intuition, but the Son is truly grasped through the Psychosis. Thus the Individual Ego as Psychosis finds its completion and fulfillment in the Divine Ego as Psychosis.



This book is DUE on the last date stamped below

AUG 1 1955

RECEIVED
MAIN LOAN DESK

OCT 1 1955

A.M.													P.M.
7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6		

AUG 19 1979
REC'D D.O. [unclear]

OCT 1 1979
01 SEP '79 REC CL

(711)

3 1158 00095 2753

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 509 229 1

BF
121
S67



00L

