

plainness is Prof. Wundt's mild attack of the "mania for naming." Along with the abstract distinctions with which the treatment of almost all the topics bristles, we find new applications constantly made of psychological, popular, and scientific terms. Every pair of phrases of this or that has its special pair of names, by which afterwards the particular phrases are known; so that the student has not only to see the distinction as he goes along, but to preserve the names for it with all exactitude in his memory. This has two vicious results: first, it creates a special Wundtian terminology—a terminology in the manufacture of which the author seems to have gone to little pains to keep himself in touch with the historical usages of the science, and which forces students who have worked over other textbooks to correlate painfully his terminology with that already learned. And, second, it fosters the habit of mind—possibly the most unfortunate of all the "idols of the den"—of taking a name and its correlate for an explanation of the distinction which they characterize. This affliction, under which psychology has so long had to labor, is still the *onus maximum* of psychological science. It is currently braced up by all sorts of theoretical pleas, which are nothing less than apologies for inability to find explaining principles. For example, as soon as one goes to biology or neurology for explanations, he is arrested by the cry, "You are deserting the 'psychological standpoint,' you are no longer doing legitimate work; psychological explanations must be purely psychological; anthropology has its own devotees, so have biology and neurology; leave them to their flesh-pots!"—and so the weary describing, and concatenating, and comparing, and naming goes on. Or, if one sights a larger truth, something which may fairly be called "philosophical," he is reined up with equal vigor, and told that no theorist shall inherit the psychological kingdom of heaven. The James-Lange theory of emotion is absurd. Why? Because it is "physiological"! The "inheritance of acquired characters" is true. Why? Because all other accounts of mental continuity in evolution are unpsychological. And so it goes.

It must be said, however, without reserve, that Professor Wundt does not sin on the side of inhospitality to legitimate theory. In his various books he shifts his point of view. Indeed, he is one of the first among living psychologists in the breadth of his interests and the variety of his contributions to current theory. In this he furnishes a salutary example.

*Through South Africa.* By Henry M. Stanley, M.P. Charles Scribner's Sons.

This book is made up of letters written to a newspaper called *South Africa*, with the addition of a map, an introductory chapter, and a number of photographs. Mr. Stanley attended the celebration at Bulawayo held when the railroad was completed to that city, an event which may well deserve commemoration. In March, 1896, this railway extended about 880 miles north from Cape Town, and in November, 1897, the remainder, 480 miles, was finished. The engineering difficulties seem to have been not numerous, and although an elevation of 4,500 feet is attained, there are few steep grades. Mr. Stanley's train made the distance in ninety hours, and he declares that its motion was wonderfully smooth and steady. The rails are laid

on iron tires. The people of Bulawayo, of course, expect great results from the building of this road, and extensions are already projected. Mr. Stanley writes as if this settlement might become a second Chicago, but his arguments are not very convincing. They amount to no more than saying that there is a vast amount of unoccupied land around Bulawayo, which is at present a desert, but which might be made productive if great companies could be formed to irrigate it, and if they could find the water wherewith to do so. The conditions which created Chicago were very different from this.

As Mr. Stanley saw little of the country except what was visible from a car-window, his impressions are not very extensive, nor are they interesting. His speculations as to the future development of South Africa have no such basis as to command our attention, and his recommendations as to the measures to be pursued are often puerile and presumptuous. We find none of his letters particularly agreeable reading, but the most repulsive are those from Johannesburg, which are in the main given up to coarse abuse of President Kruger. This worthy is doubtless a perverse and oppressive ruler, possibly a corrupt one; but the violent language employed by Mr. Stanley in describing him arouses the sympathy of the reader, nor are such facts presented as would give reason for this vituperation. On the whole, these letters give the impression of much ignorance on the writer's part of what he undertakes to describe; what he has to say is hardly worth saying, and he does not say it very well. It would be a waste of time for any one who can procure Mr. Bryce's 'Impressions' to pay attention to those of Mr. Stanley.

*Memory and its Cultivation.* By F. W. Edridge-Green, M.D., F.R.C.S. (International Scientific Series, No. 78.) D. Appleton & Co. 1897. 8vo, pp. 311.

This author recognizes thirty-seven faculties of the mind; differing in but few particulars from the thirty-seven accepted by the phrenologists, and located like theirs in the cortex of the brain. This is utterly at variance with all the results of the last thirty years' study of the functions of the brain. Still worse, although Dr. Edridge-Green acknowledges that memory is the most important of all the powers, he places it in the corpus striatum and optic thalamus—that is, in organs between the cortex and the spinal cord. Two chapters are devoted to arguing these positions, yet the only reference to the experimental researches of our time is one brief and vague mention of Ferrier's work. No reasons are put forward which are not either old or insignificant.

The opening sentence of the book is, "What is memory?" This is pertinent; but the true answer is not given. The phenomena of memory are nothing but those of the phenomena of association by contiguity, in which the suggested idea brings with it so much of its environment as to be referred to the past. Hence, whatever cerebral explanation is given for association in general must be applied to the chief constituent of memory. Dr. Edridge-Green (p. 145) appears to locate association by contiguity in the optic thalamus. Considering that association by contiguity is nothing but mental habit, and that habit-taking is one of the fundamental attributes of protoplasm in

general, the theory of this work could not well be narrower or more arbitrary.

Although the theoretical part of the book is so unimportant, it might be hoped that some wise counsels would be given about the cultivation of memory. All we find, however, is a series of twenty-two mnemonic rules. Though there are so many, they omit some well-known principles, such as that of the summation of stimuli. Among the rules given are a few which will probably be of some value. Others, though well enough, are trite. Still others are both trite and pernicious, because they recommend the burdening of the memory with utterly trivial and useless associations. Thus, we are advised to remember that the first Roman invasion of Britain took place 55 B. C. by associating it with the vocables "Julius Cæsar," and remembering that the letter *d* means 5. Is it not much easier to remember that it was seven years after the defeat of Catiline and seven years before Pharsalia? The good old way of learning a few important and familiar dates *per se*, and the rest by their intervals between those, can hardly be improved.

*Modern Architecture: A Book for Architects and the Public.* By H. Heathcote Statham, Fellow of the Institute of British Architects, Editor of the *Builder*, etc. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1898.

The keynote of Mr. Statham's book is common sense. It contains good instruction for those who are candidates for such instruction, whether laymen or architectural students, discussing the planning and in the rough the designing of buildings in country and town, without concerning itself much for the technical forms of architecture, with abundant illustrations from the buildings of various countries, and with a catholicity of judgment which we do not always find in the writers of a country that has an architecture of its own. If we notice at all that Anglocentric view of the universe from which Englishmen find it hard to get away, it is when Mr. Statham sees in every Parliament-house an appropriation of the idea, which he patents to Mr. Barry, of using a central hall of entrance connected with a great chamber on either hand—one of the obvious expedients which belong to the world, and have been used by it at many times and places. This is very much as if one should accuse every musician who writes a perfect cadence of plagiarizing from Haydn. It is not unnatural that Mr. Statham should prefer English planning to French, perhaps not strange that he should say that "the French architects are mostly very bad planners": we have known French architects to say the same thing of English. Possibly architects not French, who have studied French work, though they might not quite agree with either, would on the whole give the preference to French planning. It is very much a question of the comparative values one sets on details of convenience, of which the French are ready to sacrifice a good deal, and of elegance, for which the English have little natural gift. It should be remembered that all planning is a matter of compromise. He succeeds best who combines the greatest number of the possible excellences, and who knows best what to sacrifice; as to this last, opinions will differ, as habits do.

In spite of an inclination, which is common to writers on this subject, to lay down law