

tain an object in myself, but we have attention only so far as I maintain it theoretically or at least perceptively." Moving one's hand or eye to gain knowledge about an object need not involve attention. "My end in attention is to maintain an object before me with a view to gain knowledge about it." Attention is thus negative of any mere psychical interference with the object and its knowledge.

But attention implies also a volition on my part. When listless or absorbed, I may notice a bird fly across the field of vision without attention. An idea may develop itself theoretically before me without attention. Not that attention is the same thing as will, and not that all attention is directly willed. It may be directly willed but need not be so. Wherever an end of any kind involves in and for its realization the maintenance and support of an ideal object before me and in me—that is attention (p. 8). "The ideal development of the object in me is thus, directly or indirectly, the realization of my will" (p. 10).

So-called passive attention 'may be called the mere occupancy of myself,' and this is not essential to attention. Immediate action upon a sensation or a perception need not involve attention; and apperception, the modification of a sensation by a disposition, is not an attending. And yet, this activity of apperception 'may be said, if you please, to cause in a certain sense attention to the object' (p. 11), but we have first been impressed and laid hold of by an idea (=any suggestion even when coming straight from a perception) (p. 29). "Our will to realize this idea in external action and in inward knowledge is but the self-realization of the idea which so has possessed us. And you cannot, if you keep to facts, maintain even that the suggestion holds us in all cases because it arouses desire or even pleasure." We cannot get rid of ideo-motor action, and it is idle to deny that at least some ideo-motor actions are volitions. Sometimes an idea whose psychical origin is apparently casual or undiscoverable is simply 'there' and remains 'there'; it 'goes on to realize itself and in this way unfeeling forces, we may say, our will and our active attention' (p. 30).

*On Mental Conflict and Imputation.* F. H. BRADLEY, *Mind*, XI., No. 43, July, 1902, pp. 289-315.

Divided will, conflict of ideas in desire and impulse, alleged action contrary to will, and the principles on which we impute actions to ourselves, or again disown them, are the topics of this paper. "Volition I take to be the realization of itself by an idea, an idea (it is better to add) with which the self here and now is identified" (p. 290).

The paper first discusses the alleged case of action realizing an idea contrary to will — such as yielding to morbid desire for drink. The author holds that two ideas cannot be present at once, and that where they immediately succeed the one the other the self is not identified with both of them in the same degree. All my acts are mine, but they are not equally or in the same sense mine, as is shown by the following: (1) Viewing the self in its material aspect, we all distinguish between our true self, our self taken as a whole, and the lower or chance self of any moment. (2) Formally, we regard the more universal as the higher and the more mine; but the universal is often abstract, and hence may be higher in one respect while in other respects it is lower and worse. (a) A course will be formally higher when it explicitly and consciously asserts a principle, instead of embodying it unconsciously. (b) To adopt a course reflectively is higher than to adopt it at once and unreflectively. (c) *A* and *B* may be incompatible and known to be so, each involving the negation of the other, or they may be so related that *A*, for example, includes *B*, and in the latter case *A* will be the higher and the more mine. (3) An idea which is pleasant or more pleasant is so far higher and more mine, and one which is painful or more painful is lower and less mine.

The author next proceeds to give reasons for not accepting the alleged fact of action contrary to will. In the end he holds that if the alternatives are really incompatible and are known to be so, they cannot, 'while really taken thus as alternatives, be present together, and we are able to think this possible only because we really do not take them as opposites.' A man cannot knowingly and willingly do what is bad. And yet, the author admits that an idea which is contrary to will may get itself carried out (where the ideas are abnormal), denying merely that any act of this sort is volition. The reader feels at first that Mr. Bradley has yielded his case, at this point, to Mr. Shand, but he goes on to say that the idea which is carried out in such a case is really not an idea at all, because held subordinate to the alternative idea and negated by it (p. 309). Mr. Shand contends that ideas may realize themselves, in Mr. Bradley's sense of the word, without volition taking place.

If I hold the idea of another person's doing a thing and this thing follows in me, this is not volition; and if I imagine myself in a certain state, and my imagination is thereupon realized, this is not volition; for in neither case can the result be shown to follow as a genuine consequence of the idea, and in neither case is the idea had in mind the one realized in action.

The paper closes (pp. 314-315) with a restatement of the principles upon which the difference and the degrees of mine and not-mine rest. (1) If I can bring and retain *A* not-*b* before my mind and cannot do this with *B* not-*a*, *B* is so far higher and so far mine more truly than *A*. (2) The same is true, if, taken on the whole, *B* is more pleasant or less painful than *A*. (3) If *A* is the outcome of and represents deliberate choice, while this is wanting in the case of *B*, *B* is so far the lower and less mine. (4) If *A* appears as falling under a principle, while *B* falls under a principle lower and less general or under no principle whatever, *A* will to that extent be higher. (5) Lastly, the most important criterion of all consists in the material difference of content. If *A* represents some minor interest of my being, and if this feature is not contained or is to a less extent contained in *B*, *B* is so far lower and is not mine.

*The Definition of Will.* F. H. BRADLEY. *Mind*, XI., No. 44, Oct., 1902, pp. 437-469.

This paper proposes an explanation and defense of the author's definition of will as 'the self-realization of an idea with which the self is identified.' Volition involves the following aspects: (1) Existence, (2) the idea of a change, (3) the actual change of the existence by the idea to (4) the idea's content and in such a way that (5) the self feels itself realized. Assuming 'provisionally the existence of what is called ideo-motor action,' defined as 'the tendency of an idea to realize itself,' the paper proceeds to discuss the above five points.

(1) Existence is either the actual series of events that is now and here, or continuous with my now and here. (2) This existence must be altered in volition beginning 'now' with the 'present.' Even the will to continue the present in a certain character is a will for alteration. The alteration must not be merely ideal, but it must be an alteration to the character possessed by the idea, and it must be produced by the idea. Here follow discussions of several phenomena which in the author's view are not volitions, viz., resolve and intention, will in paralysis, and disapprobation or approval. In resolve, the existence to be altered by the idea is severed by a gap from the actual present; and after abstracting from the result, that is, from the actual realization of the idea, in volition, what remains is so far only an incomplete will (p. 446). We may roughly distinguish between two stages in volition, (1) the mere prevalence of the idea, and (2) the advance of the idea beyond its own existence toward its physical or psychical end. If taken strictly, the first stage 'is not a complete or