In my opinion, as I have said at length elsewhere, it is only when human strivings toward the preservation and increase of that which is valued follow along a specific channel; or, in other words, when the fulfillment of life's purposes is sought by certain specific means, that we have that particular mode of behavior called religion.

If I mention finally a group of chapters on the origin and development of religion, and another on special problems, such as conversion, mental traits of religious leaders, religion and the subconscious, mysticism, the future life as a psychological problem, prayer, I shall have indicated, if very insufficiently, the wide scope of the book.

The successful effort of the author "to provide, particularly in the alphabetical and topical bibliographies, convenient apparatus for following up problems, and especially for setting them in a scientific perspective" (p. ix), deserves notice and commendation. The chapters are brief but substantial and in many parts original, and they all bear witness to an intimacy with religious life—in whatever sense the term be taken—and to an acuteness of psychological understanding which give to this volume a distinctive place in the literature of the psychology of religion.

JAMES H. LEUBA

The Belief in God and Immortality. A Psychological, Anthropological and Statistical Study. J. H. LEUBA. Boston: Sherman, French, 1916. Pp. xvii + 340.

In an earlier work, *A Psychological Study of Religion*, Professor Leuba gave an account of the origin, the function, and the future of the belief in "personal gods." The present volume is a similar study of the belief in "personal immortality," including closely related material on the belief in a "personal god." By "personal immortality" the author means "a continuation after death (with or without body) of the consciousness of personal identity" (pp. viii, ix.) A "personal God" would be one with whom direct intellectual and affective relations can be maintained (p. ix), *i. e.*, "a God to whom one may pray in the expectation of receiving an answer," this last implying "more than the subjective, psychological effect of prayer" (p. 225). The conceptions as thus defined are declared to be fundamental to all the historical religions, including Christianity and Judaism, but excepting primitive Buddhism and Comtism.

The book is divided into three parts. In the first of these an

effective contrast is drawn between the "primary belief" in immortality—held by primitive men without a desire for it, and simply consisting in a fear of ghosts forced upon them by what appear to be patent facts—and the "modern belief" in a state of blessedness—which had a wholly different origin and was motivated by "the desire for the realization of ideals." A number of interesting interpretations are advanced in this connection, noteworthy among which is the distinction between the "ghost" which begins its career with a person's death, and the "soul" which exists before birth and is "the (individualized?) life-power possessed by every object that, in the eye of the savage, is animated" (p. 71). Two historical chapters argue for the origin of the "modern belief" in ancient Greece and Israel in independence of the "primitive belief." The two concluding chapters of the first part maintain the inadequacy of the arguments for immortality based upon metaphysics, inner experience, and psychical research.

The second part reports the results of a statistical investigation of the prevalence of the beliefs in a "personal God" and "personal immortality," as above defined, among American scientific men and college students. The questionnaires were carried on with great care and thoroughness, and this portion of the book deserves the study of all interested in possible methods for the investigation of the prevalence of beliefs in contemporary society. Four questions were submitted to and replied to by *all* students in classes of the non-technical departments of "nine colleges of high rank" and "two classes of a normal school," 1,100 answers being obtained. 56 per cent. of the men students and 82 per cent. of the women students were found to believe in a "personal God." In "one college of high rank and moderate size" in which 90 per cent. of all the students replied to a questionnaire, the believers in "personal immortality" constituted 80 per cent. of the freshmen, 76 per cent. of the sophomores, 60 per cent. of the juniors, and 70 per cent. of the seniors. Two identical investigations were made, each including 500 names chosen at random, from the list of 5,500 names in *American Men of Science*. It was found that 42 per cent. believed in a "personal God," and 48 per cent. were disbelieving or doubtful, while 51 per cent. believed in "personal immortality" and 49 per cent. were disbelieving or doubtful. The questionnaire was also sent to names similarly chosen from the membership lists of the American Historical Association, the American Sociological Society, and the American Psychological Association. Comparing special-

ists in different fields the proportion of believers in a "personal God" diminished in the following order: historians, 48 per cent.; sociologists, 46 per cent.; physicists, 44 per cent.; biologists, 31 per cent.; psychologists, 24 per cent. The proportion of believers in "personal immortality" was: sociologists, 55 per cent.; historians, 52 per cent.; physicists, 51 per cent.; biologists, 37 per cent.; psychologists, 20 per cent. In every group the believers were much less numerous among the men who had previously been designated in an impartial manner as the more "eminent." Though the attempt was made, no unambiguous replies could be obtained from philosophical men for a variety of reasons. The author finds that disbelief, both among scholars and students, is not so much due to technical knowledge directly bearing on these subjects as to traits of independence and self-affirmation, and to greater freedom from social pressure.

In the third part the author advances "certain weighty facts" to show that at the present time, at least among the most civilized nations, the beliefs in a "personal God" and "personal immortality" as defined, do not possess the utility usually ascribed to them. Among these facts the following may be mentioned. The replies to the questionnaires show that a large percentage of cultivated persons do not desire "personal immortality," while an equally large percentage are only moderately desirous of it. The fear that the disappearance of these beliefs would work moral injury is ill founded. At present they have very little force as moral sanctions. Moral ideals and moral energy, on the other hand, have their source in social life. Moral education can better be effected through a clear recognition of the natural consequences of actions than through formal religion. These beliefs have an injurious effect in promoting "other-worldliness."

The reviewer wishes to express his dissent upon three points. (1) Though the general distinction between the two beliefs in immortality seems well established, the author does not give enough recognition to certain motives to belief in immortality that are common to the two. The desire to give and receive aid and sympathy from the deceased is such a motive. One does not need to be a specialist in these matters to recall the presence of such motives among Melanesian and African savages. The ancestral and hero worship of ancient Greece and Rome and modern Japan show the presence of this motive on the higher levels of the "primitive" belief. Catholic adoration of saints and prayers for the dead and both Catholic and

Protestant moral reinforcement from belief in the aid of the risen Christ and the sympathy of the church triumphant belong within the scope of the "modern" belief. (2) The author shows that beliefs in a "personal God" and "personal immortality," as he has defined them, have surprisingly little vital hold to-day upon the types of people included within his statistical investigation. In other words, these beliefs, as defined, are losing ground among persons independent enough not to accept popular beliefs as a result of social suggestion and who have not had the opportunity or inclination to investigate these questions for themselves. Philosophers, the only type of thinkers included in the questionnaires, who do give serious consideration to these beliefs from the standpoint of metaphysics—the only discipline in the present state of human knowledge adequate to consider their verity—were unable to assume either the naïve attitude of credulity or the only slightly more critical attitude of incredulity requisite to reply to the questions with a simple Yes or No. In the reviewer's opinion, there is a considerable amount of truth in both of these doctrines, and he believes that in the course of another generation, after this truth shall have become adequately formulated and well known, that these beliefs in their reconstructed forms will again become vital in religious life. Of course he is here only opposing his own personal opinion to that of the author. He does so merely in order to show that it is quite possible to interpret the results of the author's research on this point in another way than that favored by the author himself. (3) The reviewer does not believe that the beliefs in a "personal God" and a "personal immortality," as defined, are fundamental to modern Christianity in the sense that their abandonment would involve either its disappearance or its transformation into something unrecognizable (p. 173). In fact, he believes that the psychology of religion has now taught us that no dogma can be said to be fundamental to any religion, mistaken as its adherents may be in thinking the contrary.

The author has made a number of noteworthy contributions, among which are the distinctions between two types of immortality, differing in origin, nature, and function, and the first really trustworthy information on the actual status of the beliefs in a personal God and personal immortality among certain classes of contemporary American society.

WILLIAM KELLEY WRIGHT