it by no means follows that they are ends to be sought. "There is no bargaining with hedonic values."

MANFRED W. DEPUTY.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY.

The Status of the Subconscious. JOSEPH JASTROW. Amer. Journal of Psychol., Commemorative Number, July-October, 1903, p. 79.

In this paper Professor Jastrow sets forth in a suggestive way two allied views. On the one hand, he urges that hypotheses formulated to explain abnormal psychic phenomena 'should be broad enough to include both the normal and the abnormal phases of mental action' (p. 88). This sound doctrine is based on the fact that "intermediate between these extreme examples of the abnormal and the commonplace incidents of the life of the subconscious, are many forms of manifestation forming a bridge from the one to the other. Dreaming," Dr. Jastrow adds, with great perfect justice, "is in itself a sufficiently versatile process to manifest them all." The study, from this point of view, of the abnormal, 'in no wise,' according to Dr. Jastrow, sanctions 'the hypothesis of an independent subconscious organization' (p. 86).

None the less, Dr. Jastrow teaches, 'subconscious activities' do constitute a part of the material of psychology. For this view he argues, *first*, by pointing out that there is no break in the continuity of the intensity-series of physical stimuli, although the low intensities are not perceptible whereas the higher intensities are perceived; *second*, by emphasizing (p. 85) the presence of 'marginal' as well as 'focal elements of consciousness.' The writer of this notice misses, in Jastrow's discussion, a definite distinction between consciousness and subconsciousness. In particular he does not make clear the relation between (1) that form of subconsciousness which is presupposed by the continuity of the physical intensities and (2) that form of subconsciousness which is involved in 'marginal' consciousness. 'The subconscious' in the latter sense seems to be nothing more nor less than 'the unattended-to'; whereas 'the subconscious' in the former sense may surely be a physiological process—at least such an account of it is not disproved. In the fuller treatment of the whole subject, promised by Professor Jastrow, one may look for a discussion of this point.

M. W. CALKINS.

WELLESLEY COLLEGE.