

of psychology and philosophy to an analysis of experience, but with the fundamental difference that what is aimed at is not an analysis of individual experience, as with Ward, but an analysis of pure experience. The title of his great work as a 'Critique of Pure Experience' reminds one of Kant's 'Critique of Pure Reason.' As Kant set himself the task of finding out the innate forms of the reasoning intellect, so Avenarius tries to arrive at a description of pure experience, *i.e.*, of such experience as is not contaminated and mixed up with a whole host of conceptions, images, and ideas, which are imported through tradition and habit and elaborated by fanciful analogies. Unfortunately the style of Avenarius' writings is no less peculiar than that of Kant's Critique, and it remains to be seen whether his disciples will succeed in extricating an intelligible and useful set of important and

analysis towards which we approach, but which is, after all, only a distant ideal. There seems no doubt that Avenarius was much influenced by the success attained in the abstract sciences of nature through reduction of qualitative to quantitative differences. Prof. Höffding in his independent statement of Avenarius' speculation ('Moderne Philosophie,' pp. 117-27) characterises it as the natural history of problems; the attempt to show how, through the want of equilibrium between the external (physical) and the internal (psychical) series of events or processes, the desire and need for equalisation is produced. Through a repeated study of Avenarius' works, as also through personal intercourse with him, Höffding has come to the conclusion (against Wundt) that Avenarius cannot be stigmatised as a materialist, inasmuch as he himself declared that he

knew neither the "physical" nor the "psychical," but only a third something. Nevertheless it has to be admitted that the attempt to penetrate from outside, from the brain processes to the mind processes, gives the whole the appearance of a purely physiological treatment. "This relation between psychology and physiology is characteristic, and contains a significant warning against the view that it would be more scientific in questions of this kind to proclaim the 'biological' as the only correct method" (Höffding, *loc. cit.*, p. 122). A very interesting though somewhat acrid criticism of modern psychology in Germany, from the position indicated by Avenarius, will be found in Rudolf Willy, 'Die Krisis in der Psychologie' (1899). Hardly any notice is taken of modern English or French psychological work.