evidence on which our verdict was found, the rôle of special pleader, being content to follow Darwin's own example—Let the truth speak for itself.

ARTHUR KEITH

EDWARD BRADFORD TITCHENER

THE recent death of Professor Edward Bradford Titchener, of Cornell, at the age of sixty, removes one of the most prominent figures in American psychology. Professor Titchener came to this country in 1892, when experimental methods were first beginning to find favor and psychological laboratories were being started in all our leading universities. An Englishman by birth, and a graduate of Brasenose College, Oxford, he studied under Wundt at Leipzig, and had just obtained his doctor's degree when called to Cornell.

On assuming this position Professor Titchener at once adopted a program which has been followed at Cornell ever since. He established a psychological laboratory and made experimental psychology the keystone of the departmental courses. Under his direction, Cornell soon became one of the most productive universities in psychological research. Many of our leading investigators owe their training to Titchener, and the Cornell laboratory has served as model for many departments elsewhere.

While not following Wundt's system in every particular, Professor Titchener held rigidly to the Leipzig ideals. Psychology meant to him introspection by trained subjects or observers, under carefully controlled conditions, with exact measurement of the stimuli and of the observer's responsive activities. He had no sympathy with the behavioristic type of psychology which has grown up in the past fifteen years. For Titchener psychology was the investigation of consciousness—of conscious, subjective experiences. He measured "responses" as a means of obtaining quantitative values for the introspective data; but he did not consider the study of behavior as part of the science of psychology. He set himself the task of analyzing the elementary data of experience—the structure of mind or consciousness—and pursued this analysis systematically throughout his career. The achievements of the Cornell laboratory in this direction are universally recognized by psychologists of every school. No one has challenged the thoroughness nor the scientific accuracy of this work, though certain behaviorists have queried the value of introspective results as contributions to science. The time has not yet come to pass judgment on this question. But the title of Professor Titchener to rank as leader in the analytic or structural investigation of psychology is unassailable. For many years this method and system have been generally known as the Titchenerian psychology.

Titchener's writings are numerous and were always carefully prepared. He is the author of several text-books on general psychology, both elementary and advanced, the best known being his "Text-book of Psychology" published in 1910. His most important contribution is his "Experimental Psychology," a comprehensive laboratory manual in four volumes (1901–05). Among his works on special topics may be mentioned the "Elementary Psychology of Feeling and Attention" (1908) and "Experimental Psychology of the Thought Processes" (1909). No less important are his editorial contributions. For many years he served as American editor of the English magazine *Mind* (1894–1920), for a time the sole mouthpiece of psychology in Britain. Since 1895 he has been closely identified with *The American Journal of Psychology,* first as associate editor under Stanley Hall (1895–1920), and after Hall's retirement as editor-in-chief (1921–25). To this and other journals he was a frequent contributor of systematic articles, experimental reports, discussions and reviews. The wide range of his contributions is no less remarkable than his clear style and the breadth of his knowledge.

Professor Titchener was an omnivorous reader in the field of psychology. His acquaintance with the older writers extended to medieval and ancient times. He would frequently refer quite incidentally to contributions or hints in some classic source bearing upon a topic on which he or another was working. At the same time he kept fully abreast with current literature. One could not mention in his presence any recent periodical article, however trivial, that he did not show himself perfectly familiar with its contents.

Nor were his interests confined to psychology. He devoted much time to the kindred science of anthropology, and had gathered a large collection of idols, masks, drums and other folk-relics. More recently he developed an interest in numismatics. In connection with this latter avocation he undertook the study of several new languages, including Arabic and Chinese. He was highly appreciative of art in all its forms, particularly music. For a time he served as "professor in charge of music" at Cornell.

In his own field, psychology, there seems to have been a constant conflict between his broad general outlook and his narrower ideals. Professor Titchener's aim was to concentrate the entire research work of his department upon certain definite problems, one topic being taken up at a time, and leading eventually and logically to the next. He was averse to investigation along independent lines by his students and to discussion of extraneous problems in the courses in his department.

This rigid specialization is to-day somewhat exceptional. In most American universities the ideal is to teach a science rather than a system or school. At Cornell the aim was to teach and develop a single type of psychology. This policy has its advantages and disadvantages, both of which have been clearly shown at Cornell. We find on the one hand a splendid body of experimentally obtained contributions to science—on the other hand an increasing lack of sympathy with non-introspective methods of investigation and with the important psychological problems which they suggest.

The same characteristic appears in Titchener's personality. Like Wundt, he preferred to work alone; it was difficult for him to cooperate. He seldom attended the meetings of the American Psychological Association, and for many years withdrew from membership. On the other hand, with his own pupils and his immediate circle of friends he was unreserved and genial. One could always count on him for advice and sympathy. Many years ago he brought together a small group of experimentalists and graduate students from various universities, who were accustomed to meet at various places during the spring recess, to discuss laboratory problems informally and give mutual advice. In these gatherings Titchener ignored all distinctions of age and degree, and treated every one on terms of close intimacy.

The contrast between these two sides of his personality is after all not difficult to understand. Titchener was wholly wrapped up in his work. He had no time to devote to miscellaneous social activities, nor to general meetings, where a large proportion of the papers were quite foreign to his own line of research. But his friends and coworkers were part of his scientific environment, and their interests were closely related to his own. His punctiliousness in certain directions was often misunderstood by those who did not know him and gained for him the reputation of being "difficult." His friends understood him better. They knew that at heart he was sympathetic and thoroughly human, unbending only in matters which seemed to affect his scientific ideals and his standards of conduct. Thoroughly sincere himself, he was deeply offended at anything which seemed to savor of scientific dishonesty. Difference of standpoint had little effect on his friendships, but he was touched to the quick when these differences seemed to result in a lowering of scientific ideals. This distress he covered with a defense reaction of harshness, which was frequently misinterpreted.

It is difficult to estimate at this time Titchener's real place in the development of psychology. But one may safely predict that the value of his extensive experimental contributions will be fully recognized, whatever direction the science may take in the future. It is to be hoped also that Titchener's real personality, the underlying humanity and honesty of the man, may come to be more widely known and appreciated, and that his strict adherence to scientific ideals may have a lasting influence.

HOWARD C. WARREN

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

SCIENTIFIC EVENTS

MESSAGE FROM THE RETIRING PRESIDENT OF THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION

THE following message from the Prince of Wales, on laying down the presidency of the association, was read at the opening session of the Leeds meeting on August 31:

My year of office as president of the British Association has come to an end, and I can only express my regret to the members of the association, and to our hosts, the City and University of Leeds, that I am unable to attend personally in order to take my leave.

At Oxford last year I ventured in my address to lay before the meeting a view of the relations between science and the state. I felt subsequently some justification for having chosen this topic, when I observed in the proceedings of the Imperial and Colonial Conferences of the past year the extraordinary emphasis laid upon the value of scientific research in relation to imperial development. Both conferences set up special committees on research, and we can not but believe and rejoice that the foundations of an imperial scientific service are being firmly laid. The prime minister of Australia indicated "the application of science both to our primary and secondary industries" as "the most important thing for empire trade"; more recently our ex-president, the Earl of Balfour, invited the attention of the House of Lords to "the enormous value of the work given by men of science, with the most lavish generosity," to the study of problems of the common welfare.

Such events as these place it beyond doubt that one of the main objects of the British Association itself is in process of achievement, namely, that of "obtaining more general attention for the objects of science." The association, the so-called parliament of science, is one of the chief instruments to that end, and I trust that the public support will continue, in increasing measure, to be accorded to its work. Its powers, I am happy to say, have been very materially strengthened, during my own term of office, through the splendid generosity of Sir Alfred Yarrow, in making a gift of £10,000 for the general purposes of the association, to be expended, in accordance with his wise provision, in the course of twenty years. I gladly take this opportunity of publicly repeating the thanks of the association to Sir Alfred Yarrow.

In resigning the chair to Sir Arthur Keith, I can wholeheartedly congratulate the association on its choice of my successor. His name stands very high in the science of